A CASE STUDY OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN DIVISION I RESEARCH INSTITUTION COLLEGES: THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS

BY

JASON FITZSIMMONS

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Secondary and Continuing Education in the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2010

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Marilyn Johnston-Parsons, Chair
Assistant Professor Barbara Hug
Professor Carolyn Shields
Assistant Professor Bekisizwe Ndimande
Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate faculty development from the perspectives of program administrators in different colleges of a Division I research institution. The participants were administrators of faculty development programs from eight different colleges at the institution. The research questions were (a) How do the administrators of faculty development programs describe the organization of their programs? (b) What do program administrators see as the purposes of the faculty development programs in the colleges? and (c) How do the program administrators as well as the college leadership determine the viability of a faculty development program? The data from the interviews were first coded to themes; as broader categories emerged, they were connected to the three research questions. The framework for the study was the concept of communities of practice, a part of Wenger’s (1998) social theory of learning. The discussion explored how the role of a faculty development program in a college could be classified as a passive instructional resource, an active teaching service, or an influential community changer. In each classification a college places an increasing degree of importance on (a) teaching as a measure of faculty competence, (b) faculty pursuit of becoming a better teacher, and (c) the need for a faculty development program in the college.
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Chapter One

Overview

There have been pivotal moments influencing or even demanding academe to adjust over the last 200 years. Engineering, for example, was taught for more than 100 years typically using the same pedagogy and student-learning model. Due to European engineering professors immigrating after World War I, engineering education in the early 1920s slowly shifted to a more research-oriented climate (Wankat et al., 2002). In the 1940s, academe’s modern research foundation was firmly established in great part because of World War II. Wankat et al. (2002) explained that the demands of the war caused a dramatic increase in the rate of innovations. The research climate of academe advanced after World War II, eventually being shaped in the 1950s and 1960s. During this time period, the space race between America and Russia led to major changes in precollege science education and created heightened interest in students graduating from high school (Wankat et al., 2002). The government increased its appropriations for basic research to try to keep up with the Russians, which made available large amounts of funding for research in academe. During the 1950s and 1960s, research became the primary, if not the only, path to tenure, promotion, and prestige for faculty members at aptly-named “research institutions” (Wankat et al., 2002). The 1960s were also the period when rigorous research, represented by the Ph.D., became faculty’s entrance requirement into academe (Wankat et al., 2002).

The professoriate may be the only profession requiring an advanced graduate degree but not requiring teaching competence, and possibly no experience, in teaching students. Russell Edgerton (1998), president of the American Association for Higher Education, underscored this problem by saying:
Faculty members come to us strong in content and blissfully ignorant of anything having to do with theories of learning and strategies of teaching rooted in pedagogical knowledge. In their knowledge of their disciplines . . . they stand on the shoulders of giants; in their knowledge of teaching, they stand on the ground. (p. B2)

Brent and her colleagues (2001) felt that, “College teaching may be the only skilled profession that neither presumes experience nor routinely provides training to its novice practitioners” (p. 1). The authors continued their argument for the importance of faculty development by stating, “In the absence of systematic guidance, new faculty make common mistakes leading to low scholarly productivity, ineffective teaching, and high stress levels” (Brent et al., 2001, p. 1). This statement basically summarized Boice’s (1992) research results on new faculty in which he found that the cost for faculty development activities would be significantly less than paying for low productivity, faculty turnover, or, ultimately, failure.

Wankat (2002) and Wulf (2002) both argued from experience that it was possible to learn how to teach well despite the fact that a majority of research faculty have never had a formal course in education. Sorcinelli (1994) synthesized numerous studies on the early experiences of new faculty. She found a common thread throughout the research indicating that new and junior faculty had the most potential to improve their teaching. Weimer (1990) concluded from her research that, “Until higher education recognizes the inherent value and equality of both its missions [teaching and research], faculty involvement in instructional improvement will never be what it could be” (p. 21). Research faculty can still improve their teaching skills by participating in faculty development activities, despite never having a formal course in education.

Rationale

Many of the best teachers in academe have been driven by their enjoyment of teaching and desire to see students succeed. Yet even the most self-motivated faculty require an
organizational environment that affirms the value of their work, rewards teaching, and sustains morale over time (Rice and Austin, 1990). “Faculty hear teaching is important, but see research is rewarded” (Weimer, 1990, p. 131). Consequently, a central part of an institution’s mission must be the commitment to a high standard of teaching for faculty to be motivated to teach well (Rice and Austin, 1990). Weimer (1990) plainly concluded from her research that, “If improvement [in teaching] is expected, its pursuit must be supported” (p. 139).

The primary mission of research universities, according to Rice and Austin’s (1990) research, was the “pursuit and production of knowledge in the form of traditional research projects and publications” (p. 34). The authors discovered that while good teaching was stated as a parallel objective, explicit and implicit signals indicated that research was the primary goal of the institutions. Rice and Austin (1990) acknowledged the complex relationship between teaching and research, especially at a research institution, but stated that, “Encouragement of serious attention to teaching is important for its implications for the quality of education offered” (p. 34). To this end, the authors presented three factors for supporting quality teaching at research institutions. First, teaching must have been a strongly valued institutional commitment. Second, institutional leaders must have articulated the importance of high-quality teaching. Third, institutions that wished to motivate faculty to take teaching seriously benefitted from creating communities of faculty who shared a commitment to teaching.

According to Green’s (1990) research, making good teaching an institutional priority required changing values, behaviors, and academic norms. Research studies showed that faculty improved their teaching and the overall quality of teaching was better at the institution in academic settings that recognized and rewarded instructional excellence (Green, 1990; Weimer, 1990). General discussion of the importance of good teaching was not sufficient to
counterbalance the graduate school socialization process (Green, 1990; Rice and Austin, 1990),
the usual institutional reward structures (Green, 1990; Rice and Austin, 1990; Weimer, 1990),
and the rhetoric regarding the importance of research activity (Green 1990; Rice and Austin,
1990; Weimer, 1990). Therefore, academic leaders need to be clear and consistent in
communicating faculty expectations regarding the importance of teaching, research, and service.

**Researcher’s Experience**

I experienced the tension between teaching and research as an undergraduate and
graduate engineering student at a Division I research institution. My perception as a student was
that many professors, but not all, would rather work on a research project than teach a class.
There were a couple of times when professors even forgot a lecture because they were so
involved in research. Another professor made teaching a succinct and efficient endeavor by
covering a certain number of pages from the course packet during each lecture, giving a test
every 100 pages. I also experienced firsthand that while all engineering faculty members met the
expectation to teach courses, they exhibited poor pedagogy. The professors taught in more
traditional lecture formats that did not help convey difficult concepts well. I felt that other
methods might be better at not only presenting the concepts better, but also help improve
students learning those concepts. Overall, it seemed to me that teaching was not their first
priority.

I became interested in improving teaching and student learning in engineering from my
experiences as a student, which led me to pursue a Ph.D. in education. I wanted to know more
about curriculum and instruction and better ways to teach. During my doctoral studies, I also
came to realize that as a future professor in engineering that my impact on student learning
would be limited to only the students in my classes. I realized that I could have a greater
influence on student learning if I changed my focus to faculty development. For example, as an individual professor I might be able to influence the learning of 90 students during a semester. However, if I work with 10 professors who have 90 students during a semester, then as a faculty developer I have considerably increased my influence on student learning at an institution. This realization led me to do my dissertation research on faculty development within research university settings.

**Faculty Development and Teaching**

Individual faculty members considered good teachers can influence the instructional attitudes and activities of their colleagues (Boyer, 1990; Brawner, 2002). However, department heads as well as college and institutional leaders are in better positions to directly influence more of the perceptions that faculty have related to teaching (Green, 1990; Lucas, 1990; Weimer, 1990). An institution’s teaching commitment is closely linked to the role academic leaders take in articulating and supporting teaching. Green (1990) concluded from research findings that successfully improving teaching required an enthusiastic and committed associate dean or director of a faculty development program held in high regard by peers.

Institutions provide incentives for good teaching when they encourage interactions among faculty and leadership who are committed to teaching. Rice and Austin (1990) found from their research that these kinds of interactions could build networks and communities amongst an institution’s faculty. Faculty within these informal teaching communities encouraged each other as teachers and provided examples to other faculty. Palmer (1993) suggested from research findings that each faculty member should “have a community of honest and open colleagues with whom to explore [his or her] struggles as a teacher” (p. 11). Palmer (1993) also stated that little talk about teaching would take place if leadership and department
heads did not invite these conversations regularly. Rice and Austin (1990) found from their research that faculty development programs that brought a group of professors together on a regular basis to address teaching issues were effective in developing a cohort of teaching-oriented faculty.

**Definition of Terms**

The focus of this study was the concept of development, which can have many meanings in different areas as well as many uses within the same community. The definition of development used in this study is taken from *Webster’s Dictionary*, which states that *development* is the act or process of bringing knowledge and/or skills to a more advanced, effective, or useable state. This study used two specific applications of the term development. The first is in a professional setting. *Professional development* connotes advancement in a person’s profession or field of study. The second application is in an academic setting. *Faculty development* connotes advancement in a person’s responsibilities as a faculty member in academe (i.e., research, teaching, service). As an example, a faculty member in veterinary medicine can attend a professional development seminar concerning new methods for treating animals, whereas attending a faculty development seminar would focus on how to teach students in a clinical setting.

**Purpose of the Study**

This research was a case study of college faculty development programs at a Division I research institution. The participants of the study were the program administrators from different faculty development programs. The purpose of this study was to investigate faculty development
in different colleges from the perspectives of program administrators. The main research questions were:

1. How do the administrators of faculty development programs describe the organization of their programs?

2. What do program administrators see as the purposes of the faculty development programs in the college?

3. How do the program administrators as well as the college leadership determine the viability of a faculty development program?

These questions were investigated using qualitative methods.

**Synopsis of the Dissertation**

This study contributes to the knowledge about faculty development in academe. The study investigated the perceptions of faculty development program administrators from different colleges of a Division I research institution. The following provides a brief description of the particular chapters of this paper.

**Literature**

*Theoretical framework.* The theoretical framework of this research study is based on Etienne Wegner’s *Communities of Practice* (1998), which espouses a social theory of learning. Wegner defined a community of practice as people engaged in the pursuit of an enterprise or practice. Over time, this collective learning results in practices that reflect both the pursuit of the enterprise and the social relations of the participants. The process of taking part and the relations with others are what Wegner called *participation.* In Wegner’s theory, participation suggests action and connection to social communities that are actively involved in social enterprises. Participation in a community of practice is a source of identity for the participant as well as a form of competence. The concept of communities of practice translates to this research study in
that faculty development can be a community belonging to a college or an institution. The faculty development community can also contribute to the institution’s enterprise of service, research, and teaching.

**Higher education.** Robert Boice, a pioneer in faculty development research, found that most new faculty take between four and five years to bring their research productivity and instructional effectiveness to levels that meet their institution’s standards (Boice, 1992, 2000). The tenure track considerations of most faculty members loosely coincide with the four to five year time frame of Boice. The responsibility and pressure of research usually overwhelms faculty members’ dedication to improving their instructional skills. According to Boice’s (1992, 2000) research findings, faculty generally teach the same way they were taught as students, more so when they are more concerned with achieving tenure and promotion through their research productivity.

Wankat (2002) and Wulf (2002) both argued from experience that it was possible to learn how to teach well despite the fact that a majority of research faculty have never had a formal course in education. Sorcinelli (1994) synthesized numerous studies on the early experiences of new faculty. She found a common thread throughout the research that indicated new and junior faculty had the most potential to improve their teaching. Weimer (1990) concluded from her research, “Until higher education recognizes the inherent value and equality of both its missions [teaching and research], faculty involvement in instructional improvement will never be what it could be” (p. 21).

**Faculty development.** Faculty development programs, as well as other centralized services in support of teaching, have been around in various forms for more than 30 years. Green (1990) stated, “Faculty development and the encouragement of good teaching are not new
issues” (p. 59). While the faculty development movement in academe has had a nearly thirty-year history, staff and professional development in K-12 education has had a longer history. Teachers are at the center of reform in K-12 education because they are the ones who will have to carry out the demands for higher standards in the classroom (Cuban, 1990; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001).

**Staff development.** The staff development programs found in literature vary widely in context and format but generally share a common purpose. Specifically, staff development programs were designed to “alter the professional practices, beliefs, and understanding of school persons toward an articulated end” (Griffin, 1983, p. 2). In most cases, that end was the improvement of student learning. According to Guskey’s (1986) research, staff development programs were a “systematic attempt to bring about change—change in the classroom practices of teachers, change in their beliefs and attitudes, and change in the learning outcomes of students” (p. 5). Fenstermacher and Berliner (1985) concluded from their research that the goal of staff development was “to advance the knowledge, skills, and understanding of teachers in ways that lead to changes in their thinking and classroom behavior” (p. 283).

**Methods**

Case study methodology as discussed by Stake in *The Art of Case Study* (1995) was chosen as the research framework. According to Stake, case study methodology is the study of the particularity and complexity of a single, bounded case (Stake, 1995). Case studies are used to understand how the people involved in the case see things while preserving the different and sometimes contradictory views of what is happening. Stake (1995) defines these different interpretations as *multiple realities*, which help increase the understanding of the case. A
researcher’s role is to understand the activity, interaction, and multiple realities of the case’s context.

Research data was gathered primarily from interviews with program administrators, but also through observations and artifacts. Stake (1995) describes data analysis in a case study as “a matter of giving meaning to first impressions as well as to final compilations” (p. 71). Data analysis began prior to the start of the study and continued through the entire progression of the study. I searched for themes in the data while transcribing the interviews. Subsequent readings aggregated emergent themes into main themes or coding categories used in data analysis. There were a total of ten coding categories, many of which reflected topics in the interviews. The coding categories were used to organize the case description (Chapter Four), the research findings (Chapter Five), and discussion of the research questions (Chapter Six).

Cases

The faculty development programs in this research study included 12 administrators from eight college-level faculty development programs. The cases are presented anonymously. I generically labeled the colleges (e.g., College A) and substituted pseudonyms for persons in the cases (e.g., Associate Dean Beske, Dean Cothran, Professor DeHart).

Findings and discussion

Organization. The first research question focused on understanding how faculty development programs were organized, which was evident in how colleges chose to administrate the programs and structure the activities offered to faculty.

Research findings indicated that either a director or committee chair administered faculty development programs. Six out of the eight programs followed an administrator model in which an individual faculty member was given responsibility for faculty development in the colleges.
The remaining two faculty development programs followed a unit model of organization; these programs had a director and assistant director. The establishment of a dedicated unit appeared to benefit a faculty development program. These two programs showed an increase in the number of activities, resources, and services offered to faculty, more than the other programs in this study.

Demands on faculty time and their schedules influenced administrator’s scheduling of activities in all the faculty development programs in this study. Administrators tried to increase participation by scheduling activities at the start of the academic year and/or at lunchtime throughout the academic year. It is possible that the effects of offering opening retreats followed by individual activities could convince faculty that the college valued teaching as an enterprise. However, offering an opening retreat and regular activities did not mean there was a structure or connection across all the activities. On the contrary, rarely did any of the faculty development programs in this study offer an activity that was a follow-up to a previous activity.

**Mission.** The second research question focused on understanding the mission of faculty development programs which was evident in (a) the administrator’s philosophy for the program; (b) the targeted audiences for activities; (c) the perceived impact on faculty; and (d) the artifacts created by the program.

The administrators’ primary mission for faculty development programs in this study was teaching. The majority of administrators viewed research as separate from teaching and therefore fell outside the purview of the faculty development program. The programs’ administrators mainly discussed improving teaching without explicit expectations of an improvement in student learning. Most of the program administrators perceived or viewed their
faculty development programs as raising the awareness of teaching and helping signal the importance of teaching in the college.

The program administrators did not keep historical documentation such as the number or demographics of faculty participants. The primary, and sometimes only, audience for faculty development activities was the current faculty of a college. Some of the programs offered activities primarily for new faculty, while only one program allowed graduate students to attend faculty activities. If documents were produced for activities, e.g., handouts or end-of-session surveys, they were never archived.

**Viability.** The third research question focused on understanding the viability of faculty development programs which was evident in (a) the history of the program; (b) the support given by the college and campus; (c) the assessment and accountability of the program; and (d) the administrator’s past challenges and future ideas.

One important finding of this study related to how colleges initiated their faculty development programs. The impetus for starting a faculty development program either originated from outside the college (i.e., Provost initiative) or from within the college (i.e., faculty initiative). I found that the impetus for creating a college faculty development program was a good indicator of the program’s activity level and long-term sustainability in the college. The programs that began from motivations within the college were consistently active and appeared more sustainable. By contrast, the programs that began from motivations external to the college were not active at the time of this study and were evidently harder to sustain.

The actual impact of the faculty development programs in this study was indeterminate. None of the current or past program administrators ever conducted formal assessment of activities or evaluated the program’s impact in the college. The administrators only used two
informal assessment metrics regarding activities offered: faculty participation and faculty satisfaction. It should be noted that the majority of faculty development programs were the responsibility of the Associate Deans of Academic Affairs in their colleges, although they did not direct the programs. The administrators of these programs, however, indicated that an office primarily concerned with undergraduate students should not also be responsible for faculty development issues.

According to the literature, a lack of institutional support for faculty development can impede its success in improving the teaching quality of faculty members. Even the most self-motivated teachers in academe require an organizational environment that affirms the value of their work, rewards teaching, and sustains morale over time. While colleges supported faculty development to varying degrees, it was unclear from the program administrators’ points of view if these supports had made faculty development and teaching central norms in the college. Faculty development was never a stated mission of the case study colleges. However, a college’s commitment to the successful development of faculty teaching can be inferred from the support given to the faculty development program.

While the challenges faced by administrators in this study were necessarily specific to the situation of particular colleges and programs, the challenges could be grouped into some common themes. The first challenge administrators faced was competition for faculty’s attention and time to participate in faculty development activities. The administrators themselves also grappled with having enough time for the faculty development programs. The second challenge administrators faced was the infrastructure of the college, which included the allocation of college resources and oversight of the faculty development program. The third challenge administrators faced was the inconsistent importance placed on research versus teaching within
colleges in this study. The final challenge for administrators was that faculty development programs struggled to find an identity in their colleges.

When considering the future of their faculty development programs, administrators primarily discussed three areas: activities, participation, and resources. The degree to which program administrators focused on these three areas depended on their particular interests at the time. First, the administrators of faculty development programs wanted to have regular and predictable activities or wanted to offer more and/or different activities. Second, they wanted to increase participation and create a wider presence in each college. Third, administrators wanted to increase the monetary and personnel resources for the faculty development programs.

**Conclusion**

I view faculty development as having the potential to develop a shared sense of a research and teaching community within a college, what Wenger would call a community of practice. In the ideal case, this faculty development community would be focused on connecting faculty teaching, research, and service with student learning. For this research, a case study approach was used to investigate faculty development as a community of practice within different disciplines. The program administrators’ perspective and experience provided evidence rarely evident in literature. I did not find evidence that colleges had established the kind of faculty development community where teaching, research, and service were connected to student learning.
Chapter Two

Literature

I reviewed engineering education literature at the start of this research study. I was interested in how teaching was encouraged and supported in engineering colleges at Division I research institutions. I expanded the scope of the literature to look specifically at faculty development within engineering. The reason was that faculty development literature included the teaching, research, and service of engineering faculty. It was recommended later that I expand my review of faculty development literature to include the research in K-12 education. I also reviewed some organizational and leadership literature because the participants in this research study were all administrators of faculty development programs at a Division I research institution.

In this chapter, I discuss four areas of literature: (a) engineering education and its impact on the research climate of academe; (b) faculty development in both higher and K-12 educational settings; (c) supportive organizational structures and leadership qualities; and (d) theoretical frameworks applicable to faculty development in academe.

Situating the Literature

There have been pivotal moments influencing or even demanding academe to adjust over the last 200 years. Engineering, for example, was taught for more than 100 years using the same pedagogy and student-learning model. Due to European engineering professors immigrating after World War I, engineering education in the early 1920s slowly shifted to a more research-oriented climate (Wankat et al., 2002). In the 1940s, academe’s modern research foundation was firmly established in great part because of World War II. Wankat et al. (2002) explained that the demands of the war caused a dramatic increase in the rate of innovations. The research climate
of academe advanced after World War II, eventually being shaped during the 1950s and 1960s. During this time period, the space race between America and Russia led to major changes in precollege science education and created heightened interest in students graduating from high school (Wankat et al., 2002). The government increased its appropriations for basic research to try to keep up with the Russians, which made available large amounts of funding for research in academe. During the 1950s and 1960s, research became the primary, if not only, path to tenure, promotion, and prestige for faculty members at aptly-named “research institutions” (Wankat et al., 2002). The 1960s were also the critical period when rigorous research, represented by the Ph.D., became faculty’s entrance requirement into academe (Wankat et al., 2002).

The modern age of engineering education has changed very little since the 1940s. Dr. William Wulf, in his keynote lecture at the 2002 Laboratory for Innovative Engineering Education (LITEE) Conference, pointed out that the only thing really different from when he was a student was that drafting and surveying were no longer a part of current engineering education curriculum (Wulf, 2002). He went on in his lecture to say engineering has “studied the topic of reforming engineering education to death,” (p. 4) mentioning reports produced by the National Research Council, the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) as being ineffectual in actually implementing change (Wulf, 2002). Dr. Wulf ran a software company for almost ten years before returning to academe where he began to see discrepancies between the education of engineering and the practice of engineering.

Wulf (2002) described his expectation for engineering education and what he actually experienced later on in his lecture. He said:

I would like to think that engineering education keeps up with the practice of engineering, and therefore probably has to change at about the same pace. I might
even like to believe that engineering education is out in front of where the practice is. Unfortunately, I do not think either of those is true. (p. 4)

Wulf (2002) brought out a pointed example of a workshop held at the National Academy of Engineering prior to his presidency. While participants discussed the pace of change in engineering, it was proposed to quantify this rate as the “half-life of engineering knowledge” (Wulf, 2002, p. 6). The participants estimated the half-life of engineering knowledge was most likely discipline-specific, ranging from 2.5 to 7.5 years. For some engineering disciplines, in other words, half of what was taught to students at the time was most likely obsolete by the time they graduated. This rapid change in knowledge has led to recent educational research projects being conducted in engineering. It should be noted that the “half-life of knowledge” concept does not apply just to engineering. The concept also has serious implications on the future of all disciplines in academe.

In 2005, the National Academy of Engineering published two reports titled The Engineer of 2020 and Educating the Engineer of 2020: Adapting Engineering Education to the New Century. The Engineer of 2020 Project was driven by a concern that current engineering students may not have been appropriately educated to face the challenges of the future. The project’s primary focus was not engineering research but undergraduate education. The project’s goal was maintaining America’s engineering prestige in the global community. It planned to reshape and refocus the undergraduate engineering learning experience:

[The project] takes it as a given that the nation’s societal goals will not be met absent a robust engineering community in the country. [The project] asks what restructuring of program, reallocation of resources, and refocusing of faculty and professional society time and energy are required so that our educational infrastructure can educate engineers prepared to tackle the challenges of the future. [The project] questions how we can more effectively share with students—current and potential—our passion for designing systems, structures, and devices to solve problems and our conviction that engineering is a profession that offers rich rewards for serving the interests of society. (p. xi)
The report *Educating the Engineer of 2020: Adapting Engineering Education to the New Century* (2005) went on to state:

> Although there is no consensus at this stage, it is agreed that innovation is the key and engineering is essential to this task; but engineering will only contribute to success if it is able to continue to adapt to new trends and provide education to the next generation of students so as to arm them with the tools needed for the world as it will be, not as it is today. (p. 4)

The report never implicitly stated, but it was heavily inferred, that engineering faculty were going to be the sole mechanism responsible for implementing change. The report recommended that future engineering faculty be given an opportunity to teach and face the challenges of teaching as postgraduates. The report also recommended that established engineering faculty be encouraged and supported to develop their teaching skills. The report never addressed how these two recommendations could be accomplished, just that they should be done.

The Engineer of 2020 Project, while focusing on undergraduate engineering, operated under the assumption that engineering education was a system. The project highlighted a couple of areas outside of undergraduate engineering such as improving the public’s technological literacy and understanding of engineering as well as improving K-12 education to make engineering education more accessible (Engineering, 2005). James Duderstadt, one of the authors contributing to *Dancing with the Devil: Information Technology and the New Competition in Higher Education*, ended the book by listing areas he thought would be issues in academia’s future: (a) teaching—shifting from faculty-centered to learner-centered institutions; (b) learning—more emphasis on interaction and collaboration; (c) tuition or increased affordability of higher education; and (d) emphasizing lifelong learning, technological literacy, and diversity (Katz & Associates, 1999).

Wulf (2002), from his experience and research, identified eight areas connected to the future of engineering education during his lecture: curriculum, pedagogy, diversity, the first
professional degree (i.e., Bachelor’s or Master’s), the faculty reward system, lifelong learning, K-12 preparation, and technological literacy. While Wulf (2002) connected these areas specifically to engineering education, they could easily be applied to other academic disciplines to varying degrees.

I distilled the issues facing engineering education commonly discussed in the literature and separated them into two main groups. The first five focused on academe’s internal pressures, while the last five focused on academe’s external pressures:

1. Promotion and tenure
2. Teaching and learning
3. First professional degree
4. Education pipeline
5. Diversity
6. Globalization
7. Industry
8. Lifelong learning
9. Technological literacy
10. Funding or money

All ten areas were interconnected with different threads, which were hard to separate in some cases. Discussion regarding the globalization of academe was directly connected to diversity. Consider a poignant example: a more diverse student population could increase global awareness at an institution, but it does not equate to a more diverse faculty population. Discussion concerning promotion and tenure was even harder to separate from the role of funding or money in academe. It is important to remember these ten areas are highly connected to one another, offering a more holistic view of the issues facing academe.
Staff and Professional Development in K-12 Education

In recent years, efforts to improve education by creating a fundamental shift in what children learn and how they are taught have been launched by educators along with national, state, and local policy makers. Teachers will have to help students achieve at the high levels adopted by the states and districts. Teachers are at the center of reform in K-12 education because they are the ones who will have to carry out the demands for higher standards in the classroom (Cuban, 1990; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001). Thus, the success of educational reform initiatives relies, in large part, on teachers’ qualifications and effectiveness. As a result, teacher professional development has been a major focus of systemic reform initiatives (Corcoran, 1995).

Good quality staff development was a central component in nearly every proposal for improving education. The proposed staff development programs in literature vary widely in context and format, but they generally share a common purpose. Specifically, staff development programs were designed to “alter the professional practices, beliefs, and understanding of school persons toward an articulated end” (Griffin, 1983, p. 2). In most cases, that end was the improvement of student learning. According to Guskey’s (1986) research, staff development programs were a “systematic attempt to bring about change—change in the classroom practices of teachers, change in their beliefs and attitudes, and change in the learning outcomes of students” (p. 5). Fenstermacher and Berliner (1985) concluded from their research that the goal of staff development was “to advance the knowledge, skills, and understanding of teachers in ways that lead to changes in their thinking and classroom behavior” (p. 283).

While staff development and professional development were often used synonymously, Stevenson (1987) discovered two major differences. Professional development referred to the
continuing development of the individual teacher, usually undertaken voluntarily, whereas staff
development usually referred to a systematic and formal group process. Staff development was
when a group of teachers were asked or required to get together for purposes of developing
and/or advancing the goals of the institution (Stevenson, 1987). Despite these differences,
Edelfelt (1984) found that staff development processes might meet both institutional and
individual professional development goals.

It was widely accepted in the reviewed literature that staff development for teachers took
place primarily at a series of workshops, at a conference, or with the help of a consultant (i.e.,
staff developer). According to Lieberman’s (1995) research, this notion of staff development,
“Implies a limited conception of teacher learning that is out of step with current research and
practice” (p. 591). She went on to explain:

What everyone appears to want for students—a wide array of learning
opportunities that engage students in experiencing, creating, and solving
problems, using their own experiences, and working with others—is for some
reason denied to teachers when they are learners. (p. 591)

The conventional view of staff development was seen as direct instruction or what Lieberman
(1995) described as “transferable packets of knowledge to be distributed to teachers in small
bite-sized pieces” (p. 592). Lambert (1989) stated that, “Despite our knowledge of the
drawbacks of direct instruction, the premiere model of staff development for adults is in many
ways parallel to the direct instruction model for students” (p. 79). Fullan (1991), Guskey and
Huberman (1995), and Sparks and Hirsh (1997) found that efforts at staff development failed for
the following reasons: (a) extensive use of one-shot workshops; (b) topic selection by
nonparticipants; (c) lack of follow-up on related topics; (d) failure to evaluate programs; (e)
absence of a conceptual basis for program planning and evaluation; and (f) failure of school
culture to recognize the value of staff development.
Guskey (1986) stated that there were two critical factors contributing to the ineffectiveness of staff development efforts. First, programs did not take into account what motivated teachers’ participation in staff development activities: they want to become better teachers. McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) reported that “A primary motivation for teachers to take on extra work and other personal costs of attempting change is the belief that they will become better teachers and their students will benefit” (p. 75). Second, programs did not take into account the process by which change in teachers typically took place. Guskey (1986) concluded that efforts to facilitate change must consider the order of outcomes most likely to result in desired change and the endurance of that change. Staff development efforts frequently attempted to initiate some form of change in the beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions of teachers (Fullan, 1982; Harris, 1980; Richardson, 1994). The developers presumed that such a change in teachers’ beliefs and attitudes would lead to specific changes in their classroom behaviors and practices, which, in turn, would result in improved student learning. These staff development efforts typically emphasized the importance of gaining some sense of commitment from teachers assuming that change in teachers’ beliefs and attitudes came first. That is, activities were planned specifically to alter the beliefs and attitudes of teachers prior to the implementation of a new program or innovation in the school (Guskey, 1986; Richardson, 1994). However, from his research Guskey (1986) put forward an alternative perspective that significant change in teachers’ beliefs and attitudes was likely to take place after teachers witnessed changes in student learning outcomes.

Other research identified the characteristics of effective staff development endeavors, which included good leadership, institutional support, collaboration, research-based development, program integration, developmental perspective, and relevant learning activities
Staff development was a purposeful endeavor, according to Lambert (1989). She stated, “When teachers engage in reflective practice, collegiality, and shared leadership, they come to understand themselves and their work differently” (p. 80). As a result of her research, Lambert (1989) suggested redesigning staff development efforts to involve and empower the teacher as the learner.

**Faculty Development in Higher Education**

Entrance into the professoriate requires, with rare exception, a Ph.D. in a specific field and evidence of research experience, mainly in the form of publications. According to research conducted by Wankat et al. (2002), this has been academe’s standard entrance requirement since the 1960s. The professoriate may be the only profession requiring an advanced graduate degree but not requiring teaching competence, and possibly no experience, in teaching students. Russell Edgerton (1998), president of the American Association for Higher Education, underscored this problem, saying:

> Faculty members come to us strong in content and blissfully ignorant of anything having to do with theories of learning and strategies of teaching rooted in pedagogical knowledge. In their knowledge of their disciplines . . . they stand on the shoulders of giants; in their knowledge of teaching, they stand on the ground. (p. B2)

Brent and her colleagues began their research publication by stating, “College teaching may be the only skilled profession that neither presumes experience nor routinely provides training to its novice practitioners” (Brent et al., 2001). The authors continued their argument for the importance of faculty development by stating, “In the absence of systematic guidance, new faculty make common mistakes leading to low scholarly productivity, ineffective teaching, and high stress levels” (Brent et al., 2001, p. 1). This statement basically summarized Boice’s (1992)
research results on new faculty in which he found that the cost for faculty development activities would be significantly less than paying for low productivity, faculty turnover, or, ultimately, failure.

Robert Boice, a pioneer in faculty development research, found that most new faculty take between four and five years to bring their research productivity and instructional effectiveness to levels that meet their institution’s standards (Boice, 1992, 2000). The tenure track considerations of most faculty members loosely coincide with the four to five year time frame of Boice. The responsibility and pressure of research usually overwhelm faculty members’ dedication to improving their instructional skills. According to Boice’s (1992, 2000) research findings, faculty teach the same way they were taught as students when they are more concerned with achieving tenure and promotion through their research productivity.

Colleges at Division I research institutions usually will not require their established faculty members to attend faculty development activities and, most likely, will only initially encourage new faculty participation. Results from Boice’s research found that new faculty orientation activities consisted of short workshops or seminars that were mainly geared toward establishing faculty research. The seminars covered such topics as improving successful grant writing skills, managing graduate student workers, handling technology, and starting up labs (Boice, 1992, 2000). Other studies found that topics not oriented toward research were less likely to be covered during these same orientation activities, such as different instructional methods and student learning styles (Brent et al., 2006; Sorcinelli, 1994).

Wankat (2002) and Wulf (2002) both argued from experience that it was possible to learn how to teach well despite the fact that a majority of research faculty have never had a formal course in education. Sorcinelli (1994) synthesized numerous studies on the early experiences of
new faculty. She found a common thread throughout the research that indicated new and junior
faculty had the most potential to improve their teaching. Weimer (1990) concluded from her
research that “Until higher education recognizes the inherent value and equality of both its
missions [teaching and research], faculty involvement in instructional improvement will never be
what it could be” (p. 21).

Skeff et al. (1997) found from their research that the success of faculty development to
improve faculty teaching could be impeded by an institution’s lack of support. The nature of
academe, predominantly driven by an influx of research money over the last 60 years, can have a
stifling effect on any faculty development program’s effectiveness with faculty (Shuman et al.,
2002). Along the same lines, Brawner et al. (2002) discovered that departments needed to initiate
a reward system honoring faculty’s commitment to good teaching for faculty development
activities to be successful. Research faculty can still improve their teaching skills by
participating in faculty development activities, despite never having a formal course in
education.

Graduate students

Concern has arisen when looking at how Division I research institutions prepare future
faculty for their jobs. According to research conducted by Brent et al. (2006), the “default
preparation for a faculty career is none at all” (p. 1). In 1998, graduate students were teaching
approximately 40% of undergraduate courses offered at Division I research institutions
(Marincovich, Prostko, & Stout, 1998). According to the authors, 60% of the total courses taken
by first and second year undergraduate students were taught by teaching assistants (TAs). These
percentages increased as institutions tried to meet the demands of increasing freshman
enrollments. Institutions were starting to understand the importance of training and developing
their TAs to meet this demand as well as to pretrain them as future faculty members. Many departments have constructed faculty developmental activities for their TAs. These activities covered the basics of lecturing, assessment of student learning, evaluation of teaching, and an introduction to different pedagogies (Azevedo, 1990; Marincovich et al., 1998; Jody D. Nyguist et al., 1999). However, these faculty development activities only lasted one or two days and did not seem to affect any real change (Linehan, 1996; Marincovich et al., 1998). The brevity of their orientation resulted in a lack of sufficient training to handle the responsibilities of teaching a course, as found in research by Prieto (2002) and Sharpe (2000).

A substantial number of future faculty graduating from academe with Ph.D.s began their careers having never taught before and having no formal education in how to teach (Weimer, 1990). The author went on to state:

*The college teaching profession does not recognize the need for instructional training.* This is no new professional fact of life. The problem with faculty members who are untrained to teach is that they teach generally unaware of how they do it. This results in their inability to account for *why* they do it that way. It also explains a lack of variety in instructional strategy and an inability to cope in a classroom when things do not go as expected. (Weimer, 1990, p. 9,10, italics added)

Teaching assistants reported general dissatisfaction with being thrown into teaching environments in a sink-or-swim manner with no further supervision (Fagen & Wells, 2004; Goodlad, 1997). Teaching assistants showed concern over their training and pled for support and further training from their departments (Brent et al., 2001; Linehan, 1996; Jody D. Nyguist et al., 1999). The results from the 2000 National Doctoral Program Survey showed 45% of TAs surveyed felt they had not received appropriate preparation and training before their first class, with 49% indicating they lacked appropriate supervision during the semester they taught (Fagen & Wells, 2004). According to research conducted by Nyquist and Wulf (1996), the lack of support most likely stemmed from the faculty’s view that TA supervision was not a career goal.
According to a report by the NSF, Division I research universities played a major role in educating future faculty. These research-trained graduate students ultimately found employment in a range of institutions such as community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and private institutions (Wulff & Austin, 2004). For this reason, many authors stated the need to include graduate students in faculty development activities prior to entering the professoriate (Marincovich et al., 1998; Jody D. Nyquist et al., 1999; J.D. Nyquist & Sprague, 1998; Prieto, 2002; Sharpe, 2000; Wulff & Austin, 2004). Training future research faculty before they enter the professoriate shortened their learning curve as researchers and teachers in academe (Boice, 1992, 2000; Brent et al., 2001). Wulff and Austin’s (2004) research yielded five conclusions applicable to the preparation of future faculty:

1. The doctoral experience should provide increasingly independent and varied teaching responsibilities as well as opportunities for prospective faculty to grow and develop as researchers.

2. The experience should help students begin to understand and appreciate elements of faculty service.

3. Doctoral students should learn about the academic profession through exposure to the range of professional responsibilities in the variety of institutions that may become their professional homes.

4. Doctoral experiences should equip future faculty for the significant changes taking place in classrooms and curricula.

5. Faculty development experiences should be thoughtfully integrated into the academic program and sequence of degree requirements.

Graduate students participating in faculty development activities would have a good foundation of teaching skills and experience when they entered the professorate. They could adapt their teaching styles much quicker to student needs than new faculty who had not participated in faculty development activities. Faculty would be better teachers and researchers if they participated in faculty development activities as graduate students. Therefore, the caliber
of future faculty directly related to Division I research institutions’ investment in the training and development of their graduate students.

**Challenges**

Enrollment in colleges and universities across the country has increased every year, creating a growing, diverse student population (Wankat et al., 2002; Wulf, 2002). Through the educational method historically used to instruct these students, that is direct instruction, faculty have had a harder time addressing the needs of a more diverse student population (Shuman et al., 2002) as well as providing them with the skills to enter industry (Marsh, 1998; Wulf, 2002). Fink et al. (2005) argued that the increasing futility of lectures might not be because faculty were poor lecturers, but rather because there are other educational methods better suited to engaging the learning process of students. Felder and Brent (1996) stated that traditional campuses were less likely to attract prospective students if they had a choice between (a) attending passive lectures at fixed locations and times in a campus-based curriculum or (b) completing interactive, multimedia tutorials asynchronously in an accredited, online curriculum. Wulf (2002) proposed that faculty members in academe could teach smarter if they used what social scientists and psychologists have discovered about how people learn and different learning styles. He mentioned that there were better ways of teaching (e.g., inquiry-based learning) that most research faculty did not know how to incorporate and use in their teaching.

The educational pipeline and its effect on the diversity of students appeared to be one of the biggest challenges facing the future of academe (Wankat et al., 2002; Wulf, 2002). The issue concerning the educational pipeline was the attrition and retention of certain people (e.g., women and underrepresented groups). Efforts have been made specifically in engineering to increase the numbers of these groups entering academe. The hope was that increasing the diversity of
students would equate to an increase in the diversity of full professors. However, research over the last 30 years showed only an insignificant amount of change (Gibson, 2003; Shuman et al., 2002). According to Trower and Chait’s (2002) research, since the equal opportunity initiative of the 1970s, self-reform for faculty has not and, most likely, will not work. A significant group of authors recommended using faculty development as a mechanism to arrest the attrition of women from engineering by creating a warmer, more inviting (less hostile) environment—a major concern found in research (Allen, 1999; Benson, 1998; Brush, 1991; Lent, Lopez, & Bieschke, 1991; Seymour, 1995; Seymour & Hewitt, 1997; Tonso, 1998; Trower & Chait, 2002).

Two major changes need to take place in the current climate of academe for faculty development activities to have any impact on faculty. The first and probably most significant change involves the promotion and tenure of faculty at Division I research institutions (Boyer, 1990; Felder, Stice, & Rugarcia, 2000; Shuman et al., 2002). Faculty requirements for tenure and promotion in academe today are measured against 70-year-old standards. The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure put forth research, education, and service as the three areas for consideration in a faculty member’s bid for tenure. The criteria for modern tenure and promotion try to place numeric values to these categories: 40%, 40%, and 20%, respectively. There are no delineated criterion for these standards because they are based on a “statement of principles” couched in societal norms of a different era. Today’s academic setting, especially in Division I research institutions, places the importance for promotion, tenure, and hiring on research (Wankat & Oreovicz, 2002). Evans argued in his section of the paper that more importance needs to be placed on teaching in the reward structures of tenure, promotion, and hiring (Shuman et al., 2002). Felder et al. (2000) argued that expecting faculty to focus on teaching and learning while also meeting the traditional promotion and tenure
requirements for disciplinary research was unrealistic. Both Felder (2000) and Boyer (1990) stated that the scholarship of teaching and learning should be a part of the promotion and tenure process for faculty at Division I research institutions.

The second change needed in academe for faculty development activities to have an impact involves funding. Faculty development was not usually a funded program within a Division I research institution (Wankat & Oreovicz, 2002). There have been federally-funded faculty development programs sponsored by the NSF, but they did not continue past their initial funding cycle (Felder et al., 2000; Rees, Amy, Jacobson, & Weistrop, 2000; Shuman et al., 2002; Wankat et al., 2002). It has been only since the late 1990s that the NSF and the federal government have begun funding educational initiatives at Division I research institutions. Again, the educational programs started with this money stopped once the initial funding ran out. However, according to Evans, it was a good concept. He recommended throwing money at universities to stimulate change (Shuman et al., 2002). Division I research institutions need to start funding their own activities for faculty development to be prosperous, productive, and sustainable.

**Organization of Faculty Development**

Faculty development programs, as well as other centralized services in support of teaching, have been around in various forms for more than 30 years. Green (1990) stated, “Faculty development and the encouragement of good teaching are not new issues” (p. 59). The faculty development movement has had a nearly thirty-year history, which began with generous federal funding. Unfortunately, when the initial funding ran out, institutions were confronted with continuing or not (Mathis, 1979). Some institutions stopped the faculty development
programs after the initial funding. Other institutions realistically considered what could and could not be done for the faculty development programs to survive.

An option for academic leaders who are serious about creating a climate conducive to improving teaching would be to centralize the resources and services of the campus or college. According to Weimer’s (1990) research, this centralization can be accomplished in two ways. First, the resources and services could be assigned to an individual administrator. Second, a teaching center or faculty development program could be created that was responsible for the resources and services. The resources, services, and responsibilities that are combined in any given organizational structure have a significant effect on the faculty development program’s operation and outcomes. Weimer (1990) considered three main organizational and operational options for faculty development programs: (a) those in which the impetus for faculty development was given to an individual; (b) those in which the resources and services were sponsored by a faculty committee; and (c) those in which the activities were offered by a program, office, unit, or center structure.

The administrator model

Faculty development responsibilities can be assigned to an individual faculty member. According to research conducted by Erickson (1986), a faculty member in this model assumed the faculty development duties as one of a collection of other responsibilities. The most common structural approach to faculty development in the administrator model was where a faculty committee worked with or advised the administrator/committee chair (Erickson, 1986). Cost was the main advantage of the committee approach because all available money could be used for faculty development activities. However, both the administrator and faculty members on the committee have many other duties and not enough time to dedicate to faculty development
strategies and techniques. Weimer (1990) found that due to faculty’s time issues, this organizational option for faculty development primarily involved workshop and/or seminar activities. Erickson (1986) stated, “Fewest services were available on campuses where faculty development was one among many of an administrator’s responsibilities” (p. 185). Weimer (1990) felt that the administrator option “Severely limits both the kind and quantity of services that can be made available to faculty” (p. 151).

Weimer discussed another disadvantage to the administrator model in that assigning an administrator the responsibility to help faculty improve their teaching potentially discourages the process. Weimer (1990) discovered from her research that the administrator, if not directly then certainly by virtue of association, belonged to the group that rendered personnel decisions. This view of the administrator made it hard for faculty to divulge information about instructional practice, especially if they were experiencing problems. As a result of the research, Weimer (1990) found that in this faculty development approach (a) instructional practices that needed the most improvement received no direct attention, and (b) inauthentic interest in instructional improvement occurred in order to impress administrators.

There were different variations of the individual organization model for faculty development found in literature that addressed some of the limitations previously discussed. Bakker and Lacey’s (1980) research described one such variation as a teaching consultant. The teaching consultant was described in the authors’ research as a senior faculty member who was chosen by a faculty committee. The senior faculty’s responsibility was to listen to and interact with fellow faculty members as a sympathetic colleague (Bakker and Lacey, 1980). In this variation of the individual model, the senior faculty member spent half of her or his time teaching and the other half as a teaching consultant. Advantages of this approach included the
economic benefit discussed earlier. In addition, the one-on-one consultations were more of an effective instructional intervention for faculty than workshop participation. The teaching consultant approach also increased faculty respect for confidentiality, making it easier for them to divulge instructional difficulties. However, this approach was not without limitations. Bakker and Lacey (1980) asked: How many faculty can one consultant work with either half time or even full time? What does a senior faculty member know, other than experientially, about good teaching? More importantly, what does a senior faculty member know about actually implementing alternative instructional methods?

**The committee model**

The committee model focused on faculty development in which committees actually provided the services, whereas the committees in the administrator model functioned only in an advisory capacity. Weimer (1990) listed several factors determining the success of faculty development committees. First, the committee must be empowered. It must be able to make decisions, implement plans, pay for activities, and evaluate outcomes. A limited amount of activities would be offered, according to Weimer (1990), if that committee had to get approval from an administrator. Second, the committee must have time to plan and implement activities. According to Weimer’s (1990) research, influencing a committee’s productivity was done by (a) providing modest amounts of release time; (b) relieving faculty’s other committee responsibilities; and/or (c) allowing faculty to stop taking new advisees. Any of these options could reinforce an institution or college’s commitment to teaching and the importance of the faculty development committee. Third, the committee may need access to outside resources and expertise if they had little or no experience in faculty development as well as little or no
knowledge of available resources. Finally, the committee should be comprised of faculty recognized as good teachers and committed to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

One of the advantages of the committee model was that it grounded the impetus for faculty development. Faculty in the college or institution built a stake in the outcomes of the faculty development activities, which encouraged participation in the activities and made running activities easier to obtain (Weimer, 1990). The committee experience itself generally had a profound effect on the teaching of those faculty serving on the committee. According to Weimer’s (1990) research, faculty committees contributed to faculty development programs in four principal ways. They (a) advised as to the policies and practices of the program; (b) participated in the offerings and activities of the program; (c) evaluated those activities and offerings; and (d) served as teaching and program advocates throughout the college and institution. However, sometimes problems resulted from the nature of a committee and how it worked. Romer (1980) recounted an experience with a faculty development committee as a “clumsy device.” He reported that “It took a year and a half to accomplish anything worth mentioning” (p. 77). In spite of this limitation, Romer (1980) stated later in his paper, “We began awkwardly, we planned magnificently, what we achieved was different from our plan, and somehow we managed to influence a considerable number of our colleagues” (p. 83).

The program model

Having a program or unit devoted to faculty development increased the number of activities, resources, and services a college or institution could offer its faculty. Results from Erickson’s (1986) research reported either programs (e.g., centers, offices, units) or coordinators (i.e., director) of faculty development were found at institutions. This indicated that the program model had the greatest potential for faculty development and instructional improvement.
Although no model distinguished itself as the best, some structures and ways of configuring, staffing, and funding faculty development programs did have potential advantages and disadvantages.

Consider first the external organization of a faculty development program and where it was located within the larger institutional structure. Weimer (1990) asked as part of her research, “In what department, division, college, or administrative unit is the program placed?” It should be noted that Weimer’s discussion was specifically talking about one institutional faculty development program; her research did not look into having multiple programs in different colleges. She stated as part of her conclusions that, “One of the most natural organizational locations for offices with instructional improvement missions would seem to be within the department or college of education” (p. 157). The idea was that faculty members at an institution with the most training and knowledge about teaching were usually education professors. However, education professors did not always have the credibility needed to accomplish faculty development objectives (Brawner et al., 2002; Sorcinelli, 1994; Weimer, 1990). Brawner et al. (2002) stated, “Most engineering professors attach little credibility to pedagogical advice given by individuals who are unfamiliar with engineering content and so cannot offer discipline-specific examples, even if the advice is perfectly sound” (p. 4). The authors went on to state that an implication of their research findings indicated that “Engineering schools might do well to strengthen their internal faculty development efforts rather than relying primarily or entirely on campus-wide teaching centers for guidance in improving teaching” (Brawner et al., 2002, p. 4). Weimer’s (1990) research substantiated that successful faculty development programs were located in other colleges and departments besides education. The location of a faculty development program influenced its credibility, its ability to provide
resources and services, and ultimately its capacity to change the quality of instruction at the institution.

The next consideration of a faculty development program was its internal organization. The following discussion will consider the qualifications of the person chosen to lead the faculty development program. In general, faculty development programs were small units or offices, many times with no more staff than a director and some clerical support (Weimer, 1990). Currently, with faculty development’s thirty-year history, it is possible to hire a professional with an educational background in the area of faculty development to run a program. However, according to Weimer (1990), having a background as a faculty developer was not an essential requirement for a director. She went on to state that “Many of the practitioners in the field [of faculty development] were at one time or are currently faculty members who have found an appropriate outlet for a long-standing interest in college teaching” (p. 161). Weimer’s (1990) research found that interest, enthusiasm, and motivation could compensate for a lack of formal training. According to research conducted by Mathis (1979), “The desirability of having someone from within the university who has the confidence and support of his or her colleagues is an important consideration in appointing a faculty development director” (p. 107).

**Leadership of Faculty Development**

Many of the best teachers in academe have been driven by their enjoyment of teaching and desire to see students succeed. However, even the most self-motivated faculty required an organizational environment that affirmed the value of their work, rewarded teaching, and sustained morale over time (Rice and Austin, 1990). In their research, the authors examined institutional factors supporting faculty teaching in (a) colleges where teaching was the primary commitment (i.e., liberal arts colleges) and (b) more research-oriented universities they described
as “institutional settings in which teaching is not a high priority and junior faculty are systematically encouraged to attend to their research, not to their teaching” (Rice and Austin, 1990, p. 25). Only the authors’ findings concerning research universities were discussed in this paper.

The primary mission of research universities, according to Rice and Austin’s (1990) research, was the “pursuit and production of knowledge in the form of traditional research projects and publications” (p. 34). The authors also discovered that while good teaching was stated as a parallel objective, explicit and implicit signals indicated that research was the primary goal of the institutions. Rice and Austin (1990) acknowledged the complex relationship between teaching and research, especially at a research institution, but stated, “Encouragement of serious attention to teaching is important for its implications for the quality of education offered” (p. 34). To this end, the authors presented three factors for supporting quality teaching at research institutions. First, teaching must have been a strongly valued institutional commitment. Second, institutional leaders must have articulated the importance of high-quality teaching. Third, universities that wished to motivate faculty to take teaching seriously benefitted from creating communities of faculty who shared a commitment to teaching. These three areas were used as a structure for further discussion in this paper.

**Strong institutional commitment**

A university that wants its faculty to be motivated to teach well must commit to a high standard of faculty teaching as part of its central mission (Rice and Austin, 1990). “Faculty hear teaching is important, but see research is rewarded” (Weimer, 1990, p. 131). Research studies showed faculty not only improved their teaching, but the overall quality of teaching at the institution was better in academic settings that recognized and rewarded instructional excellence.
According to Weimer (1990), “Learning to teach well is not an easy task to be accomplished painlessly during a bit of release time” (p. 133).

Making good teaching an institutional priority required changing values, behaviors, and academic norms (Green, 1990). Weimer (1990) plainly concluded from her research that, “If improvement is expected, its pursuit must be supported” (p. 139). General discussion of the importance of good teaching was not sufficient to counterbalance the graduate school socialization process (Green, 1990; Rice and Austin, 1990), the usual institutional reward structures (Green, 1990; Rice and Austin, 1990; Weimer, 1990), and the rhetoric regarding the importance of research activity (Green 1990; Rice and Austin, 1990; Weimer, 1990). Therefore, academic leaders needed to be clear and consistent in communicating their expectations to faculty.

**Supportive instructional leaders**

The role academic leaders had in articulating and supporting teaching was closely linked to the institution’s teaching commitment. Individual faculty members modeled instructional attitudes and activities that influenced the classroom decisions of their colleagues (Boyer, 1990; Brawner, 2002). However, department heads, college administrators, and institutional leaders were in better positions to more directly influence larger numbers of faculty (Green, 1990; Lucas, 1990; Weimer, 1990). Green (1990) concluded from research findings that an enthusiastic and committed associate dean or a director of faculty development held in high regard by peers was also important in successfully improving teaching.

Improving teaching required academic leaders to adopt the principle of saying less and doing more about the importance of teaching in the department, college, and institution. Weimer (1990) explained:
Academic leaders must not underestimate the power of their own example to motivate faculty to pursue instructional excellence. Most department heads and many [college] administrators are faculty members themselves; a fair number still teach. Those who do not should, at least on occasion. Teaching provides an opportunity to model all the behaviors expected of faculty committed to effective instruction. (p. 143)

What Weimer suggested did not mean that the department head or dean must be the best teacher. It did mean that “Whether department head, dean, or faculty member, the leader will not convince by the strategies themselves or the example he or she offers by using them unless they are accompanied by honest commitment and serious intent” (Weimer, 1990, p. 144). Mobilizing faculty leaders to take the initiative for change required creating new structures, programs, and/or initiatives. If ineffective structures existed, they need to be reenergized by new leadership or new ideas. Green (1990) stated, “If faculty are to exert real leadership, they must have the power to get things done and the necessary resources to do so” (p. 55).

**Teaching communities**

Institutions provided incentives for good teaching when they encouraged interactions among faculty and administrators who were committed to teaching. Rice and Austin (1990) found from their research that these interactions could build networks and communities amongst an institution’s faculty. Faculty within these informal teaching communities encouraged each other as teachers and provided examples to other faculty. Palmer (1993) suggested from research findings that each faculty member “have a community of honest and open colleagues with whom to explore [his or her] struggles as a teacher” (p. 11). Palmer (1993) also stated that little talk about teaching would take place if administrators and department heads did not invite these conversations regularly. Consequently, regular learning about quality teaching became a professional development goal of faculty and administrators. Rice and Austin (1990) found from their research that faculty development programs that brought a group of professors together on a
regular basis to address teaching issues were very effective in developing a cohort of teaching-oriented faculty. The teaching community then became the focus of an advocacy group for teaching within the college. Rice and Austin (1990) suggested that once such a group existed, deans could appoint individuals from the group to serve on college or institutional committees addressing teaching issues.

Theoretical Frameworks

Communities of practice

The theoretical framework of this research study is based on Etienne Wegner’s Communities of Practice (1998), which espouses a social theory of learning. Communities of practice can define themselves in broader contexts, such as contributing to a broader enterprise or belonging to an organization. The concept of communities of practice translates to this research study in that faculty development can be a community of practice belonging to an institution, but at the same time, faculty development can contribute to the institution’s enterprise of service, research, and teaching. According to Wegner’s theory, faculty members of an institution can practice in multiple communities at once. The theoretical framework of Wegner’s communities of practice helped in framing this research study as well as structuring the assertions developed from the research findings.

Wegner defined a community of practice as people engaged in the pursuit of an enterprise or practice. Wegner’s idea of practice implied doing, not just doing in and of itself, but in a historical and social context, which resulted in learning (Wenger, 1998). Over time, this collective learning resulted in practices that reflected both the pursuit of the enterprise and the social relations of the participants. Practice was defined as “property of a community created
over time by the sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise” (1998, p. 45). The practice gave structure and meaning to what participants do.

The process of taking part and the relations with others are what Wegner called participation. In Wegner’s theory, participation suggested action and connection to social communities that are actively involved in social enterprise. Participation in a community of practice was a source of identity for the participant. According to Wegner, issues of identity were an integral aspect of a social theory of learning, thus, inseparable from issues of practice, community, and meaning (Wenger, 1998). Wegner suggests that membership in a community of practice translates into an identity as a form of competence. The identity of community of practice was also seen in its artifacts or what Wenger called reification. Wegner defined reification in his theory as “giving form to our experiences by producing objects that congeal this experience” (1998, p. 58). He explained any community of practice produces abstractions, artifacts, and concepts that reify (i.e., make something abstract more concrete or real) something of that practice. This reification, he explained, “Leads to the creation of points of focus around which the negotiations of meaning become organized” (1998, p. 58). He also explained that reification works in conjunction with participation, and “in their interplay [they] are both distinct and complementary” (p. 62), but they both require and enable each other in a community of practice.

The Biglan model.

One of the most easily overlooked facts about university organization is that colleges are organized according to subject matter. Typically, each field of specialization has its own college, and, traditionally, most colleges are comprised of only one discipline. In the past, a college comprised of more than one discipline was the exception, but multi-discipline colleges
are becoming more prevalent in academe. Presumably, this system stemmed from the peculiar requirements that each area has for the organization of its research, teaching, and administrative activities. For example, it is obvious that disciplines such as engineering and education differ in subject, but what is the nature of those differences?

One pioneering attempt to develop a logical method of grouping academic disciplines for comparative purposes was that of Biglan (1973a). He surveyed 186 scholars at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign to determine their perceptions of similarities among 35 separate academic departments. Using non-metric multi-dimensional scaling (Kruskal, 1964), Biglan found that each of the 35 academic areas could be categorized using only three dimensions. He labeled these three dimensions as (a) the concern with a single paradigm (i.e., hard versus soft); (b) the degree of concern with theory as opposed to application (i.e., pure versus applied); and (c) the concern with life systems (i.e., life versus non-life). Biglan used Kuhn’s (1963) definition of a paradigm as the existence of a generally accepted core of problems to be solved with agreed upon methodologies. Using his three dimensions as a conceptual base, Biglan (1973b) went on to examine other ways in which the categorized groups differed among themselves. He found that the various departmental groupings differed as to (a) the degree to which faculty were socially connected to others; (b) faculty’s commitment to teaching, research, and services; (c) the number of journal articles, monographs, and technical reports published by the faculty; and (d) the number of dissertation that faculty sponsored.

Hard subject areas were characterized by a paradigm or an agreed upon body of theory. A paradigm permitted greater social connectedness, greater journal article publications, and more commitment to research among scholars in the hard areas than for those in the soft areas. In the hard subject areas, the faculty reported greater collaboration with fellow faculty in teaching and
research, more sources of influence on their research goals, a significantly greater number of co-authors, a greater preference for research, and the preparation of significantly more journal articles than faculty in the soft areas. Faculty in the soft subject areas indicated that they gave greater preference for teaching, spent more time on teaching, and produced more monographs than faculty in the hard areas.

The applied areas differed from the pure areas because of their orientation to service activities, the writing of technical reports, and their collaboration on research and teaching activities. In the pure areas, the faculty reported liking research activities more. Faculty in the applied areas indicated a preference for working with more people on research and teaching, more sources of influence on their research goals, more service activities, and also reported publishing more technical reports and rating the quality of graduate students’ first jobs higher than faculty in the pure areas.

Differences between the life and non-life areas were attributed to the influence of graduate training in which the non-life faculty collaborated more on guiding student research and placing students in jobs than faculty in the life systems areas. Faculty in the life systems areas cited working with more people, liking teaching less, and spending less time on teaching than faculty in the non-life areas. No differences were found between the life and non-life areas concerning the number of journal articles or monographs published.

Biglan (1973a, 1973b) reported differences between the hard and soft, pure and applied, and life and non-life colleges in terms of teaching and research. At the end of his research (1973b), he cautioned:

The results of this study show that university-wide standards for the evaluation of faculty members will be possible . . . When we establish standards or evaluate the scholar’s work we shall first need to consider the relative importance of each of these scholar’s activities in his or her areas . . . In sum, it appears that any attempt
at universal standards for academia will impose a uniformity of activity and output which is consistent with particular subject matter requirements of specific areas. (p. 212-213)

Since his initial research in 1973, more than ten studies have been conducted testing the Biglan model. Some examples of the research are:

- Social connectedness, commitment of scholars, and scholarly output (Biglan 1973b).
- Eleven departmental goals (Smart and Elton, 1975).
- Twenty-seven duties performed by department heads (Smart and Elton, 1976).
- Eleven categories of professional responsibility, years of service, total years of professional experience in higher education, salary of each faculty member (Smart and McLaughlin, 1978).
- Perceived need for professional development on fourteen chair tasks (Creswell, Seagren, Henry, 1979).
- Research productivity variables (Creswell and Bean, 1981).
- Disciplinary differences and their implications for the future of agribusiness programs (Royer, 2007).

All the authors reported their research findings validated Biglan’s model for their respective applications.

Summary

This chapter began by reviewing engineering education literature. The shaping of academe’s modern research climate has been greatly influenced over the years by changes in engineering education. Historical events such as World War I and II have transformed higher education into a research-driven enterprise. Research money has inundated academe for more than 60 years. This has caused research to become the entrance requirement into academe as well as the currency for tenure and promotion. However, there would not be a need for faculty to teach if there were not any students in academe.
The practice of faculty or staff development has had a much longer history in K-12 education than in academe. Guskey (1986) summarized the literature findings best with three recommendations for effective staff development practices: (a) recognize that change is a gradual and difficult process for teachers; (b) ensure that teachers receive regular feedback on student learning progress; and (c) provide continued support and follow-up after the initial training. Wulf (2002) argued that faculty in academe can teach smarter, which would help address his concerns about academe being able to adapt to the changes in students and the demands of industry. According to Sorcinelli’s (1994) research, new faculty had the most potential to improve their teaching. These new faculty members, according to Brent et al. (2001), needed guidance to be productive researchers and effective teachers. Support for graduate students and faculty can be achieved through faculty development programs and activities (Brent & Felder, 2001; Brent et al., 2006; Brent et al., 2001; Skeff et al., 1997).

Wegner’s (1998) theory of communities of practice aligns well with the practice of faculty development in academe. Faculty development programs are a community of practice within the colleges of an institution. The practice of faculty development gives participants a source of identity as well as structure and meaning to their activities. The faculty development program, as a community, has a membership that changes as new faculty join and other faculty retire or leave. However, membership in the community is not restricted to faculty. Wegner (1998) argues that membership in the community is defined by the practice of the community. Therefore, the faculty development community can include graduate students and institutional staff in the practice of faculty development.

There are inherent differences in disciplines of academe. For example, it is obvious that disciplines such as engineering and education differ in subject, but what is the nature of those
differences? The theory put forth by Biglan (1973a, 1973b) and validated by other researchers gives a framework for the assessment of faculty development practiced by different colleges. Biglan’s model of classification allows the colleges that participated in this study to remain anonymous, but still be classified for evaluation and comparison.
Chapter Three

Methods

The primary purpose of this research study was to investigate how different colleges at a Division I research institution practiced faculty development as seen from the program administrators’ perspectives. This chapter describes the methodology followed in this research study. The chapter includes six sections including: (a) research framework, (b) research questions, (c) research design, (d) data collection methods, (e) data analysis and interpretation, and (f) validity of data interpretation. Each section provides methodological details of how this research study was conducted.

Research Framework

Case study methodology, as discussed by Stake in *The Art of Case Study* (1995), was chosen as the research framework. According to Stake, case study methodology is the study of the particularity and complexity of a single, bounded case (Stake, 1995). Case study methodology tries to understand how the people involved in the case see things while preserving the different and sometimes contradictory views of what is happening. Stake (1995) defines these different interpretations as *multiple realities*, which help increase the understanding of the case. A researcher’s role is to understand the activity, interaction, and multiple realities of the case’s context. Stake (1995) suggests organizing a case study around an issue or issues.

The primary purpose of this research study was to gain a better understanding of how faculty development was practiced in different colleges at a Division I research institution. This research study focused on how administrators perceived their program’s organization, mission, and viability in the colleges.
Research Questions

The original purpose of this research study was to answer the following questions:

1. How do different colleges at a Division I research institution address the role and operation of a development program for their faculty members?

2. How does a college-level faculty development program at a Division I research institution influence the research and teaching roles of its faculty members to better meet the varying needs of students as well as adapt to the changing demands of the institution?

A number of assumptions were made guiding the development of the initial research questions prior to gathering data. The assumptions were as follows:

- Faculty development programs would have dedicated staff to assist the program administrators in operating the program and facilitating activities.
- Faculty development programs would broadly define the scope of their development activities to include all three tenets of tenure: service, teaching, and research.
- Faculty development programs would have assessment metrics to understand an activity’s impact on faculty teaching and student learning.
- Faculty development programs would be active in helping faculty be at the forefront of educating students by adjusting to the changing educational climate of academe.
- Colleges would have assessment metrics holding faculty development programs accountable for activities, faculty participation, and resources.

What I discovered during the course of this research study, however, was that many of my assumptions were not corroborated by what I learned from my interviews with administrators. Therefore, the design of this study changed, requiring that the research questions be edited. The final research questions along with sub-questions were as follows:

1. How do the administrators of faculty development programs describe the organization of their programs?
   - What is the history of the program?
   - How is the program administered?
   - How does the college support the program?
   - How does the institution support the program?
2. What do program administrators see as the purposes of the faculty development programs in the college?
   • What is the administrator’s mission philosophy for the program?
   • What activities does the program offer?
   • What audience does the program target for its activities?

3. How do the program administrators as well as the college leadership determine the viability of a faculty development program?
   • What does the administrator perceive as the impact of the program in the college?
   • What assessment metrics does the program use?
   • How is the program held accountable to the college?
   • What challenges does the administrator face?
   • What does the administrator want to do for the program in the future?

**Research Design**

This study was conducted at a Division I research institution, which began as a land grant university. The institution employed approximately 2,000 tenure-track faculty along with over 1,000 non-tenured faculty. There were approximately 41,500 students comprised of 10,500 graduate and 31,000 undergraduate students.

**Case sampling**

The faculty development programs for the case studies for this research study were selected from information I gathered from three independent avenues of inquiry: (a) the director of one of the larger colleges with a faculty development program; (b) the campus teaching center leadership; and (c) the websites of the institution and campus teaching center. The first avenue of inquiry was through the director of the engineering faculty development program at the institution. Six months prior to starting this research study, I had an informal meeting with the
director to discuss my dissertation. During this meeting, I asked him about other college-level faculty development programs at his institution. He recommended three colleges he knew that had active faculty development programs at the time. He mentioned more colleges had faculty development programs, but did not know specific ones.

The second avenue of inquiry was through a meeting with two leaders of the campus teaching center. The meeting was a courtesy call to make them aware of this research study as well as discuss the faculty development programs at the institution. The leadership of the teaching center mentioned four colleges with faculty development programs that they described as “strong” and having “recurring” activities. They mentioned three colleges “trying to strengthen” their “struggling” faculty development programs. The leadership also mentioned four colleges with “weak” or “inactive” faculty development programs. They also mentioned that the campus teaching center ran College C’s faculty development activities.

The third avenue of inquiry was through investigating the websites of the institution and campus teaching center. This investigation revealed the institution had 15 degree-granting units. The campus teaching center’s website, however, listed contact information for faculty development programs in only 11 colleges. The presence of contact information indicated some level of commitment to faculty development. There were also four remaining colleges at the institution not listing faculty development programs. I did not inquire further about the presence of a faculty development program in these colleges.

A recruitment email was sent to the administrators of the 11 faculty development programs soliciting participation in this research study. The research study was described as a case study of faculty development and not as an evaluation of their programs. Because I anticipated that some programs might resist participating, I planned to personally meet with the
administrators to solicit their participation; fortunately, this meeting was not required. I received positive and almost immediate responses from the administrators of 7 out of the 11 programs. In total, there were eight college-level faculty development programs participating in this research study.

There were three remaining colleges at the institution not participating in this research study. The administrator of the faculty development program in College I had retired prior to the start of this study; the dean of the college had not found a replacement. The contact person for the faculty development program in College J indicated the college never had a faculty development program. He was also very confused why he was listed as a contact person on the campus teaching center website. The two contacts for the faculty development program in College K never responded to the initial recruitment letter or the two follow-up emails asking for their participation in this research study. Further investigation revealed the faculty development program in College K had not offered activities for a year or two prior to the study starting.

**Participant sampling**

The research design originally specified interviewing a faculty development program’s entire staff. However, it was discovered during the preliminary phase of scheduling interviews that none of the faculty development programs had any dedicated staff other than the administrator(s) of the program. Therefore, the primary participants in this study were the administrators of the consenting college-level faculty development programs (i.e., director, assistant director, or committee chair). There were a total of 12 people participating in this study who were connected to the administration of the 8 faculty development programs.
Data Collection Methods

The data for this research came from three sources: participant interviews, field observations, and program artifacts. These various data sources were used in validating and triangulating the claims made from the data (Stake, 1995).

Participant interviews

Stake (1995) describes the interview as the main tool of the researcher in “discovering and portraying the multiple views of the case” (p. 64). He goes on to mention that much of what we cannot observe for ourselves as researchers has been or is being observed by others. Interviews were used in this study to identify and clarify the different administrators’ perspectives regarding aspects of their faculty development programs, colleges, and faculty members.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with each of the 12 administrators from the 8 faculty development programs participating in this study. The interviews started with asking the administrators to tell a little bit about the history of their faculty development programs. This opening question served the purpose of setting the tone for the interview (i.e., collegial conversation) while at the same time walking me through the creation and existence of the program as experienced by the administrator. The use of semi-structured interviews ensured that each administrator was asked similarly phrased main questions assuring comparable findings, but not restricting the interview to a linear line of questioning. Subsequent questions were asked during the interview to clarify responses or discover additional information (See Appendix B for the full list of interview questions).

The interviews were scheduled for approximately 90 minutes and averaged 80 minutes in length. Written consent to be interviewed and recorded was obtained from administrators prior
to asking the opening question. After the interview concluded, I immediately moved to a different room on campus and wrote down the key ideas from the discussion, important observations from the administrator, and my impressions from the interview. As suggested by Stake (1995), all interviews were transcribed verbatim within a couple of weeks following the interview.

The interview was comprised of four sections with questions addressing different aspects of a faculty development program. The first section was a general inquiry into the history of the faculty development program. The second section focused on the administrator’s background and involvement in the faculty development program. The third and largest section focused on the operation of the faculty development program. The fourth section focused on the interaction between the program administrators and the college leadership. I learned about a faculty development leadership group at the institution during my initial meeting with the director of College D’s faculty development program.

Field observations

Observations direct the researcher toward greater understanding of the case (Stake, 1995). Field observations were planned for three areas associated with a faculty development program; the areas were (a) program planning meetings; (b) administrator and college leadership meetings; and (c) faculty development activities.

The first field observations were meant to gain a better understanding of what the administrators determined important for faculty development in their colleges as well as how the program functioned. Unfortunately, I was unable to complete these observations. I discovered that directors and/or assistant directors did not have any official planning meetings. Also, the faculty development programs administered by a committee chair never met during the course of
this research study. I learned of one special case where the newly appointed director of a program selected an advisory board from faculty in the college whom she thought were good teachers. The advisory board assisted the director in generating ideas for the future of the faculty development program. The advisory board met prior to the start of this research study.

The second field observations were meant to increase the understanding of each administrator’s relationship and interaction with the college leadership. Unfortunately, I discovered during the interviews that there were no official oversight or planning meetings between the administrators from the eight faculty development programs and college leadership.

I participated in three faculty development activities for the third field observations. As an example, I observed how faculty development activities had different structures (e.g., lectures, workshops) and how these structures influenced the participation of attendees. The lecture activities were oriented toward an expert in a particular field sharing his or her knowledge and experience with attendees. The workshops were generally conducted with a topic being presented then attendees being paired or grouped to discuss the topic. If time permitted, the workshops concluded with the entire group discussing the topic and sharing their small group discussions.

**Program artifacts**

In the interview, I asked for documents or artifacts generated by the faculty development programs. Reviewing the documents of a faculty development program served two purposes. First, the artifacts revealed a better understanding of the program (e.g., website, evaluation of program and/or activities, handouts). Second, the documents were considered a substitute for records of activity (Stake, 1995), which I could not observe directly (e.g., historical records, information about activities, etc.). As an example, two faculty development programs created
packets they gave their new faculty members. These packets were meant as a resource for the new faculty to use throughout their first couple of years in the college. The packets created by these two programs represented the activities offered during the year of the study and were not a historical record.

**Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Stake (1995) describes data analysis in a case study as “a matter of giving meaning to first impressions as well as to final compilations” (p. 71). Data analysis begins prior to the start of the study and continues through the entire progression of the study. According to Stake (1995), there are two strategic methods of data analysis in case study research. The first method is through direct interpretation of an individual instance in the data. The second method is through categorical aggregation of instances until something can be said about them as a group. In case study research, the search for meaning often is a search for patterns and consistencies (Stake, 1995). This research study incorporated direct interpretation in data analysis, but primarily relied on categorical aggregation in the search for patterns or interpretation of what I called themes.

I searched for themes in the data while transcribing the interviews. I then reviewed and began coding the completed interview transcripts. Coding was conducted by reading each interview transcript several times. The initial reading led to identifying preliminary themes emerging from the interviews. Subsequent readings aggregated emergent themes into main themes and marked them in the relevant areas of each interview transcript for data analysis. See Table 1 for a list of coding categories. Many of these categories reflected the topics in the interviews. The case descriptions in Chapter Four, which includes a cross-case analysis chart,
are organized using these coding categories. Chapter Five uses these categories as a structure for discussing the research findings.

Table 1

*Categories Used to Code Research Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>The formation, history, and organizational placement of the faculty development programs as well as general background information of the colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>The administrative structure of faculty development programs (i.e., committee chair or director) along with the administrator’s background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Philosophy</td>
<td>The purpose, goals, and philosophy statement as stated by the administrator for the faculty development program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>The different faculty development activities as distinguished and offered by the program or college, including their purpose, intended audience(s), and participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Impact</td>
<td>The administrator’s perception of the impact and success the faculty development program had in the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Accountability</td>
<td>The feedback metrics implemented by the faculty development programs as well as the program’s accountability to the college leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The support of the faculty development program (e.g., funding, staff, resources) from the college, campus, or teaching center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>The obstacles, both past and present, facing faculty development programs along with any actions implemented to overcome them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Ideas</td>
<td>The administrator’s thoughts, given an ideal situation, on the direction of the faculty development program, creation of new activities, development of existing activities, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Validity of Data Interpretation**

A researcher’s search for both accuracy and alternative explanations in the data requires protocols for establishing the validity of the data gathered for the research. Stake (1995) believes these protocols, called *triangulation* in qualitative research, should be used in case study research, arguing that “[case study researchers] deal with many complex phenomena and issues for which no consensus can be found as to what really exists—yet we have ethical obligations to minimize misrepresentation and misunderstanding” (p. 108). He goes on to explain that triangulation is the need to be accurate in measuring things, but logical in interpreting the meaning of those measurements. According to Stake (1995), a case study researcher can use any
of several triangulation protocols to (a) gain the needed confirmation; (b) increase credibility in the interpretation; and (c) demonstrate commonality of an assertion. This research study incorporated two triangulation protocols in trying to establish meanings and increase the validity of data interpretation.

**Triangulation protocols**

This research study used *data source triangulation* in an effort to see if what the researcher observed and reported carried the same meaning when found under different circumstances. This research study incorporates data source triangulation through the inclusion of faculty development programs from different colleges, with different faculty members, and varied ways of practicing faculty development (e.g., activity structure, administration, history). As an example, the administrators from one faculty development program mentioned a specific instance of having particular difficult dealings with a past college leader. During the interview process, this particular instance was brought up and commented on by several of the other faculty development program administrators.

The goal of the second protocol, *methodological triangulation*, was to increase the confidence in the interpretations of data by using multiple methods of gathering data. This research study incorporated multiple data gathering sources (i.e., interviews, field observations, and document review) in an attempt to increase the validity of interpretations and assertions from the data. Interviewing two administrators in five of the eight programs increased the validity of the interview data.

The field observations and document review primarily substantiated the findings connected to the activities of the faculty development programs. An example was seen in the theme of impact assessment. While participating in faculty development activities, I observed
that the only assessment of activities was in attendance and participant satisfaction. Interviewing the faculty development program administrators further corroborated this finding. In addition, none of the faculty development programs had any data that assessed the impact of their activities on faculty.

**Member checking**

Participants in a case study can help triangulate the researcher’s observations and interpretations by providing critical feedback through *member checking* (Stake, 1995). This process validates the accuracy and meaning of the interviewee’s ideas and comments as represented by the researcher. I solicited each administrator’s assistance in examining a draft of his or her faculty development program compiled from the interview data. I asked each administrator to review the presentation of his or her program, making comments and edits where needed. I then met with the administrator for an informal 30-minute meeting that was not recorded, discussing the presentation of his or her faculty development program.

There were some minor edits for each of the cases, but administrators did not object to the content after the agreed upon edits were made. Myself and other researchers then reviewed all eight cases as one complete set of data. We determined from this review that the original case presentations did not properly reflect the intricacies of the faculty development programs as evidenced in the administrators’ interviews. While some administrators stated they wanted to be identified during member checking, a couple of administrators objected to some of the details. I decided to present the cases anonymously to retain that complexity. I generically labeled the colleges (e.g., College A) and substituted pseudonyms in the cases (e.g., Associate Dean Beske, Dean Cothran, Professor DeHart). The rewritten, anonymous cases were not member checked with administrators.
Chapter Four

Cases

In this chapter, I describe the college-level faculty development programs that were included in this case study research project. The faculty development programs are presented in the sequence in which I came into contact with them during the research investigation. The program descriptions present how the faculty development administrators of the eight colleges conceptualized faculty development at the Division I research institution where this study was conducted. The eight faculty development programs are presented in this chapter as individual cases structured using the coding categories (see Table 1 in Chapter 3). The information from the interviews is summarized in a cross-case data comparison that follows in Table 2. The colleges have been given generic labels to obscure the identities of the interviewees, the college’s discipline(s), and their physical locations. Table 2 presents information on the size and composition of the colleges. Pseudonyms have also been used when referring to the administrators and the college leadership of each case.
Table 2

Cross-Case Data Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>College A</th>
<th>College B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Started in 2001 when the institution advocated formalized faculty development support in colleges</td>
<td>Started in 2001 when the institution advocated formalized faculty development support in colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Chair, committee with six members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Dean of Academic Programs</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Philosophy</td>
<td>“Trying to create a culture, a time, and a space for people at any stage in their career (graduate student to professor) to share, encourage, and focus on teaching.”</td>
<td>“Providing an effective service to help faculty teach.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (Program)</td>
<td>No established programming, but had offered intermittent, stand-alone activities in the past</td>
<td>One established program with recurring activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (College)</td>
<td>Offered regular faculty development activities</td>
<td>Offered regular faculty development activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience</td>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>Graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established faculty</td>
<td>Established faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional staff</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Impact</td>
<td>Gave a strong signal that teaching was important in the college</td>
<td>Received positive informal feedback in the past about activities offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicated the value of teaching</td>
<td>Noticed that faculty were not commenting on the program’s inactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>End-of-session satisfaction survey</td>
<td>End-of-session satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>No formal mechanism established</td>
<td>No formal mechanism established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No measurable outcomes required from college</td>
<td>No measurable outcomes required from college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (College)</td>
<td>No dedicated budget</td>
<td>No dedicated budget, but paid for handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No dedicated clerical staff</td>
<td>No dedicated clerical staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (Teaching Center)</td>
<td>Teaching center representative never worked with the program</td>
<td>Teaching center representative was no longer working with the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ran institution-funded activities for the college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (Campus)</td>
<td>Used teaching advancement grant money to offer activities</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>No infrastructure to ensure continued viability</td>
<td>Identity of the program, where it fits in the college offering relevant activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competition for faculty time and attention</td>
<td>Not enough resources (e.g., time, staff, budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of administrative leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competition for faculty time and attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance of faculty to changing teaching methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical and discipline segregation of faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Ideas</td>
<td>Develop college-supported activities that are not dependent on the campus teaching center</td>
<td>Benefit from support of a dedicated staff person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish some predictability in the scheduling of activities</td>
<td>Organize a yearly faculty retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a full faculty development committee to administer the program</td>
<td>Establish an identity for the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>College C</th>
<th>College D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Started in 2000 from a faculty initiative with subsequent funding from a campus teaching advancement grant</td>
<td>Started in 1994 from a faculty initiative with subsequent funding from the college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Chair, committee with six empty member positions</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-tenured faculty/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Philosophy</td>
<td>“Valuing effective teaching and maximizing the level of effectiveness.”</td>
<td>“Improving instruction in the college.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Giving departments tools to make it a priority in evaluating teaching, for the purposes of advancement.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (Program)</td>
<td>Four established programs with recurring activities</td>
<td>One established program with recurring activities for new faculty as well as other activities and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (College)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Funded teaching grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience</td>
<td>New faculty</td>
<td>New faculty (primarily)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established faculty</td>
<td>Established faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Impact</td>
<td>If faculty in the college were regarding teaching in more thoughtful ways</td>
<td>Help carve out a foothold for teaching in the college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If there was more effective and productive teaching because of the program</td>
<td>Participants acknowledge and embrace teaching as part of their responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>End-of-session satisfaction survey</td>
<td>End-of-session satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty participation</td>
<td>Faculty participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>No formal mechanism established</td>
<td>No formal mechanism established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No measurable outcomes required from college</td>
<td>No measurable outcomes required from college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (College)</td>
<td>Line item in budget paid campus teaching center for services</td>
<td>No dedicated budget, but paid assistant director’s salary, handouts, lunches, notebooks, and speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No dedicated clerical staff</td>
<td>No dedicated clerical staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (Teaching Center)</td>
<td>Teaching center representative never worked with the program</td>
<td>Teaching center representative actively worked with the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching center staffed and ran all activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (Campus)</td>
<td>Used teaching advancement grants to pilot and establish activities</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Re-establish faculty development committee</td>
<td>Enhance the level of importance given to teaching by the college leadership and faculty themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address new faculty’s presumption that teaching and research are conflicting and competitive at the institution instead of complementary</td>
<td>Communicate the existence and importance of the program to department heads and college leaders. Stay with participants after the first year Get new ideas and invigorate the program Influence faculty teaching to impact student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Ideas</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Have more of a presence and visibility to faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have more momentum for the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redesign the website and market program to donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish teaching endowments from alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create an engineering education center for faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work more closely with students and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase amount of teaching grant funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>College E</th>
<th>College F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Started in 1999 from a faculty initiative with subsequent funding from a campus teaching advancement grant</td>
<td>Started in 1996 from a faculty initiative with subsequent funding from a campus teaching advancement grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Director: Professor, Assistant Director: Non-tenured faculty/staff</td>
<td>Chair, committee with 14 members, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Philosophy</td>
<td>“Creating a norm and culture of good teaching in the college. Providing some services to the faculty allowing them to reflect on their teaching.”</td>
<td>“Recognizing and supporting excellence in instruction broadly defined.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (Program)</td>
<td>Two established programs with recurring activities as well as other activities and services</td>
<td>One established program with recurring activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (College)</td>
<td>Funded teaching grants</td>
<td>One established program with recurring activities as well as funded teaching grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience</td>
<td>New faculty, Established faculty, Instructional staff</td>
<td>Graduate students, New faculty, Established faculty, Instructional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Impact</td>
<td>Built faculty relationships across departments</td>
<td>Made the idea of excellent teaching more concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raised awareness of teaching and teaching related issues in the college</td>
<td>Created a positive image around good teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>End-of-session satisfaction survey, Faculty participation</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>No formal mechanism established</td>
<td>No formal mechanism established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (College)</td>
<td>No dedicated budget, but paid director’s stipend, assistant director’s salary, and other expenditures</td>
<td>Line item in budget provided by an alumni endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (Teaching Center)</td>
<td>Teaching center representative was no longer working with the program</td>
<td>Teaching center representative never worked with the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (Campus)</td>
<td>Used teaching advancement grants to pilot and establish current activities</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Pressures for faculty time, Composition of college (600+ faculty) and diversity of disciplines (50+ departments), Diversity of a large cohort of new faculty each year</td>
<td>Avoid nominating the same faculty for teaching awards, Recognize other good teachers in the college as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Ideas</td>
<td>Build the resources of the program, Get a research assistant from the education college, Create a better-coordinated and well-defined role for campus teaching center in the college, Rework and re-establish website, Propose more real opportunities for faculty to focus on teaching (i.e., classroom observations and teaching circles)</td>
<td>Encourage more participation in the program, Establish a mentoring program for new faculty, Expand the role and responsibilities of the teaching committee, Review the college teaching course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>College G</th>
<th>College H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Started in 2005 from a faculty initiative with subsequent funding from a campus teaching advancement grant</td>
<td>Started in 2001 when the institution advocated formalized faculty development support in colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Philosophy</td>
<td>“Developing a formalized mechanism whereby new and experienced professors can improve their teaching, strive for excellence, and learn to feel comfortable in the classroom.”</td>
<td>“Building a sense of community among new faculty focused around teaching.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (Program)</td>
<td>One established program with recurring activities as well as other activities and services</td>
<td>One established program with recurring activities for new faculty as well as other activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (College)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience</td>
<td>New faculty</td>
<td>New faculty (primarily)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Established faculty</td>
<td>Established faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Impact</td>
<td>Increasing faculty participation and visibility of program</td>
<td>Building a sense of community across disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helping struggling faculty improve teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>End-of-session satisfaction survey</td>
<td>End-of-session satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty participation</td>
<td>Faculty participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>No formal mechanism established</td>
<td>No formal mechanism established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No measurable outcomes required from college</td>
<td>No measurable outcomes required from college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (College)</td>
<td>No budget, but paid for lunches and notebooks</td>
<td>No budget, but paid for lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No dedicated clerical staff</td>
<td>No dedicated clerical staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (Teaching Center)</td>
<td>Teaching center representative never worked with the program</td>
<td>Teaching center representative never worked with the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in and ran some activities when asked</td>
<td>Sent faculty to teaching center activities when needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (Campus)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Influencing senior faculty to attend activities</td>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director feels restricted as a faculty member in doing more with the program</td>
<td>Struggle for identity in the college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of the right mix of activities to interest the diverse faculty of the college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of central oversight and communication in the college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty in effectively using faculty and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Ideas</td>
<td>Increase visibility and faculty awareness of program</td>
<td>Create regular and predictable programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop more teaching resources for faculty</td>
<td>Create a faculty development committee with a faculty coordinator (i.e., director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a website and video library of activities</td>
<td>Restart program from a grassroots effort and include a small budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop more activities and teaching resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a PhD teaching program and allow graduate students to participate in established activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have faculty write one article per year looking at their teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Disbanded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3

*College Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number of Departments</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Total Faculty</th>
<th>Average Number of New Faculty Each Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>Infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>75 - 100</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>75 - 100</td>
<td>10 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>300 - 500</td>
<td>15 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>500+</td>
<td>30 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>100 - 300</td>
<td>5 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2 - 4</td>
<td>75 - 100</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>100 - 300</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College A**

This case presentation is based on an interview with the director of the faculty development program in College A conducted during the spring semester of 2008. College A had approximately 25 total faculty members in a single department. College A could generally be classified as soft/applied/non-life (Biglan, 1973a).

**Introduction**

The faculty development program started in 2001 as College A’s response to the Provost advocating to formalize faculty development support in colleges. The faculty development program never was fully established in the college. The program struggled to offer faculty development activities until it finally became inactive in 2006. See Figure 1 for a timeline of the faculty development program.
Figure 1. Timeline of the faculty development program in College A.

**History**

The faculty development program started in 2001 as College A’s response to the Provost advocating to formalize faculty development support in colleges. Since 2001, the faculty development program had periods of activity and inactivity. The faculty development program was inactive at the time of this research study.

**Administration**

Director Trout had been involved with the faculty development program from the beginning. She had been Associate Dean of Academic Affairs in the college since 1997. Director Trout was even the Interim Dean of the college for a couple of years. She felt that the responsibilities of associate dean of the college and director of the faculty development program integrated well with each other. As associate dean, Director Trout viewed herself as being in a
quality control position over academic programs, which included classroom instruction and the
teaching of students. She said:

My ongoing role has been Associate Dean overseeing Academic Programs. So, I
was already in that role before we started the faculty development program and
since then I have continued in this role of overseeing Academic Programs, a piece
of which is quality control. I do classroom scheduling. We do course
development. I am on our curriculum committee. I also work with a lot of
doctoral students and most of our doctoral students aspire to faculty positions. I
mean faculty development is something I care about, but also is a logical
dimension of what I am already doing in the college.

As the director of the faculty development program, Director Trout felt she could directly impact
the quality of teaching of the faculty, adjunct instructors, and graduate teaching assistants. She
tried to identify topics that might interest participants and ways they could best be served by the
faculty development activities.

**Mission philosophy**

Director Trout said the mission of the faculty development program was “trying to create
a culture, a time, and a space for people at any stage in their career (graduate student to
professor) to share, encourage, and focus on teaching.” She explained:

We have had a culture of valuing teaching. Obviously, people need to be active
as researchers, but they can’t just ignore their teaching. So, in a way having a
faculty development program reinforced that well. It wasn’t a change in
philosophy in terms of saying teaching is important, but really more of an
opportunity to focus being more systematic in thinking about how can we support
faculty development in relation to teaching.

She said the primary benefit of the faculty development program was “helping people improve in
various facets of what it means to design courses, to deliver courses, and to evaluate students.”

**Activities**

The faculty development program had been inactive and not offered activities for two
years. Director Trout stated:
To be honest, we have been somewhat dormant the last year or so in terms of official activities. The main thing we have done in the last year or so is trying to promote the increasing number of opportunities across campus.

When the program offered activities in the past, it offered 90-minute lunchtime seminars. Director Trout said activities generally had been offered once a month and were designed to appeal across a wide range of constituents (i.e., graduate students, instructional staff, and faculty). The format of the lunchtime activities varied from sitting and listening to a lecture, participating actively in a workshop, or discussing a section of a book.

Director Trout said the college offered faculty development activities that were not officially sponsored by the faculty development program. She mentioned that the college also offered graduate students a formal course on instruction. She said, “So if our students want to learn more about the instructional dimension of [their profession], then we actually have a formal course that students can enroll in.”

Director Trout mentioned she conducted a conference call every semester for all the online instructors. She explained:

[The conference call] is not a formal program, but it is answering questions and often sharing tips: this is how I handle grading, this is how I make use of synchronous sessions, and these are techniques I have found helpful for managing groups. Again, it is not programmatic in the sense that we have specific goals for that particular conversation, but it is creating a time and a space for people to focus on teaching.

In addition, the college sponsored a workshop open to anyone interested in attending on how to teach an online course. The college also had a mentoring program for graduate students who were teaching courses.

**Perceived impact**

Director Trout felt the impact of the faculty development program was that it gave a strong signal to faculty that teaching was important and a priority in the college. She said:
The years that it was active, I do think it was communicating the message that we do value teaching, that we value faculty development in this dimension, that there are ways for people at any stage in their career to continue to develop.

She explained, “How do you gauge effectiveness? It is based solely on who are you reaching. Well, it is not based on continuous participation in many events. You are trying to stimulate interest. You are getting exposed to new ideas.”

Assessment and accountability

Evaluations were collected at the end of each faculty development activity. The generally positive results from this feedback and good attendance indicated to Director Trout that participants were generally satisfied. She explained:

I would say the people who have participated in the activities learned. We generally got positive evaluations that those individual activities were worthwhile in exposing them to new ideas, new techniques, but weren’t necessarily critical to their success as faculty members. It is just part of emphasizing that we do value teaching and that there are ways to continue to develop as faculty members.

Director Trout was not held accountable to any measureable outcomes for the faculty development by the college leadership.

College and campus support

College A did not provide any monetary or staff support for the faculty development program. The faculty development program received the majority of its monetary support through campus teaching advancement grants. Director Trout said the grants helped the faculty development program “focus in some sense themes, so that we have resources to have speakers and to have refreshments at events.” In 2001, a campus teaching advancement grant was used to offer the initial activities of the faculty development program. An additional grant in 2002 helped sponsor a retreat focused on online teaching. Sessions of the retreat targeted faculty, adjunct faculty, and some online students. Director Trout said the faculty development program received another campus teaching advancement grant in 2008. The funding from this grant was
planned to sponsor another retreat that focused on online instruction. This retreat targeted people teaching in or providing services for the college’s online degree program.

Director Trout mentioned that in the past she had occasionally coordinated with the campus teaching center (CTC) to offer activities. She stated, “What we found helpful is to plan in conjunction with a CTC staff member, who is appointed as the liaison to us.” She explained, “They can suggest topics or we can. Or if we have topics, they can suggest resource people to be facilitators. Often it has been picking from existing offerings that CTC has.”

**Challenges**

Director Trout connected the inconsistent activity of the faculty development program with the way it had originated in the college. She explained, “We obviously have not put together an infrastructure that ensures continued viability. I mean, I still think it is a viable concept, but it requires a lot of resources.” Director Trout also mentioned the faculty development program competed for faculty time. She said faculty in the college prioritized their time, and a faculty development activity was just one more thing to choose from in a given day. Director Trout admitted the competition for her time had greatly hindered her from creating any programming for the faculty development program. She believed the competition for faculty time had increased over the years. She said, “I would say that the competition for people’s time in terms of scheduling events, both our scheduling and then people’s participating, is more of a challenge then probably even 10 years ago.”

**Future ideas**

Director Trout wanted the faculty development program to become more self-sufficient not being solely dependent on campus support to offer activities. She envisioned a faculty development committee administering the faculty development program. She said:
I certainly could contemplate the idea of having a committee expanding the faculty development program. I can’t imagine in our environment that it would be a fulltime staff member. Unlike College E, we don’t have the resources to have a fulltime staff member.

Director Trout wanted to establish some predictability in the schedule of activities for the faculty development program. She expressed a desire for the program to have an expected schedule published in advance of the start of the semester so faculty and students could put the activities on their calendars. She believed if the faculty and students in the college could anticipate an activity, then they were more likely to participate. She believed a more college-driven faculty development program would be more active in engaging the faculty and students in building connections around teaching.

College B

This case presentation is based on individual interviews with the chair of the faculty development committee and the associate dean responsible for the faculty development committee in College B conducted during the spring semester of 2008. College B had approximately 100 total faculty members amongst 3 departments. College B could generally be classified as hard/applied/life (Biglan, 1973a).

Introduction

The faculty development program started in 2001 as College B’s response to the Provost of the institution advocating formalized faculty development support in colleges. The faculty development program offered general activities to faculty in the college. Two years after starting, the faculty development program became inactive in 2003. In 2005, the dean of the college appointed a faculty development committee to try to reinvigorate the program. The chair of the faculty development committee always struggled to offer consistent activities. The faculty
development program had become inactive again at the time of this research study. See Figure 2 for a timeline of the faculty development program.

![Timeline of the faculty development program in College B.](image)

**Figure 2.** Timeline of the faculty development program in College B.

**History**

The faculty development program started in 2001 as College B’s response to the Provost advocating to formalize faculty development support in colleges. According to Associate Dean Ulysses, the program was started in response to a couple of already established faculty development programs in other colleges as well as more programs being started at the institution. Associate Dean Ulysses said, “It became apparent that faculty development programs were something that was happening on campus, and we should have one.” Two years after starting, the faculty development program became inactive in 2003. In 2004, the dean appointed a faculty committee to reinvigorate the faculty development program for the next academic year.
Following several years of intermittent activities, the faculty development program became inactive again in 2007.

**Administration**

Several interested faculty, who were appointed by a previous associate dean in 2001, administered the first iteration of the faculty development program. A faculty committee administered the second iteration of the program starting in 2005. The faculty committee had three faculty members from each of the college’s three departments. Associate Dean Ulysses said the committee typically met early in the academic year to plan the year’s activities and events. Professor Wakefield, the chair of the faculty development committee, clarified that he tried to have the committee meet at least once a semester and, for a while, he tried to schedule meetings every two weeks. He said usually only three or four faculty out of nine on the committee would show up.

Associate Dean Ulysses was a previous member of the faculty development committee and had been the first chair of the committee in 2004. However, personal circumstances arose that required a co-chair to help him for the first year. Associate Dean Ulysses chaired the following year of the committee, but stepped down at the end of the year because of his other faculty responsibilities.

Associate Dean Ulysses was appointed the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs at the beginning of the 2008 academic year. He now advises the faculty development committee, but stated that he had not been active with the program because he was still learning his new position. He explained, “To tell you the honest truth, in my first year in here [as associate dean], the faculty development program has been very inert, it has not been very active.”
Professor Wakefield had helped administer the first iteration of the program in 2001 as a faculty member. He explained:

In what I would call the halcyon days of the program, a bunch of us were really passionate about teaching. We were senior faculty and we would get together and really come up with a concerted plan. Then it was about the time we lost [a faculty member] who was probably the most enthusiastic. We just didn’t have enough people to even come to the meetings let alone plan anything after that.

At the time of the research study, Professor Wakefield had been the chair of the faculty development committee for two years. He had also helped co-chair the faculty development committee with Associate Dean Ulysses in 2004. Professor Wakefield had enjoyed his time as chair, but said, “I just plain ran out of time. I thought, you know, my health is starting to go and this is just one more stress I don’t need at the moment.” Professor Wakefield said the faculty development program did not accomplish anything the previous year because he focused on his teaching and clinic responsibilities. He also stopped going to faculty meetings and seminars the year prior to this research study. Professor Wakefield said:

I met with the department head, at least I have them on the same plane so that I know what they expect of me, and this faculty development program is not their top priority. I can understand why. I am passionate about teaching and I am passionate about training younger people. But if I can’t do my own teaching, how am I going to do the faculty development program? I wrestle with this constantly: Where does my loyalty lie? What am I suppose to do? What is my top priority supposed to be?

Professor Wakefield admitted, in talking about continuing to chair the faculty development committee, “I can’t do it anymore. I thought I was going to be able to do it. I thought I was going to be able to pull this off. I just ran out of steam.” He continued, “I’ve just gotten very frustrated with this because I want to do a good job with this, but I’ve run out of steam. I’ve just run out of energy.”
Mission philosophy

Professor Wakefield, the chair of the faculty development committee, believed the mission of the faculty development program was to “provide an effective service to help faculty teach.” He added:

I want to provide stuff for the new faculty so they don’t feel so lost when it comes to exam preparation, syllabus preparation, giving lectures, and things like that. Then I want to hook the more senior faculty on stuff like curriculum development and grading.

Associate Dean Ulysses believed the mission of the faculty development program was “to try to improve the quality of teaching that we do; improve the delivery of curriculum.” He explained, “I think the niche for the faculty development program in our college anyway is probably providing mentorship to younger faculty and to graduate students to be better teachers either didactically or on the clinic floor.” Associate Dean Ulysses admitted that the faculty development program had struggled with where it fit in the college.

Activities

According to Professor Wakefield, the faculty development program had offered general faculty development activities in the past. When these activities were offered, between 10 and 15 faculty participated out of approximately 100 total faculty in the college. These activities were open to all faculty in the college but according to Professor Wakefield and Associate Dean Ulysses, only the same cohort of faculty attended. Associate Dean Ulysses explained, “The same sub-population of very interested and dedicated faculty come to all these things and the ones who may really need to come are not the ones who come. So, we’re still not reaching those people.” There had been very few activities targeting new faculty even though Professor Wakefield said he was interested in offering activities specifically for this cohort. The faculty development program also did not offer any activities for teaching assistants in the college.
The faculty development program sponsored only one program—a monthly professional case study—during the year of the research study. The case studies were the major reason for restarting the faculty development program in 2005. On the first Monday of the month, a group of professors would present a scenario they had faced in their professional careers. The professors would discuss with participants possible courses of action to the scenario. The case study activity exposed participants to real-world situations and simulated the proper procedures in determining the best course of action in addressing the issue of the case. The case study activity was open to the whole college with faculty and students in attendance.

The faculty development program had sponsored the professional case studies for the last three years. However, while the case study activity was viewed as a function of the faculty development program, the activity no longer depended on the program for support and sustainability. Professor Wakefield explained the case study activity was “the big one we do and that’s been a great success, but it is almost ready to go off on its own. I’m not sure that should be a faculty development program thing anymore.” Associate Dean Ulysses made a similar comment when he stated he believed the case study activity had developed beyond the faculty development program and become its own entity. Associate Dean Ulysses and Professor Wakefield both indicated the case study activity had developed beyond an activity into a separate program of the college.

Professor Wakefield and Associate Dean Ulysses both mentioned the courses and curriculum committee in the college offered regular faculty development activities, in addition to the faculty development program’s activities. Associate Dean Ulysses said the courses and curriculum committee recently had held a workshop on writing course objectives, which he stated could have easily been offered by the faculty development program. Professor Wakefield
also mentioned that the college and departments offered regular professional development seminars. He said, “Monday at noon is a college seminar or the case study. Wednesday at noon is when they have departmental seminars. Of course, every department has its own seminar. Literally every noon hour there’s a seminar.”

Professor Wakefield had developed some resources for faculty in the college but had not implemented them at the time of this research study. He designed a website portal for the program that listed the members of the faculty development committee so other faculty could contact them. The website also served as an archive of previous presentations that faculty could download and view on their own time. The website had not been made public at the time of this research study. Professor Wakefield also created a new hire packet with all the material from previous years’ activities. The information packet with an accompanying CD was given to new faculty when they joined the college. However, Professor Wakefield had not developed any activities or accompanying support to help new faculty integrate the content of the packet into their teaching.

**Perceived impact**

The chair of the faculty development committee had only one faculty member last year ask when there was going to be an activity. He said the majority of the committee members had not questioned him about the inactivity of the program. However, one committee member did approach him and mention that it had been a long time since an activity was offered. Associate Dean Ulysses said he had not heard from faculty in the last year about the dormancy of the faculty development program.
**Assessment and accountability**

Professor Wakefield received positive informal feedback from participants attending activities. The faculty development program did not conduct any sort of formal evaluation of its activities. The college leadership did not require any measurable outcomes for the faculty development program. Professor Wakefield was never asked to report about the faculty development program, but did include his work with the program in his annual review to the department head.

**College and campus support**

Associate Dean Ulysses did have a small budget for the faculty development program through the office of Academic Affairs. He said his office had been responsible for helping the faculty development program put on activities by handling the enrollment and making sure there were enough handouts for participants. According to Associate Dean Ulysses, he had tried to make two permanent staff positions in his office to help provide support for the faculty development program. The college tried to have one staff person responsible for helping the faculty development committee when time allowed from his or her main staff duties.

Professor Wakefield said he had worked in the past with a representative from the campus teaching center to conduct various activities in the college. He admitted to relying heavily on the representative to put on activities. Professor Wakefield explained the representative “was over here at least once a week, sometimes twice a week, and when that happened it was very easy to set up faculty development stuff.” Unfortunately, she retired after working with the program for a year. Her replacement had only intermittent contact with the program before stopping contact all together.
Challenges

Associate Dean Ulysses said when the idea for a faculty development program was first brought up in the college, he did not know what it was going to do. He explained, “I think we are still struggling with that identity.” Professor Wakefield explained:

There is a philosophical difference that I had with, it wasn’t just the dean, it was some other faculty about the faculty development program. They wanted the program to be a driving force for curriculum change, which is laudable, except my opinion is that college curriculum reform is not what a faculty development program is for. A faculty development program is supposed to help the faculty, particularly junior faculty, learn how to teach.

The structure and responsibility of the faculty development committee created a challenge in the operation of the program. Associate Dean Ulysses said, “The problem is that at least the way we’re structuring the faculty development committee, probably inappropriately, the onus ends up falling on the chair.” Professor Wakefield stated, “I love doing the faculty development program, but I won’t do it if it’s slipshod and that’s an issue. That’s why I dropped it, because I just don’t want to do something that is embarrassing.” As an example, the committee had agreed to offer an activity, but according to Professor Wakefield, nobody on the committee could or would conduct the activity when it was offered due to other responsibilities. Therefore, he ran the activity by himself. Associate Dean Ulysses explained, “To tell you the truth, there’s no real upside to being that person [the chair of the faculty development committee]. There is no financial reward. There’s no verbal praise for the most part.” He said if the chair had a busy semester, then the faculty development committee and program were the most likely things that were not going to get done.

Professor Wakefield said a lack of resources was his biggest challenge in running the faculty development program. He felt strongly that the lack of staff was a big part of the program’s struggle to be active. He stated:
The faculty person is supposed to provide the direction and the ideas, and be the advocate and go out there. But if you’re going to do that then there is a heck of a lot of staff resources you need. Otherwise, I have found, if you take this on, you end up being a staff person more than a faculty person.

Professor Wakefield said that the college staff person who helped the faculty development program was repeatedly reassigned to other duties. He explained:

We have a problem here in that we get staff people trained and they are pulled off to do something else. I’ve had this problem with the most recent one. Now she is the office manager for Academic Affairs, that means her ability to help me, which she was doing last year, is about zero now. So, I am stuck back having to run the show myself and if I don’t have time, the show doesn’t go on.

He continued:

I look at myself as being the intellectual force behind the faculty development program. But I am not so sure it’s a good use of my faculty time or intellect to be the guy who has to make the flyers who has to do all this other stuff that we need some staff support for.

Professor Wakefield explained the faculty development program took a lot of planning and one of the reasons he had not been active with the program the last year was because he needed a good staff person to help.

The struggle for faculty time greatly impacted the faculty development program. First, Professor Wakefield could not find time for the members of the faculty development committee to meet. Second, the college faculty did not have time to attend activities. Professor Wakefield said faculty schedules were almost mutually incompatible in the college. He explained, “I have found it virtually impossible to find a time when I can get even 60 or 70% of the faculty open to attend. Somebody is always not available.”

Future ideas

Professor Wakefield wanted a staff person with 10 to 20 hours a week dedicated to the program. He also wanted the faculty development program to offer a yearly retreat for all faculty in the college. Associate Dean Ulysses wanted to start over with the faculty development
program. He first wanted to figure out who on the committee was still interested in participating, fill any vacant spots, and then go forward with the new committee. He said, “I think we will have a package of things we provide to people. The current chair of the faculty development committee has put together a big package of all the things we have sponsored.” Associate Dean Ulysses did not know if the faculty development program would hold any sponsored activities in the future. He primarily wanted a faculty development committee in hopes that if new faculty had any questions or concerns, they would talk with the members of the committee from their departments.

**College C**

This case presentation is based on an interview with the chair of the faculty development committee in College C conducted during the spring semester of 2008. College C had approximately 100 total faculty members amongst 3 departments. College C could generally be classified as soft/applied/non-life (Biglan, 1973a).

**Introduction**

The faculty development program in College C was the only one in this research study in which people from outside the college facilitated the faculty development activities offered within the college. The themes and topics of the faculty development activities were set each year by a committee of faculty from the college. The faculty development committee had used campus funds to develop four distinct curricula with recurring activities. At the time of this research study, the chair of the faculty development committee was the only member left of the six-member committee; all other members had retired or left the college. The lack of a committee had not affected the faculty development program. College C paid the campus teaching center to facilitate the faculty development activities, which had been offered
consistently since the fall of 2000. See Figure 3 for a timeline of the faculty development program.

**History**

The faculty development committee was established in the spring of 1999 to enhance teaching effectiveness within College C. A campus teaching advancement grant allowed faculty members from the committee to observe classes of exemplary teachers identified on the campus. In a series of meetings during the 1999-2000 academic year, the committee members shared what they had observed as the best practices for teaching and identified components of effective teaching and learning. In the fall of 2000, five workshops were held to explore specific issues related to teaching. These workshops were open to the entire faculty of College C. The high participation and enthusiasm from participants led the faculty development committee to seek

**Figure 3.** Timeline of the faculty development program in College C.
additional funding from the campus teaching advancement grant. The additional funding was used, over the course of a couple of years, to expand the initial workshops into four modules each with distinctive activities and target audiences.

**Administration**

The faculty development committee was responsible for administering the four faculty development modules in the college by choosing the themes and intended topics each year. However, the faculty development committee did not coordinate or facilitate any of the activities in the modules. Professor Miller, the chair of the faculty development committee, explained the main function of the committee was “to set policy and try to get the resources from the college or beyond. We are at the stage now where we are maintaining modules as opposed to designing them.” Professor Miller explained the committee’s process for planning each year.

[We] pick our theme, what are we going to do, why, how, what is the purpose of that particular workshop series. Then we outsource it to the campus teaching center to decide the methods and format they think are best.

Professor Miller joined the faculty development committee in 2001 as an assistant professor. He was asked to be a co-chair in 2002 then became the chair of the committee in 2004. The committee was supposed to have two faculty members from each department in the college. There were three departments in the college at the time of the research study, but there were no committee members. At the time of this research study, all of the former committee members had left the college or retired and had not been replaced. Therefore, Professor Miller had worked with the campus teaching center without the support of a committee for at least an academic year. He explained:

You kind of hit me at a bad time with this right now because a lot of the original board is gone. We have not necessarily replenished. One of our more local goals is how do we fill this out again. Right now, it is me working with the campus teaching center. The ‘we’ is me and CTC.
Mission philosophy

When asked about the mission of the faculty development program, Professor Miller replied, “Wow. Great question, in the sense that I hadn’t thought about the mission.” After thinking about the question, he explained the mission was “to value effective teaching and maximize the level of effectiveness” in the faculty and college. He stated, “If I had to put a thing out there, what I am driven by is the notion of teaching excellence. How do we move towards a faculty of excellent teachers—teaching excellence?”

Activities

There were four distinct modules developed by the faculty development committee and facilitated by the campus teaching center. Professor Miller said the modules were created and implemented one at a time, but could not recall the exact order the modules had been developed. He described these modules as the four syllabi of the faculty development committee’s curriculum. Professor Miller explained no new modules were being developed; the four established modules were just being maintained.

Professor Miller indicated the first module, called the Program for Achieving Teaching Excellence (PATE), was the longest running one. He commented that PATE had been established already when he joined the faculty development committee in 2001. Professor Miller explained that PATE was the committee’s core module. The activities of PATE served to introduce new faculty, both tenure track and visiting, to the college as well as acclimate them to teaching in the college. The first PATE activity was a one-and-a-half day workshop held the week prior to the start of the academic year. Professor Miller gave the opening talk of the workshop, then the dean talked about the importance of teaching in the college. Professor Miller
described the first meeting of PATE as “being the very first thing happening for new faculty, and it serves essentially as an orientation to the kind of culture of the college.” He explained:

Everything being equal, we would rather have a really good teacher than not a really good teacher. I am very careful in terms of these things and usually my opening remarks try to put the importance of teaching into the context of a teaching and research balance. So, what I usually do as my introduction here is not to go in there and talk about how important teaching is, but to talk about how teaching and research are complementary. How being a better teacher has made me a better writer or researcher and vice versa. So here is why you should think about it in a scholarly way because it is going to ultimately help you out both ways.

The opening workshop was followed by four or five lunchtime seminars throughout the fall semester; the committee provided the participants lunches. The 90-minute seminars covered thematic topics ranging from philosophical to practical teaching ideas. Only PATE participants were invited to these seminars to maintain the community of new faculty. While participation in PATE was voluntary, the department heads sent letters to their new faculty encouraging them to attend the orientation and participate in PATE activities. There were usually 10 to 20 new faculty who participated in PATE each year.

The second module, offered in the fall along with PATE, focused on general topics of teaching and learning. The module had five or six 90-minute lunchtime seminars with lunches provided by the faculty development committee. The seminars were thematic in nature and had new content each year. The teaching and learning seminars provided activities to maintain the community of faculty who had already completed PATE. Previous PATE participants were the main audience of the seminars, but participation was open to the entire college faculty. There were usually 20 to 30 faculty who participated in the teaching and learning seminars each year.

Professor Miller stated the third module was offered only when a large enough cohort of assistant professors were starting the tenure process. The module was designed for assistant professors to reflect on their own teaching. The goal of the reflective teaching module was for
faculty to develop a systematic and holistic view of teaching. The reflective teaching activities helped faculty develop their teaching portfolios through purposeful reflection on teaching and learning philosophies and how these philosophies fit into their course syllabi, learning objectives, exams, and homework assignments. Professor Miller described the reflective teaching module as a “stationary course that once you have gone through it you have gone through it. It is a non-repetitive module.” This module was organized as a short course with an established curriculum offered over five or six sessions during the fall semester. Approximately 10 faculty participated in the module every couple of years. Professor Miller explained, “Our fall semester modules are PATE together with either the teaching and learning seminars or the reflective teaching workshops to complement PATE.”

Professor Miller described the fourth module as being more philosophical in nature as compared to the previous three. He explained the module was the advanced study seminar of the faculty development committee’s curriculum. The module’s activities were structured like a book club at which 10 to 12 faculty members discussed a chapter of a book at each meeting during the spring semester. At the beginning of the semester, Professor Miller sent an open invitation to the entire college faculty to promote the book for that semester. Once there were enough participants, he would set the roster for the book club, which remained the same throughout the semester. The books discussed usually covered topics related to pedagogy, or the philosophy of teaching and learning. The discussions were scheduled for 90 minutes over lunchtime, with the faculty development committee providing lunches. The faculty met once a week over the course of the spring semester until the book was finished. Professor Miller said the group usually finished a book well before the end of the semester. According to Professor
Miller, each session started with a discussion of the book, but quickly progressed to faculty sharing personal experiences.

Professor Miller indicated that the faculty development committee focused solely on faculty teaching and did not offer any activities for the graduate students in the college. Instead, the teaching assistants in the college were encouraged to attend the graduate activities offered by the campus teaching center.

**Perceived impact**

Professor Miller stated, “I think we are more effective and perhaps more productive teachers because of the faculty development activities.” He perceived a degree of success if faculty in the college regarded teaching in ways that were more thoughtful. He explained,

“Being scholars as we are, if as long as we are thinking about something seriously, you are going to have some positive effect. There are few people around who think hard about something and then come up so absolutely short, right?”

**Assessment and accountability**

When asked about evaluating the faculty development committee’s activities, Professor Miller responded, “I don’t have that. Honestly, it is all anecdotal. To be honest with you, that is part of the outsourcing.” Professor Miller explained that he and the campus teaching center, while working closely together, did not evaluate the activities and modules offered by the committee. However, Professor Miller did mention two external measures he considered when personally evaluating the faculty development program: participation and funding. Faculty development in the college was okay in his opinion if there was money and if faculty were participating in activities.
College and campus support

In the past, the faculty development committee had used funding from campus teaching advancement grants to develop activity modules. Professor Miller stated the modules of the faculty development committee were in a steady state at the time of this research study.

The college had a primary line item in the budget for the faculty development committee. However, Professor Miller had to write a yearly proposal to receive this support. He said, “Basically, the way I see it from my eyes is the college has a budget for it [faculty development] and I am able to get it each year.” The money the committee received from the college paid for the services of the campus teaching center and the lunches for faculty participants. It should be noted this was a special arrangement between College C and the campus teaching center.

Professor Miller said the previous associate dean was integral in supporting the development stage of the faculty development program. He said, “The previous associate dean was very explicitly supportive of the idea and spirit of what the faculty development committee was trying to accomplish.” He went on to explain the current associate dean was supportive of the faculty development committee and continually approved the funding.

Professor Miller commented that the biggest support for the faculty development program was the department heads’ endorsement sent to new faculty encouraging them to attend activities. He thought that some departments were better than others at supporting the program. He also mentioned that the dean was supportive of the teaching mission of the college, but he had retired at the end of the last academic year. Professor Miller voiced concern about where teaching and the faculty development program would fit in the college with a new dean.
Challenges

The main challenge for Professor Miller was whether faculty viewed the relationship of teaching and research as complementary or competitive. He explained, “The challenge is always whether it is the reality or the perception that it is teaching versus research as opposed to teaching and research [italics added for emphasis].” He believed, “Philosophically, if you are going to ask me, basically what I am going to say is that to me teaching is a scholarly activity.” However, he feared the presumption of new faculty was that they have two jobs (i.e., research versus teaching). He explained:

The message of the faculty development committee is that teaching is a scholarly activity. If scholars view teaching as a scholarly activity, it is going to be done well because they are scholars. What are we experts at? We are experts at scholarship. Ergo, if teaching is an area of scholarship, game over. I don’t have to tell you how to teach; I just have to convince you that it is important because you are a scholar.

Future ideas

Professor Miller was content with the activities of the four modules offered by the faculty development committee. However, he realized it might be necessary to infuse something new into the modules. He did not know specifically what it would be, but he knew it would have to be fundamentally different in ideology, not format, than what was currently being offered. He explained:

With the teaching and learning workshop series, it was designed in a robust way; it is the shell that is repeated, but the content changes. So, to have something new becomes a really fundamentally new idea. Do we have a different goal than this notion of pursuing teaching excellence? So, if I have a new goal then we would get an idea for a new module. Or if this becomes the same goal that we are trying to contribute to the notion of teaching excellence, okay how do we define a module that is orthogonal so that it would be actually new, not just a new name, that ultimately ends up being some linear combination of these other established modules.
The only idea Professor Miller had for the future was reestablishing the members of the faculty development committee. He said, “The thing is how do we start? How can we be an actual body again as opposed to just me? Because what has happened is we have hit this steady state with these modules.”

**College D**

This case presentation is based on individual interviews with the director and assistant director of the faculty development program in College D conducted during the spring semester of 2008. College D had approximately 400 total faculty members amongst 13 departments. College D could generally be classified as hard/applied/non-life (Biglan, 1973a).

**Introduction**

The faculty development program in College D was the first college-level program at the institution and the only one in this research study that started with college funding. The faculty development program started in 1994 as a college teaching course for faculty in the college. In 2001, the director and assistant director of the faculty development program renamed the college teaching course *Accelerated Faculty*. The director and assistant director felt the previous name, *College Teaching Course*, did not reflect the inclusion of more research topics in the faculty development activities. At this time, the directors also decided to expand the range of activities offered to faculty in the college. The purview of the faculty development program expanded again in 2007 to include reviewing and awarding teaching grants in the college. While the faculty development program in College D had been active consistently since 1994, the program was characterized by an ongoing political struggle with the college leadership. See Figure 4 for a more detailed timeline of the faculty development program.
**Figure 4.** Timeline of the faculty development program in College D.
History

The faculty development program originated from an idea generated by Professor Nolan, the director of the program, at a faculty retreat on undergraduate education in the spring of 1994. During a small workgroup session, Professor Nolan, a faculty member of another college at the time, relayed his experience of taking a college teaching course as a graduate student at another Division I research institution. He suggested to the group, “Maybe we need to have a new faculty, a new professor’s course, on teaching.” According to Nolan, the group initially said the idea would never work. However, after thinking about the idea for a college teaching course overnight, the group decided the college teaching course was the group’s main deliverable idea to the larger group at the retreat. Dean Adcox, the dean of the college at the time, approved the funding and the teaching course was offered the fall of 1994 for incoming faculty.

During the first year, the professor in charge of the course applied for and received a significant three-year grant from a corporate fund. According to the director, this funding “helped move the course from simply a class about teaching to a more holistic orientation and transition to life in academia.” Director Nolan renewed the initial grant for another three years of corporate support. After six years of support, the corporate funding was no longer available to the faculty development program. Therefore, in 2001 Director Nolan and Assistant Director Oakes met with department heads to discuss establishing college funding for the faculty development program and ask for input. Assistant Director Oakes explained the program was “a service to departments; essentially we are training their faculty. We are doing something that they could be doing themselves.” During the meeting, department heads “brought up the idea that teaching is important, but research is also important” and asked if the program could “give new faculty tools for both.” The activities of the faculty development program were doing this at
the time, but the department heads understood the nature of the program only by the college teaching course, its titular activity. The department heads generally were unaware the course offered both teaching and research content for participants.

This misconception prompted Director Nolan and Assistant Director Oakes to change the name of the College Teaching Course, trying to minimize future confusion and hopefully bolster faculty participation. They wanted the title to reflect the program’s purpose to help new faculty get a better start at the beginning of their careers. Therefore, Director Nolan and Assistant Director Oakes renamed the teaching course Accelerated Faculty, connecting the program with Robert Boice’s (1992, 2000) notion of faculty “quick starters.” Boice’s research found faculty who participate in development activities meet an institution’s standard of research productivity and instructional effectiveness quicker than faculty who do not attend.

Administration

Director Nolan had attended College D’s faculty retreat in 1994 because at the time College D administered the undergraduate curriculum of his home college. Director Nolan remained involved with the college teaching course and subsequent establishment of the faculty development program while primarily a tenure-track faculty member in his home college. He admitted that his involvement with the faculty development program during this time was “just in the margins of my life.”

An opportunity came in 1998 for Director Nolan to be an active part in the leadership of the college. The college had a rotating assistant dean program in which it took two half-time faculty members from various departments around the college and assigned one as a dean in the morning and the other in the afternoon. These assistant deans primarily advised students, but also worked on personal projects of interest to the college. The college had trouble getting their
own faculty to participate in the rotating assistant dean program. So, Director Nolan’s home
department and college gave him permission to leave for half a day while teaching classes,
conducting research, and overseeing graduate students. The rotating assistant dean program gave
Director Nolan time to work on his personal project, the faculty development program. He was
in this position for a year during which time he “enjoyed it and got familiar with the office and
responsibilities.” After returning to his home college for a year, Director Nolan decided, “I am
going to put my full effort into the faculty development program.”

Director Nolan applied for and received an assistant dean position in the college in 2000.
He held a nine-month appointment and reported to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs. His
main responsibilities were admissions and student advisement, but he made the faculty
development program one of his other main responsibilities. The program was “still a passion”
for Director Nolan after 14 years and he “still loves doing it.” However, he also stated, “I keep
doing it, because if I didn’t, it would die at this point.” He sustained the program for more than
ten years through budget cuts, frequent turnover in college leadership, and the need to justify the
existence of the program in the college. Assistant Director Oakes stated that Director Nolan was
“really, really good at continuity and maintaining the faculty development program as an
important thing” in the college.

Assistant Director Oakes started working in the college in 1996 as a doctoral student
from another college. A department in the college was looking for a graduate student to teach
communication skills to senior students and help them with their final reports and presentations.
Assistant Director Oakes said, “What I loved and still love about working with [these] students
was the sense of how much they are going out into the world and doing interesting things.”
Working on this course led her to meet the professor who was directing the college teaching
course at the time. The professor asked her to work on an undergraduate project in which she designed and taught a course in developing students’ writing and research skills. She taught this course until the professor left the institution, at which time the current director became responsible for the course. Assistant Director Oakes remained with the college teaching course as a graduate student.

Between 1998 and 2001, Assistant Director Oakes finished her doctoral degree and was hired by the college to work with the faculty development program. She explained that nothing really changed in terms of her job responsibilities with the hiring. She continued in the same position helping the director run the faculty development program. After she was hired, Assistant Director Oakes’ position was renewed yearly and “there were years where the budget people upstairs would be like, ‘What are we paying her for? Is she doing clerical stuff? Is she doing coordinating stuff?’” Both directors were responsible for planning the activities of the program as well as guiding its direction in the college. Assistant Director Oakes also ordered lunches, collated notebooks, made name tags, and scheduled meetings. Director Nolan praised her as an integral part of the program’s existence by saying, “essentially she does everything. I mean, she does a lot of work and frankly she could do it all.”

Assistant Director Oakes’ position remained year-to-year until 2004 when a new Associate Dean of Academic Affairs was hired. She said Associate Dean Beske was “really supportive of me and of the faculty development program.” In 2005, Associate Dean Beske made the position of assistant director permanent. Assistant Director Oakes explained, “Now I don’t have to go upstairs [to the budget office] and explain myself every year.”

Since entering the college, Assistant Director Oakes became more interested in doing what she called higher level tasks in the college, which the associate dean encouraged her to
pursue. Associate Dean Beske helped Assistant Director Oakes become responsible for more things in the college outside the purview of the faculty development program. Her role in the college expanded to include teaching a course for probation students and helping advise students. She was the interim director of the faculty development program for a year, when Director Nolan went on sabbatical.

Associate Dean Beske helped Assistant Director Oakes participate in a subcommittee responsible for the oversight of teaching evaluation and improvement in the college. Her task was to write the charges for the committee, describing what departments needed to investigate and evaluate teaching. Her responsibilities on the subcommittee dealt “with teaching, but it is not at the coordinating level” (e.g., making name tags, ordering lunches, sending emails, etc.). She explained, “I still have to do all that stuff. That’s actually a little bit of a source of frustration because the faculty development program doesn’t have any secretarial staff.” She described a meeting with the associate dean at which she told him, “I don’t mind doing the clerical stuff. I have been doing it for years. But if I’m making name tags, I can’t spend my time doing other stuff that I would be better [suited to do].” She explained Associate Dean Beske concurred with her and said he would work on the situation. However, Associate Dean Beske left the institution before this was accomplished.

**Mission philosophy**

When asked what he saw as the mission for the faculty development program, Director Nolan replied, “The core mission is to improve instruction in the college.” When asked the same question, Assistant Director Oakes replied, “I feel like I would like for the faculty development program to be much more dynamic in terms of being involved in evaluating teaching, giving departments tools to make it a priority to evaluate teaching for the purposes of advancement.”
Both directors tried to accomplish the mission of the program through primarily supporting new faculty. They believed new faculty needed the program most and might have more time in their already busy schedules to attend activities. Their idea was to incrementally increase the total number of faculty who participated in the program each year. Director Nolan explained, “eventually many people in the college will be at least exposed to some of these things and be thinking about improving their instruction. And by having occasional seminars and other things, then we can continue to reinvigorate and re-engage the faculty.”

Even though Director Nolan mentioned only improving instruction in the mission philosophy of the program, the faculty development program focused on both the teaching and research roles of faculty in the college. Director Nolan stated he believed faculty development in the college was “really about education and that includes teaching and research.” He continued:

We made a strategic decision that we could probably engage more people if we were more holistic and helped them with the research. We are going to help you get research grants. We are going to help you hire graduate students and manage your lab, those things you didn’t learn in graduate school. We just want you to be successful. We want you to do well here and yeah, we’re going to do teaching too, because that is one of the big things you may not have learned. We thought we would have a lot better chance of getting our foot in the door.

Director Nolan explained, “I’ve toned down my expectations a bit to say reaching a good group of 12 to 15 faculty a year is pretty good. It’s better than nothing.”

**Activities**

The original teaching course project that initiated the faculty development program in 1994 was designed primarily for new faculty members. The format of the college teaching course was a weekly two-hour meeting in the evening during the academic year with dinners provided by the faculty development program. After a couple of years, the format for the course became a five-day event held before classes began in the fall. The format changed again after a couple of years, becoming a lunchtime seminar that met once a week during the academic year.
with lunches provided by the program. During the first meeting, participants received a teaching resource notebook to be used as a reference and to record notes in during subsequent meetings.

In 2001 the teaching college course underwent another format change and was renamed *Accelerated Faculty* by the directors. The activities of the *Accelerated Faculty* curriculum were structured in two tiers. The first tier consisted of two-day workshops held in the fall before classes started, in January before spring classes started, and in May toward the conclusion of the academic year. These workshops delivered information to new faculty at times when faculty needed to hear it. Assistant Director Oakes explained:

> This is because, if you’re not in the classroom at the time, it doesn’t seem important to you. Then after you’ve spent a semester dealing with students, you have 10,000 more questions than you would if you’ve never done it before because you just don’t know.

The first day of the fall workshop focused on career development and very research-oriented topics for the new faculty (e.g., what did faculty need to set up labs, where was funding nationally, and how did faculty apply for it, etc.). The workshop’s second day focused more on teaching topics. The other two-day workshops in January and May also focused more on teaching topics.

*Accelerated Faculty*’s second tier of activities consisted of monthly lunchtime meetings during the academic year with lunches provided by the faculty development program. The main purpose of the fall semester meetings was to check in and find out how the new faculty were acclimating to the college and what they were doing. These meetings allowed new faculty to discuss changes they tried in their courses, what worked, what did not work, and any other issues they wanted to discuss. The faculty development directors used these sessions to discuss different teaching topics, review and discuss a paper, and host an occasional outside speaker.
The monthly meetings in the spring were mainly to review and help faculty prepare for their National Science Foundation career award proposals.

The faculty development directors also offered services, in addition to the *Accelerated Faculty* meetings, to new and established faculty. Part of the services included conducting classroom observations in which a person would videotape a class then discuss recommendations with the instructor. Previous participants in the faculty development program served as peer observers when needed. Assistant Director Oakes also created short informational teaching emails (e.g., creating a syllabus, making a test, grading, conducting the first day of class, etc.) she occasionally sent to new faculty as well as any other faculty who expressed an interest.

New faculty were the core audience of the faculty development program’s activities. While new faculty specifically were invited, all interested faculty were welcome to participate in activities. Occasionally one or two senior faculty participated, and on rare occasions a doctoral student or postdoctoral fellow participated. Both directors made a concerted effort to notify and recruit new faculty for activities. Assistant Director Oakes contacted the offices of each department early during the spring semester to request a list of new hires for the next academic year. She sent an initial email welcoming the new faculty to the college, telling them about the faculty development program, and inviting them to register online for the program’s activities. The new hires also received a follow-up email from the dean of the college encouraging them to participate in the faculty development program.

In 2004, Associate Dean Beske—the same dean responsible for making the assistant director’s position permanent— instituted a student surcharge that funded yearly proposals from faculty for new laboratory equipment. The student surcharge generated approximately $150,000 every year. The surcharge money was used to establish a teaching advancement grant that
funded faculty proposals for innovative teaching in the classroom. Associate Dean Beske reviewed and funded proposals for which he never required feedback or follow-up. In 2007, however, he left the college and responsibility for the teaching advancement grant was given to the directors of the faculty development program.

After taking responsibility for the grant, the directors were able to coordinate the focus of the proposals. The directors used the grant money to fund five proposals the first year. Assistant Director Oakes explained that while the teaching advancement grant was “a relatively small amount of money, it is given to people who are already interested in doing stuff to improve teaching, giving them some resources to do that.” She gave examples of previous grants, including things like hiring graduate or undergraduate students as teaching assistants or providing a faculty member with summer leave time to develop curriculum. Director Nolan gave examples of grant topics, including self-guided, web-based tutorials for increasing student understanding, improving conceptual understanding and retention, evaluating pedagogy, and assessing student teams in a freshman course.

The directors also required grant winners to participate in a feedback mechanism. Assistant Director Oakes explained:

One of the key things that make this different from just handing out money is that we’ve also formed this group where recipients of the grants meet a few times during the semester and share their experiences about what they’re doing, kind of network, and learn about different evaluation resources.

She pointed out that the campus teaching center representative was responsible for forming this group. Both Assistant Director Oakes and the campus teaching center representative facilitated the group meetings.
Perceived impact

Director Nolan believed the biggest impacts of the faculty development program were helping to “carve out a foothold for teaching” in the college and influencing what faculty thought about their positions. He stated:

I think that giving teaching and learning credibility as part of the job here and acknowledging that, hey, this is a research institution, we are obviously here to do research, but if you’re only here to do research then you might as well be at a research lab or someplace else. Also, another part of this job, which is very important, is teaching.

Director Nolan reported anecdotal evidence that indicated participants in the program were making teaching a priority by acknowledging teaching as part of their faculty responsibilities. He heard “faculty acknowledging while their research area is very important to them, that maybe the biggest impact they’ll have over their career is the students they meet semester in and out.”

The directors both felt the longevity of the program had a significant impact on the faculty and college. Director Nolan gave an example of the program’s longevity. There were, “several junior faculty who have been through the program and now are tenured or maybe even just getting to the point of full professors, who are making changes” in their departments’ quality of teaching.

Assessment and accountability

The directors of the faculty development program conducted end-of-session evaluations after the workshop at the beginning of the academic year. Assistant Director Oakes collected this data because she wanted “to be able to sell the program to the next year’s group and tell department heads how it’s going.” She said the data from the surveys was always very positive.

The directors both believed faculty found the activities helpful because there were always participants at the events. When the number of participants began to dwindle, the directors internally conducted their own informal evaluation of the program. Assistant Director Oakes
explained, “Like when we changed the configuration of the program, that was very much like an internal assessment. This just is not working. We are getting too much drop off. People are not absorbing information. How can we do this differently?”

The college leadership did not require any measurable outcomes for the faculty development program. Assistant Director Oakes felt that the college leadership was “just glad that someone’s doing something. They’re not down there like, ‘What can we do to help you?’ or ‘What can we do for you to be more successful? Are you doing a good job?’” She explained:

I mean the college is not equipped to evaluate the faculty development program anyway. If they were, they would see we need more money. We need more staff. It’s fine as it is in their perception. It’s fine; it’s not a huge problem.

Assistant Director Oakes reported to the associate dean and included what she did with the faculty development program in her annual review.

College and campus support

The college monetarily supported the faculty development program without giving it an official budget. Assistant Director Oakes explained, “We spend money and then hope that somebody pays for it. Usually they do because we don’t do huge things.” The cost of running the program included miscellaneous costs such as copying notebooks, buying books, and ordering food. The directors of the faculty development program occasionally invited a speaker from outside the campus, which the college usually paid for as well. The college’s biggest monetary commitment was the assistant director’s salary. The faculty development program did not have a dedicated staff beyond the director and assistant director. Assistant Director Oakes said the staff situation for the program was “a little bit of a source of frustration right now because we don’t have any secretarial support.”

Traditionally the deans of the college were supportive of the faculty development program. The program was a talking point for deans when recruiting prospective new faculty.
The deans also gave speeches at the faculty development program’s orientation retreats. While the deans gave some verbal support of the faculty development program, the majority of verbal and personal support for the program came from the associate deans of the college.

Associate Dean Beske supported the faculty development program so much that he approached Dean Cothran with the issue of the college supporting the program’s function with faculty. Assistant Director Oakes recounted that Associate Dean Beske told Dean Cothran that in order for the college to be more successful in evaluating teaching, Dean Cothran needed to make a statement on behalf of the college. Dean Cothran’s response, according to Assistant Director Oakes, was “No, the departments need to do that. The departments need to decide if teaching is important to them or not.”

Historically, the tenure for Associate Deans of Academic Affairs ranged from 13 to more than 30 years, according to Director Nolan. Associate Dean Beske held the position for three years when Dean Cothran asked him to leave or step down. Assistant Director Oakes explained, “That was a blow to our office because we loved him. Everybody did, except the dean.” She continued, “I wish he were still here because I felt like he gave me so much more responsibility than I had before.”

Director Nolan recounted another incident the faculty development program had with Dean DeHart, a former department head who became the dean before Dean Cothran. Director Nolan said that as the department head, Dean DeHart was supportive of the faculty development program and had the highest number of new faculty attend faculty development activities. Dean DeHart’s approach as a department head, according to Director Nolan, was “he would sort of put his arm around you and say, ‘Yeah, you’re going to do the faculty development program.’” Dean DeHart remained supportive of the faculty development program when he became the
However, Director Nolan said the college went through some lean budget years during Dean DeHart’s tenure. During one of those years, Dean DeHart shut down the faculty development program and took away the assistant director’s salary, which was still year-to-year. Dean DeHart said he needed money for other things and pulled all of the faculty development program’s monies. The news quickly spread across the institution to the other faculty development programs and the campus teaching center. Director Nolan explained,

Word spread like wildfire that [the institution’s] inaugural unit had been shut down. People from the campus teaching center and people from the other faculty development programs cornered him. In fact, there was a campus committee meeting he was chairing and people in there said you can’t shut down your faculty development program, it’s the father program, look at the message it sends to the rest of the campus. It makes it look like it’s not important.

Director Nolan explained Dean DeHart reinstated the faculty development program before it missed offering any of its activities.

The faculty development program did get support from the campus teaching center. The program had the same representative from the campus teaching center since the fall of 1999. She conducted training for the college’s teaching assistants, coordinated the program’s faculty peer teaching observations, and along with Assistant Director Oakes helped facilitate the meetings of the teaching advancement grant recipients.

**Challenges**

The level of importance given to teaching in the college and the tension between teaching and research appeared to be the biggest challenges facing the directors of the faculty development program. This challenge was seen in the college leadership’s regard for teaching. Assistant Director Oakes talked about what she saw as Dean Cothran’s view of the faculty development program:

I think he’s proud of it as a resource in the college. He believes in it. He believes it is important. It is a good thing to be able to talk about to new faculty. But in
terms of is there going to be intervention or momentum in terms of improving teaching, for Dean Cothran that’s just not a priority. I think his feeling is it’s fine how it is.

As an example, Assistant Director Oakes talked about how transforming education was a major goal in the strategic plan of the college. She explained, “So you would kind of assume that, all right, we’ll start with the faculty development program because we’re directly contacting faculty, we’re directly interacting with faculty, improving their capacity both in research and teaching.”

Assistant Director Oakes, however, pointed out that the college leadership did not even consider the faculty development program as a part of the strategic plan to transform education in the college. Instead, the college leadership looked at retention and diversity, asking questions such as “How do we attract more underrepresented students? What do we do for them when they’re here?”

Director Nolan stated, “People who get into the positions above me don’t get there because they espouse teaching as being important” for the college. He gave an example of Dean Cothran’s welcome speech that he witnessed at one of the faculty development program’s opening orientations:

We are so glad you are here. It’s a great place; everybody here loves it. It is really important to get off to a good start with your research and your service. Oh yeah, there is the new one now that we’re talking about, entrepreneurship; those three big things. [Long pause.] Oh and teaching. Teaching is important too.

Director Nolan explained, “There’s just about that much pause and that much break. It wasn’t, we have the four missions. The three rolled off his tongue, even the new one, and then teaching was an afterthought.”

Director Nolan said, “I think it’s just a way of life, at least in a place like this, where the dean is going to be someone who is the manager of a research center, someone who has very high prominence and probably won’t embrace education.” He continued:
Dean Cothran has never been supportive. He, I don’t think, had a strong teaching component of his faculty experience; he has always been very immersed in research. He didn’t experience the faculty development program, never came to any of the workshops or any of the things that have been a part of the program. He really made his career on building these big research centers, being very successful with the National Science Foundation, and now being in the national academy. Yeah, he has not been particularly supportive.

However, Director Nolan said Dean Cothran would “occasionally give some sort of acknowledgement to the faculty development program, where it seems to serve a purpose.”

Director Nolan was referencing a time when external accreditation reviewers visited the college. Referring to the faculty development program and Dean Cothran, Assistant Director Oakes stated:

The faculty development program is not a priority in terms of his scope. I don’t think he understands where it could fit into what he’s doing and maybe that will change. I mean, he did commission the education sub-committee to look at efforts in the college and the faculty development program was one of the groups they met with. We were written into their final report. We will see what comes from that.

How faculty teaching was evaluated in the college also was directly connected to its level of importance. Assistant Director Oakes stated, “It’s not standardized and there’s no kind of research support under how it works. It’s just like someone will come into your classroom, someone from your department comes in and they sit there, and they are like, ‘Oh, that looks fine.’” She went on to say, “It’s like as long as you’re not doing something horrendous, you’re fine. I just feel like that is not good enough.” According to her, “there are people coming in who need more and different types of interactions with their professors than they get. I just don’t see that happening.”

The directors of the faculty development program were challenged in overcoming the inertia of change in the college. Director Nolan explained, “It’s a very decentralized system of
faculty. As long as they’re within the guidelines of the code, they’re not accountable to anyone.”

Assistant Director Oakes stated:

I feel like faculty development goes at the pace that it goes at. I mean, you can’t tell faculty to do anything, you know. If the consequences are not dire for them doing a bad job, you really can’t tell them to do anything.

She also felt that she could work with the faculty development program for the next 20 years and nothing would change.

In their dealings with faculty, the directors of the faculty development program had to address an unfounded perception that a good researcher was a poor teacher. Assistant Director Oakes pointed out that while the priority of faculty was research, the irony was that “there is actually data on this that shows teaching and research are very closely correlated. You can be good at both, and most people who are good in one are good at the other.” In addressing this issue and promoting the importance of teaching to faculty, Director Nolan was challenged to follow-up with new faculty who had already participated in the program. He stated, “I mean, the first year is not the end all, we need to stay with people,” which means he constantly had to “keep selling the idea [of faculty development] to administrators who may not have had experience with it.”

Two of the challenges for the faculty development program were internal and involved the directors. The first challenge was the longevity of Director Nolan’s leadership. He believed that after a long time in a job, people got tired of doing things and ideas were harder to generate. Director Nolan explained:

For several years, I have been telling my boss that you really need to get someone new to be the director of the faculty development program, just fresh ideas. There are people who go through the program who at the end say, hey, I would be interested in getting more involved at some point after I get tenure or after whatever. So I think it would be good to have someone new in. The problem is my boss keeps turning over.
The second challenge involved the perceived validity of the assistant director’s leadership, as viewed by faculty in the college. While Assistant Director Oakes would be the most likely choice to become the new director of the faculty program, she was not a faculty member of the college. Director Nolan explained, “I think if it was just her, even though she has a Ph.D. and is completely competent and knows more than I do, there is still this idea of who’s the department head going to call up if there’s an issue.” Therefore, a new director would have to come from the faculty for the faculty development program to have validity in the college.

**Future ideas**

When asked about ideas for the future of the faculty development program, Director Nolan replied, “We’re in a revitalization phase right now, in fact. We met with a professor who went through the program as a young professor and now is tenured and saying, hey you guys need to get going again.” Assistant Director Oakes had the same idea but said, “I feel like I really wish we had more momentum.”

Director Nolan proposed the creation of an education center for a couple of years. The center would have outside funding from alumni donors and serve as a clearinghouse for faculty regarding educational research in the college. The outside funding, Nolan believed, would be able to get the education center started. Director Nolan looked at redesigning the faculty development program’s website in order to market the program to donors. The center would have education researchers on staff to be resources for faculty interested in topics ranging from designing a better syllabus to implementing an educational research study. Director Nolan envisioned the educational specialist as a person “who knows about education, especially evaluation assessment things, and can help design reasonable classroom experiments.” Assistant Director Oakes also wanted to see a permanent educational specialist to be a part of the program.
Assistant Director Oakes wanted the faculty development program to have more of a presence in the college as well as be more visible to the faculty. She explained that she wanted the program to include clerical staff along with a clearer administrative structure delineating their roles and responsibilities. As part of increasing the visibility of the program, Assistant Director Oakes wanted to “be more active in terms of communicating with department heads because it’s a group that has a pretty high turnover.” She also wanted to see an increase in the amount of teaching grant money the program could have available to give to faculty.

Assistant Director Oakes wanted to see the faculty development program work more closely with the students of the college. She explained, “I would love for there to be a much tighter circle between what we do with faculty and how we could involve students in their own kind of understanding of what it means to learn, how to interact with teachers.” To accomplish this idea, Assistant Director Oakes wanted to redesign the faculty development program’s website. She wanted the website to be more dynamic and comprehensive, creating an interactive space and presence for both faculty and students in the college. She explained she wanted to see faculty “write in with questions or we can post news about teaching award winners” as well as give students a space on the website where the content focused on teaching, but “driven by what they want.” Assistant Director Oakes also wanted the website to have a calendar of events and links to other events going on around campus.

College E

This case presentation was compiled and written from an interview conducted during the spring semester of 2008 with the director of the faculty development program in College E. College E had approximately 600 total faculty members amongst 60 departments. Due to the
large number of departments, College E could only be classified as pure (Biglan, 1973a). The departments in the college ranged across both the hard/soft and life/non-life classifications.

**Introduction**

The faculty development program in College E originated in 1998 from an idea a faculty member had to start a mentoring program in the college. He approached the college leadership with the idea, which then developed the mentoring program into a more formalized faculty development program for the college. In the beginning, a campus teaching center representative worked with the director to expand the program’s activities and services offered by the faculty development program. In 2002, the campus teaching center representative became the assistant director of the faculty development program, a position created by the college. During its history, the faculty development program consistently offered activities. See Figure 5 for a timeline of the faculty development program.

Figure 5. Timeline of the faculty development program in College E.
History

The faculty development program originated in 1998 as a faculty mentoring program in College E. Director Price, a faculty member, discussed starting a mentoring program for junior faculty in the college with Associate Dean James. Associate Dean James wanted to start an opening workshop for all new faculty. Director Price combined both ideas into a proposal for a campus teaching advancement grant. The proposal was accepted and the faculty development program officially started the fall of 1999.

Director Price said that the activities and services were built up during the first five years of the faculty development program. During this period new ideas and activities were piloted while established activities continued with only slight modifications. Funding for all of the pilot activities was provided by campus teaching advancement grants. Director Price stated the faculty development program had become more institutionalized over the last four years resulting in no new activities being developed.

Administration

Director Price was unofficially responsible for the faculty development activities the first two years of the program. During this time, he did not receive any kind of compensation from the college. He did, however, receive assistance from a campus teaching center representative. Prior to the start of the program’s third year, the college leadership decided to officially create an assistant director position for the faculty development program. Director Price said, “the college’s view was we would really rather have our own person on board rather than relying on the campus teaching center.” The college leadership created a line item in the budget for the salary of a half-time assistant director. After creating the position, the college immediately hired the representative from the campus teaching center. She worked six years for the faculty
Director Price stated as a result of creating the assistant director position, “the college suddenly realized, well, if we have an assistant director we really should have somebody who is the director with a line in the budget.” He explained:

In some sense because of creating the positions, the program became solidified. It wasn’t that it was a conscious plan, we had been going along and as we expanded activities they thought, well, we really want somebody else, but you can’t have an assistant director without having a director. So, those positions came in place that way and it has been that way ever since.

Director Price received a salary supplement for the administrative position with no reduction in his teaching requirements. Both the director and assistant director of the faculty development program reported to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.

Mission philosophy.

When asked about the mission of the faculty development program Director Price stated, “The big picture is to create a norm and culture of good teaching in the college, that teaching is respected.” Director Price felt the faculty development program signaled to faculty that the college cared about teaching and that there were faculty thinking about teaching. He said his expectation was that there was an increasingly large cohort of faculty who had been through the program who were sensitive to teaching issues. Director Price stated a secondary mission of the faculty development program was “to provide some services to the faculty that first allow them to reflect more on their teaching, in some sense think about what you are doing and why you are doing it.” He explained student learning was the goal of faculty reflecting on their teaching.

Activities

The teaching advancement grant awarded in 1999 allowed Director Price to pilot a limited number of activities. One of the activities was an opening retreat held for new faculty
before classes started. The purpose of the opening retreat was to give new faculty long-term strategies in becoming tenured at the institution. The first part of the opening retreat covered broad general topics, while sessions in the afternoon separated faculty into groups based roughly on discipline or field of interest. Director Price said, “We do have, at the opening retreat, a couple breakout sessions that are roughly by field orientation.” He explained:

> When we have a session on active learning in the afternoon, we have often tried to put people in similar kind of groups that may have similar kinds of classes, challenges, and students. So there is a little bit of product differentiation, but not a lot.

The opening retreat was followed by a series of two or three lunchtime activities offered each semester with lunches provided by the program. Participants in the opening retreat were expected to attend these activities; attendance ranged from 30 to 50 faculty out of approximately 600 total faculty in the college. Director Price said these activities covered practical teaching topics and were often conducted by guest speakers. The faculty development program also offered a mentoring program for faculty in the college. The mentoring program matched senior faculty who were recognized as good mentors and teachers with new faculty from other departments. The opening retreat, lunchtime seminars, and mentoring program became the faculty development program’s core set of yearly activities.

The directors of the faculty development program soon realized these activities were only serving a particular population in the college (i.e., new faculty). Therefore, in 2002 the intended audience of the activities expanded to include established faculty and the instructional staff of the college. Director Price explained:

> As we’ve changed some of the topics, we’ve realized that many of them are relevant for more than just the new people. We also expanded the opening retreat and some of the services that we gave just to new tenure-track faculty, to new instructional staff.
The directors added an additional opening workshop for the instructional staff and non-tenure track faculty in the college; this did not include graduate teaching assistants.

Topics of the new workshop emphasized more short-term, immediate, and practical issues. According to Director Price, this group of instructors was more transient and needed more “just-in-time” services. Participation in this opening workshop averaged 20 to 25 people but has had up to 40 participants. In 2006, non-tenure track faculty and instructional staff from other colleges were invited to participate in the opening retreat due to the lack of an equivalent activity offered by some of the other faculty development programs at the institution. According to Director Price, the retreat usually had two or three participants from other colleges.

The directors created a reflective teaching seminar in 2003. The reflective teaching seminar was a 16-week course that met for two hours on Monday afternoons approximately 10 times during the fall semester and 6 times during the spring semester. The reflective teaching seminar was offered only every two years. Faculty committed to participating by signing up for the seminar. The seminar was offered to tenure- and non-tenure track junior faculty. Director Price identified this cohort as faculty in their second year at the institution through first year associate professors. Faculty were recruited in a couple of different ways to participate in the reflective teaching seminar. First, all tenure-track assistant faculty and newly promoted associate faculty received an invitation letter from Director Price. Second, department heads were asked to nominate faculty they would like to see participate. Third, senior faculty mentors were asked to encourage faculty to attend. Fourth, previous participants in the reflective teaching workshop were asked to encourage their peers to attend. While attendance was not mandatory, there was an expectation of building relationships, which required faculty to attend. The target attendance was 15, but there had been anywhere from 12 to 20 faculty participants.
The reflective teaching seminar organized different kinds of discussions, focusing on new pedagogical techniques. Director Price gave an example that faculty in the seminar were specifically assigned to sit in the back of a large freshman general education course. The one requirement was that faculty chose a course as far away from their expertise as possible. The purpose of the exercise was for faculty (a) to recognize how faculty from other disciplines were teaching in the college and (b) to experience what it meant, for example, to be a freshman English major taking a chemistry course.

Occasionally the faculty development program offered teaching circles or discussion groups. The directors would invite faculty to read a particular article or book. The discussion took place over lunchtime for 60 to 90 minutes, with the program buying the participants’ book and lunches. Director Price said there were usually five to seven discussion groups with up to 15 faculty per group. When these were offered depended on the availability of an interesting book, study, or topic faculty wanted to discuss. The scheduling of these activities was flexible. Some years there were discussion groups for more than one book and other years there were no groups.

The college leadership offered a teaching advancement grant, which awarded up to $2,000 to faculty who were interested in improving a course or developing a new teaching technique. While the grant was not an official part of the faculty development program, there was a condition that acceptance of the funds required faculty to participate in the reflective teaching seminar. According to Director Price, two to five faculty participated in the seminar.

Perceived impact

Director Price felt the faculty development activities had built faculty relationships across departments. He explained, “When you bring people together at the opening workshops, when you put folks together in the reflective teaching seminar, particularly the junior faculty who are
often very atomized in their own departments, they are now starting to have relationships.”

Junior faculty had told him they socialized at various college events with faculty from other departments because they participated in faculty development activities together.

Director Price felt faculty members were more aware of their teaching because of the faculty development program. He said, “I think that we’ve probably raised awareness of teaching related issues. I think we’ve made the college more sensitive to these kinds of issues and the college administrators know what to look at and pay attention to regarding teaching.” As an example Director Price said:

I got a call a couple of years ago from a department that has been one of the less active in our activities. The executive officer and a senior faculty member had gone to watch one of their faculty members teach prior to a third year review, which is required. They did not quite like what they saw and were looking for some materials or help or something. While they did not want me to do anything personally, I gave them some books, ideas, and suggestions. I talked with the associate dean who was the supervisor of this particular department. I said, well you know it’s not really encouraging to see that it took them three years to figure out something wasn’t going right. He replied you’ve made great progress with the faculty development program. Five years ago, they wouldn’t have noticed.

**Assessment and accountability**

The directors of the faculty development program administered satisfaction surveys at the end of the opening workshop and reflective teaching seminar. Director Price said the program had evaluated activities when they were first piloted, but no longer. He explained, “For some of the things, we have gotten to the point where some of the evaluations, we weren’t necessarily learning a lot more stuff that we didn’t already know.”

Director Price said the Dean’s Office monitored the number of people who participated in the faculty development activities each year. Director Price clarified that he thought the monitoring was more about holding the departments accountable for sending their faculty to activities than holding the program accountable. The directors of the faculty development
program were not required to produce an annual report or held accountable by the college leadership for any measureable outcomes. Director Price said, “the reporting in the past has been loose, the oversight has been limited shall we say, and there is no external kind of evaluation.” He continued, “as long as there are no issues that come from us then in some sense we are left alone. So, we are given an enormous amount of autonomy to do what we want.”

Director Price felt the college leadership was generally happy with what the faculty development program had done. To substantiate his opinion, he described an incident when the responsibility for the faculty development program changed at the end of the fifth or sixth year from Associate Dean James to Dean Kidder. Associate Dean James suggested to Dean Kidder that an evaluation of the faculty development program might be a good idea with the shift of responsibility. Director Price described the meeting he had with Dean Kidder discussing evaluating the faculty development program:

> We went over what the program did, but because she had won teaching awards herself and participated in the program’s activities, she knew everything we did anyway. We went over the budget and I again indicated to her that it was suggested we have this evaluation. I welcomed it as an opportunity for the program to figure out what to do.

According to Director Price, while she was interested in the idea of evaluating the faculty development program, it just never happened. He said her response was, “Well, I know what the faculty development program does. Associate Dean James said it is a well-run operation. I don’t think we really need to have an evaluation.”

**College and campus support**

There had been two different deans over the faculty development program’s history, Dean Larson and Dean Kidder. Director Price said both deans had been supportive of the faculty development program. According to Director Price, he felt the dean’s behavior signaled to
faculty the importance of the program in the college. He felt there were two critical areas the
dean played in supporting the faculty development program. He said:

One is clearly financial, but the second is a much more informal kind of a thing. It is to what extent is the dean viewed as supportive of the faculty development program and how does the dean’s behavior signal to others the importance of this element (i.e., teaching).

He explained that both Dean Larson and Dean Kidder had attended the opening workshops for tenure-track faculty and in many cases had stayed throughout most of the day. Director Price said that Dean Larson had attended a session of the reflective teaching seminar, while Dean Kidder had given a talk at one of the lunchtime seminars. He also mentioned that the associate deans had been supportive of the faculty development program over its history.

The college leadership (i.e., deans and associate deans) had on occasions not only participated in faculty development activities, but according to Director Price, had led some of the teaching circles. He said, “Faculty members respond to what is important and the college leadership has been very good in being very visible and supportive of the program that way.”

Director Price also mentioned that new faculty received a letter from the dean after they accepted a position in the college. In the letter, the dean told faculty about the opening workshop and that they were expected to attend. New faculty also received a letter from Director Price encouraging them to attend the opening workshop.

The college did not have an official line item in the budget for the operation of the faculty development program. The college did however provide the assistant director’s salary, the director’s administrative supplement, and miscellaneous costs. According to Director Price, he would ask each year for money for the program, and he had never been turned down. During the first year of the program, Dean Larson gave 20 senior faculty mentors $500 to show appreciation
Director Price had asked and received the money to continue to do this every year since. He gave an example of the college leadership’s support of a book discussion:

We asked and the college agreed to buy everybody who wanted to come to one of these discussion sessions a book and lunch. The books were cheap, frankly under $15, we spent $1500 on that, but we had over 70 participants. From the vantage point of the college, one of the associate deans said, ‘You know, to reach that many people you only spent $20 or $25 per person, that is pretty good to reach 15% to 20% of the college faculty.’

The faculty development program did not have any dedicated clerical staff, but one associate dean’s secretary assisted the faculty development program. She sent out invitations, recorded who was planning to attend activities, and secured rooms for the activities.

A campus teaching center representative helped the program when it started. However, the faculty development program stopped receiving any support from the campus teaching center once the center’s representative became the program’s assistant director. According to Director Price, the faculty development program and the campus teaching center had maintained an informal relationship since, but a recent request for a campus teaching center representative was declined.

**Challenges**

Director Price initially stated he saw the physical size of the college (600+ faculty) as a challenge, but then quickly thought of it more as an opportunity. He said, “I think the size gives us a chance to offer programs and get a bigger crowd. We can have opening workshops that even in a down year for faculty hiring can still have 30 or 40 new faculty.” He went on to state that the bigger challenge was the diversity of the almost 60 departments in the college. He explained:

Some of our faculty do a lot of lab work and may only teach one class a term versus other faculty who may teach four classes a year, some may be extremely large, some may be extremely small. I don’t think we have figured out exactly how to deal with that particular diversity; there is a little product differentiation.
Director Price also stated that pressure on faculty time challenged the faculty development program. He explained:

> It is not that the faculty members at big research universities are hostile to teaching; I just haven’t seen that. I see a willingness, but I do see a lot of people who are pulled in many different directions and in some ways have to make choices. Sometimes they do make choices to participate in our things and not in others. Other times they feel the tenure pressure.

Director Price said he tried but could make only so many adjustments in the schedule of faculty development activities to accommodate faculty.

**Future ideas**

Director Price wanted to have an educational research assistant assigned to the faculty development program. He explained:

> One of the things that a research faculty respects is advice that is backed by research findings. Having that kind of nuance is what would allow us to give better advice, a little bit more outreach, but it would also enhance the credibility of the program. That is what faculty members respect.

He explained the educational research assistant would be responsible for developing a teaching inventory with resources and materials backed by research that were specific to the needs of the faculty within the college. Director Price wanted to develop the program’s resources by first fixing the program’s website. He talked about having more teaching circles covering particular problems or issues as well as having more one-on-one sessions observing faculty teaching in their classes. Director Price also wanted more opportunities that would carve out time for faculty to focus on teaching. He explained, “It would be nice in an ideal world to give people—it sounds paradoxical—release time from teaching to focus on teaching.” He saw the release time as not only an opportunity for faculty to develop courses or participate in faculty development activities, but also as the college investing in faculty careers.
College F

This case presentation is based on an interview conducted during the spring semester of 2008 with the faculty development committee chair who was also an associate dean in College F. College F had approximately 250 total faculty members amongst 7 departments. College F could generally be classified as hard/applied/life (Biglan, 1973a).

Introduction

The faculty development program in College F was started in 1996 by an associate dean new to the college. A group of faculty from College F expressed an interest in a college teaching course prior to the associate dean’s arrival. After arriving, he established a college teaching course as well as a faculty development committee that worked with him to develop the activities of the faculty development program until the associate dean left in 2005. A new associate dean was hired in 2007 and she took over as chair of the faculty development program. See Figure 6 for a timeline of the faculty development program.
Figure 6. Timeline of the faculty development program in College F.
History

The faculty development program began in the fall of 1996 when Associate Dean Groh came to College F from another institution. Four professors from the college, who regularly met and talked about teaching over coffee, approached Associate Dean Groh prior to his coming to the institution. One of the four professors in this group was Professor Nolan, the future director of College D’s faculty development program and a faculty member in College F in 1996. Professor Nolan had already helped establish College D’s college teaching course two years earlier in 1994. He recounted:

We wrote [Associate Dean Groh] while he was still at the other institution and said, even before he set foot on campus, we hear you’ve accepted this job. What do you think of this idea for a college teaching course? He said, yeah, sounds great, let’s start it. So that fall when [Associate Dean Groh] came, he joined the four of us.

Associate Dean Groh instituted the college teaching course as well as the faculty development program in the college on his arrival at the college in 1996. He established the resources and built up formal activities for the program. He developed the program and college teaching course until 2005 when he left the institution.

There was an interim associate dean (Dean Ivanhoe) for two years and then Associate Dean Harding moved into the position and became responsible for the faculty development program. She stated, “Interim Associate Dean Ivanhoe pretty much continued what had gone on before. I would probably say that not too much new was developed because he felt he was in this interim position and just kind of holding the line.” Since taking the position in the fall of 2007, Associate Dean Harding has been “considering ways that the faculty development program could be of more use to me personally and the college.”
Administration

Associate Dean Harding had been a professor in the college for 20 years. She cared a lot about teaching and had previously participated in the faculty development activities offered in the college. She also had been recognized during her career for excellence in teaching. Associate Dean Harding had five assistant deans working for her and along with the faculty development program was responsible for other programs in the college (e.g., admissions, records, honors, study abroad, minority recruitment, curriculum, etc.).

Associate Dean Harding was the chair of the faculty committee responsible for the faculty development program. The faculty development committee was comprised of two members from each of the seven departments in the college. Members of the committee were appointed from distinguished faculty who had won college, national, or professional society teaching awards. Faculty generally served three-year terms on the committee. Associate Dean Harding explained:

When someone’s term is completed and they come from Department A, we will then look at Department A and see who are the people who have recently been recognized for excellent teaching and try to pull that individual in, especially if it is a new individual.

The faculty development committee usually met once or twice a semester. However, Associate Dean Harding recalled, “I have been on the faculty development committee as a faculty member and I know that there were some years we hardly ever met and some years that we weren’t really asked to do much.”

The faculty development committee served as a group that helped Associate Dean Harding plan how to promote good teaching in the college and review faculty applications for the college’s teaching advancement fund. She had committee members work in sub-committees
responsible for different areas (e.g., planning the fall retreat, planning the lunchtime seminars, developing the teaching resources brochure, etc.). Associate Dean Harding viewed participation in the faculty development committee as “a mark of distinction on their CV, for example, they might list it as an honor. I would consider that to be an honor. It is kind of an honor, status, that comes with a little bit of responsibility.” She commented on working with the faculty development committee:

> It is a happy thing to do, you know. You have people who care. It is very enjoyable to everyone because these are people who have already been recognized for their strong teaching. They are usually very excited about helping others become excellent teachers as well.

**Mission philosophy**

When asked, Associate Dean Harding stated that the mission of the faculty development program was “to recognize and support excellence in instruction broadly defined.” She felt the teaching and research missions of the college were not antagonistic. She explained when faculty were “hired into the college it is always explained to them that teaching, good teaching, is something valued in this college.” She said:

> I think that if we had the sense that someone was coming in and was going to have teaching as part of his or her appointment and that person had little or no interest in teaching he or she would probably not end up with the position here.

Later in the interview she said:

> Let’s be honest, everyone thinks that research is more important, but no one thinks that teaching is unimportant. Because of the way we all get our money, tuition dollars are becoming increasingly important. So economically, it is in everyone’s best interest to be a college that has great courses and good teachers. Students are why we are here.

She explained, “We are a Research I institution and I agree that research is incredibly important to who we are as a university, but at the same time there is no reason that research needs to
exclude good teaching.” She went on to say this was the same sentiment her alumni were thinking about. She said, “They are not thinking back positively about the great research that happened in someone else’s lab down the hall, but what they experienced in their courses and their interactions with the faculty and other students.”

**Activities**

The faculty development committee held a teaching retreat once a year on the Friday before classes began in the fall. The committee would bring in an outside speaker to talk about new teaching methods or address compelling issues regarding teaching. The keynote speech was followed by breakout sessions. There were usually 50 to 75 faculty who participated in the retreat. The faculty development committee followed up the retreat with teaching seminars offered twice in the fall and spring semesters. These seminars were conducted over lunch, with the faculty development program providing lunch. Attendance for these seminars in previous years had been between 15 and 20 faculty. However, Associate Dean Harding had asked for more creative topics and content from the committee her first year in charge of the program, which increased participation to 25 to 30 faculty. The faculty development committee also provided faculty with a yearly brochure of college and campus teaching resources.

The college also sponsored faculty development activities, but Associate Dean Harding viewed these activities as being conceptually separate from the faculty development program. The college teaching course was the first faculty development activity offered by the college. The college teaching course was a 10 week class that met once a week during the fall semester for 3 hours. Three or four experienced faculty of the college taught the course. When it was first created, the course was targeted to new faculty, but participation had since opened to include
doctoral students and academic professionals in the college. Associate Dean Harding explained the types of activities offered in the course:

They do a lot of practical things. They will be working on a syllabus. They create a set of objectives for their teaching. They write those teaching philosophy statements that you have to put in your annual report. The most popular thing is a three week unit where they actually have to teach a little section of a course to part of the class, get videotaped, and they are given explicit feedback. So, it is very constructive. The instructors make it as fun as they can so they are not asked to teach anything they don’t know about. They are asked to teach things that really no one would know about that they would have to research and find an innovative way to get that information across and how to teach it using active teaching methods.

She indicated new faculty were strongly encouraged to attend the course. However, there were usually only 6 to 8 faculty in a class with 24 participants; the rest were advanced graduate students. Associate Dean Harding said the instructors of the course made it a point to strip away everybody’s title the first day of class and call everyone by his or her first name. The college buys the participants’ books, notebooks, and dinner.

The second faculty development activity sponsored by the college was the teaching advancement fund, which was a college grant competition, held every semester. Faculty of the college were encouraged to write proposals about advancing their teaching knowledge or enhancing their teaching skills. The college received between 15 and 20 proposals every semester and awarded $2,000 to each of these proposals. If more money was needed for their teaching proposals, faculty could work with the campus teaching center to apply for a campus teaching advancement grant.

**Perceived impact**

Associate Dean Harding felt the activities of the faculty development program had helped create a positive image and established traditions around good teaching in the college.
According to her, the activities of the faculty development program had helped make the idea of excellence in teaching more concrete for faculty. She stated that the college teaching course had also been extremely helpful in promoting good teaching in the college. She felt these were important, “because I think there are a lot of places on our very own campus that say they care about good teaching, but they really care about really good research or well-funded research.” She went on to say, “I think that this college is extraordinary in truly caring about good teaching and student learning.”

Associate Dean Harding indicated that she used two indirect measures to gauge the success of the program’s activities: faculty’s annual reports and teaching awards. She said, “Knowing that the energy and effort that people devote to good instruction will be recognized in this college is extremely important and we have some good mechanisms in place for that recognition.” She explained:

When you ask people to write annual reports about their activities and they don’t include impressive information about their instruction, that is something we notice. On the reverse, when people are good instructors, we are going to let them know that that is great.

She continued, “We have done extremely well in having our faculty nominated for teaching awards both on campus and for national awards. They win a lot of them. That is a huge mark of success.”

Assessment and accountability

According to Associate Dean Harding, the faculty development committee generally did not gather any feedback from faculty who participated in activities. She explained, “I will give out a very simple evaluation from time to time, but often times we just don’t. We are more interested in what do you want to hear next time then how good was this one.”
Associate Dean Harding explained the college teaching course was an official course offered by the college and as such had an official course evaluation administered at the end of the semester. She explained, “The evaluations have always been positive. Given that it is 10 weeks, I think that is not a huge commitment. We have been doing this for 10 or 12 years. I think it is what is needed.”

The college did not hold the faculty development committee responsible for meeting any measureable outcomes. However, Associate Dean Harding did mention that the college surveyed graduating seniors about their experience. She explained, “We have updated our survey so that it will provide us with some better data about students’ perceptions of the quality of teaching in the college.”

**College and campus support**

Associate Dean Harding said alumni donors provided an endowment that supported the faculty development program through a line item in the college’s budget. She said that donor support made the faculty development program a viable option for the college. She explained,

> We definitely see the alumni playing a major part in enabling us to do the faculty development program and enabling us to reward teaching excellence. So most of the awards we give to good instructors and for good research actually come from alumni funds.

She felt alumni supported the teaching improvement endeavors of the college because they cared deeply about the instruction that they received as students.

The faculty development program did not have its own clerical staff. Associate Dean Harding’s administrative assistant provided clerical support for the faculty development program when needed. If the administrative assistant needed help, she could ask for aid from other clerical staff in the college.
The faculty development program never worked with a representative from the campus teaching center. According to Associate Dean Harding, a representative was never really necessary. She explained,

I would feel free to call upon the campus teaching center if there were some difficulty that we did need their expertise in. In fact, we do refer individual faculty to all of their programs and our graduate students go through all the teaching certificate programs.

She went on to state that the staff from the campus teaching center would occasionally participate and present at the retreats and seminars offered during the academic year.

**Challenges**

Associate Dean Harding was challenged to identify the good teachers in the college. In the past, she saw the same faculty get recognized as good teachers year after year, but knew there were many more good teachers in the college. She said:

One of the things I have tried to do is reach out to department heads to have them tell me who they think their good, excellent teachers are instead of going with the people that maybe are the most visible to this office.

She wanted to support all the good teachers in the college as well as make sure they were recognized appropriately. She sensed that faculty were nominated as good teachers in the past because they interacted with her predecessor more often than other faculty. She said she wanted all the faculty in the college to be nominated for their teaching. In an attempt to overcome this challenge, Associate Dean Harding started tracking when and what kind of teaching awards were received by faculty. She explained, “Who are the junior people that we want to keep an eye out and see when is it a good time to put them up for some of the entry level awards. When is it time to nominate them for the next level and who is going to fill that pipeline behind them.” Along with receiving teaching awards, Associate Dean Harding noticed the same small cohort of
faculty were asked to do everything in the college. She said, “The people who are asked to take on additional responsibilities or leadership and are nominated for awards, those people are great, but they get burned out or we have exhausted the number of things we can put them up for.” She explained, “You need a wider range of people for a strong college.”

**Future ideas**

Associate Dean Harding wanted to develop a more formalized mentoring program. She said the college teaching course dealt briefly with mentoring relationships, but she explained, “I would like to add more of the mentoring advising, which I don’t think we have covered all that heavily in the past” as part of the faculty development program’s activities.

Associate Dean Harding wanted to use the faculty development committee in different capacities connected with teaching in the college. She thought it was important for the committee to evaluate the college teaching course. While the course was outside the purview of the faculty development program, she wanted the committee to review it and give recommendations as to future directions. Instead of making teaching appointments herself, Associate Dean Harding wanted to use the faculty development committee as a democratic group in appointing instructors to the college teaching course when there was a vacancy.

Associate Dean Harding wanted to increase participation in the faculty development activities. She explained, “We probably get 25 to 30 people coming to a lunchtime seminar and there are 250 faculty in the college. So, how can we raise that from 10% to 20%, for example.” She wanted the faculty development committee to be the group that investigated this issue. While Associate Dean Harding had a couple of ideas for future work of the faculty development committee, she did not want to burn out the members. She explained, “I don’t want to overload
this group. I still want to make it a positive experience. I think if we have one unique mission a year that is enough. It is not really meant to be a work group.”

College G

This case presentation is based on an interview with the director of the faculty development program in College G conducted during the spring semester of 2008. College G had approximately 80 total faculty members amongst 3 departments. College G could generally be classified as soft/applied/life (Biglan, 1973a).

Introduction

The faculty development program in College G was established in 2005, making it the most recent one at the institution. The faculty development program offered general activities and services focusing on faculty teaching. See Figure 7 for a timeline of the faculty development program.

Figure 7. Timeline of the faculty development program in College G.
History

Associate Dean Quayle had worked on improving teaching in the college, which became the impetus for starting the faculty development program in College H. Director Radcliffe explained, “Associate Dean Quayle was the first one, I believe, to really start to try to do something” in the college. In 2005, Associate Dean Quayle left the college and Associate Dean Sharpe was responsible for continuing the work of improving faculty teaching in the college. Associate Dean Sharpe wrote a proposal and received a small teaching advancement grant from the institution. He used the funding to offer occasional lunchtime seminars as well as develop and implement a one-day teaching retreat for new faculty conducted prior to the start of the academic year. The college leadership then asked Director Radcliffe to administer the faculty development program starting with the 2007 academic year. She explained, “Associate Dean Sharpe was so overwhelmed with his other responsibilities that they asked me to take this on as director.”

Administration

Director Radcliffe was a certified teacher and an associate professor with the majority of her research focusing on teaching. She explained:

I am lucky because my research and teaching are very closely aligned. I am a certified teacher. I have been trained in teaching. A lot of my research is teaching. I study teacher educators and I have also done some research on teacher effectiveness in higher education. So to me it all kind of blends together nicely. My responsibilities all fit together really nicely.

The college gave Director Radcliffe a course release because the position was considered administrative for a faculty member. She explained, “I would normally have taught two courses fall term and one course spring term. Now I teach one course per semester and then that course
release allows me to do the faculty development program.” Director Radcliffe further explained the impact of the course release on her responsibilities:

It’s work, but it’s work that I really enjoy. So for me, having the course release this year, it’s kind of seemed almost like an easier year than teaching an intensive course that meets maybe two or three times a week. It is spread out over the course of the year and it is something I enjoy doing.

When asked about the workload of being a professor and the director of the faculty development program, Director Radcliffe replied, “I don’t feel overworked with it. It has really been a very reasonable load. This year in a lot of ways seems easier for me even though I am directing the faculty development program. Having the course release is a tremendous help.”

During her first year, Director Radcliffe established an advisory committee for the faculty development program. The committee was comprised of six members, two from each department in the college. She explained the committee members were the faculty with the most teaching experience and understanding of teaching-related issues in those departments. Director Radcliffe met with the committee at least once a semester “to talk about ideas and get their ideas on interesting sessions for the faculty development program.”

Mission philosophy

When asked what she saw as the mission for the faculty development program, Director Radcliffe replied, “to develop a formalized mechanism whereby new and experienced professors can improve their teaching, strive for excellence, and learn to feel comfortable in the classroom.” She also felt the mission of the faculty development program was connected with the students of the college. She stated, “I feel that it is incumbent upon us to provide a good education for our students so that students find their courses enjoyable and they learn from their courses.”
Director Radcliffe tried to accomplish the mission of the faculty development program by targeting activities for different cohorts in the college. She stated, “My goal is really to help every member of our faculty be successful in the area of teaching. Everybody can be excellent.” The first cohort Director Radcliffe primarily focused on were new faculty in the college. The second cohort she targeted for activities were established faculty who wanted to keep learning or be at the forefront of teaching. The third cohort Director Radcliffe mentioned targeting for activities were faculty struggling to teach in the college. She wanted struggling faculty to use the faculty development program as a resource for strategies to improve their teaching. Director Radcliffe wanted the faculty development program to help struggling faculty find teaching a fun and exciting experience. She explained, “I don’t want our faculty to dread teaching, to dislike going into the classroom because they’re not successful. I want to make them look forward to teaching and be excited about it.” She further explained:

I think this is very rare. I think maybe 5% of our faculty would say, “No, I don’t want help. I don’t care. Teaching is not important.” They really need someone to say you have to do this. I don’t like to force faculty to do anything, but they are also responsible for student learning and students are paying money, tuition money, for a good education.

Activities

The initial activities of the faculty development program were funded by a campus teaching advancement grant. These activities focused on new faculty, but were offered infrequently. Director Radcliffe helped formalize these activities her first year with the program. She explained, “Faculty didn’t necessarily come all the time. Something I’ve learned is if you have it regularly, people get in the habit that once a month they’re going to be going to a session.” She also opened the activities to all faculty in the college.
New faculty were expected to attend a one-day intensive teaching retreat held the day before all of the college and department meetings started the academic year. Sessions of the retreat introduced new faculty to the expectations for teaching in the college as well as gave them some strategies for becoming effective in the classroom. Director Radcliffe explained:

I try not to encourage new faculty to drift too far from their line of inquiry. I would rather have them be effective in the classroom and think about their teaching in a scholarly way. I try to give them some theoretical grounding for thinking about what they do in the classroom.

The retreat had one-hour sessions covering topics for new faculty such as incorporating presentation devices (e.g., iClickers), developing a course syllabus, using technology effectively, highlighting teaching accomplishments for promotion and tenure, and balancing conflicts among research, teaching, and service. Director Radcliffe, other college faculty members, and guest speakers from across the institution’s campus led different sessions of the retreat. During the retreat, new faculty received notebooks, textbooks, and a list of other faculty development workshops offered by the institution for that academic year.

Director Radcliffe scheduled regular teaching seminars throughout the academic year. These seminars were offered on average once a month, were open to all college faculty, and were held during lunchtime with lunches provided by the program. Director Radcliffe said attendance at seminars usually ranged between 20 and 40 faculty out of 80 total faculty in the college. She speculated the range of attendance was caused by several factors: (a) faculty might not be able to attend due to a scheduling conflict; (b) new faculty would participate more than established faculty because of the college’s expectation that they would attend; and (c) faculty might have been influenced by the perceived value of a topic being presented.
In addition to scheduled activities, Director Radcliffe conducted teaching observations for faculty. She said, “I think because I was so involved in teaching on campus, faculty had stopped me sometimes last year and asked me to observe their teaching or help them.” She explained how she conducted the observations:

I will observe them and then meet with them for approximately an hour afterward several times throughout the semester to try and give them ideas for ways in which they can improve their teaching. It is a confidential service. I don’t write up a formal evaluation that would in any way be given to a department head or an administrator; it goes to them. It is not an evaluation as much as it is here are some helpful things you might consider doing.

Teaching observations were not an official activity of the program. Rather they were a service Director Radcliffe conducted for interested, struggling faculty in the college. She explained, “So I was doing teaching observations without any kind of recognition. This year I find it much easier because I can say, well, this is part of the faculty development program.”

Perceived impact

Director Radcliffe believed teaching had become more significant in the college since the establishment of the faculty development program. She pointed out one of the biggest successes was the increased visibility of the faculty development program in the college. She explained, “The faculty development program is a much more visible entity. People, I think, almost perceive it now as a structure, something formal, something there for them to go to.” Director Radcliffe connected an increase in faculty participation with the increased visibility of the program. She said, “The increased attendance has been really exciting. Seeing more people come to the sessions shows me they’re getting something out of this.” She singled out new faculty and stated:

I feel successful when I feel like they have successfully become acquainted with the university and feel confident going into a class. They are prepared. They
know how to write a syllabus. They are not nervous about whether or not they have done it appropriately, whether or not they are meeting the university requirements.

Director Radcliffe received informal feedback from faculty not only about specific activities, but also about the activity’s impact on their teaching. She reported that faculty would tell her, “I’ve really improved. I feel comfortable in the classroom.” She continued, “I don’t have access to individual teaching evaluation scores, but faculty will come and tell me my evaluation scores went up. That makes me feel good and is a mechanism where I can evaluate the success of the program.”

Director Radcliffe pointed out she also received informal feedback from department heads. She said department heads would comment, “Wow, this is really great. The faculty development program has helped me so much in my role,” or “The faculty development program has really helped our faculty.” Director Radcliffe gave a more detailed example of the impact the program had on department heads:

Another benchmark is department heads who write into a faculty annual report now, “I noticed you are struggling with your teaching. I would encourage you to seek out the faculty development program.” Then for those individuals who continue to struggle and they feel that they haven’t maybe sought out the program to the degree that they should, department heads will write in their report, “This is a requirement. You must become involved with the teaching academy.”

She gave an example of her department head’s comment in a meeting with her, “I want to let you know about how valuable the faculty development program has been and how it has been so nice to have such a formalized structure this year.” Director Radcliffe also stated Dean French, the dean of the college at the time, told her “how much she enjoyed looking at the different sessions” and that she had been following the faculty development program.
**Assessment and accountability**

Director Radcliffe tracked the attendance for the different activities of the faculty development program. She explained:

> Attendance is one gauge because if you go from a really low attendance to regular high attendance, it is telling me that faculty are benefiting from it, particularly when faculty come voluntarily. They don’t have to do this, but they show up anyway. It shows that it has been a beneficial experience.

Director Radcliffe gave out satisfaction surveys at the end of the one-day retreat. She learned from the survey what sessions new faculty thought were most useful, which sessions to increase or decrease in time, and which speakers were stronger or weaker. Informally Director Radcliffe assessed the number of faculty who asked for assistance, resources, or requested a session topic.

The leadership of the college never asked for an annual report. She explained, “It is something I certainly could provide and have thought about providing. I would like to type up something in relation to what our accomplishments were this year and not just send it to the dean, but to all of our faculty.”

**College and campus support**

Director Radcliffe felt supported by the college leadership in that they “facilitate my role in whatever I need to do.” She explained, “I have never had to ask for, I have never had to justify my budget, for example. I am not even remotely sure what my budget is. Whenever I need anything, I have just been provided with it.” She indicated that when she started there was still remaining $2,000 from the original campus teaching grant. Dean French was so supportive of the faculty development program that she not only suggested the program somehow preserve the presentations given at the sessions, but she also worked on getting money for the preservation.
Director Radcliffe stated her department head was “extremely supportive of teaching. He really believes that if faculty are struggling they need to attend the faculty development program.” Director Radcliffe did not have as close a relationship with the other department heads in the college, but, as stated earlier, they were supportive of the faculty development program. She said:

One thing that I asked their support on was to make an expectation for new faculty to attend these sessions during their first two years on campus. They have been very supportive. They said, “we definitely will support that, we want them to go those first two years.”

Director Radcliffe explained the reason the college made attending the sessions of the faculty development program an expectation for new faculty was so they would “develop a habit of going to things like this in the future and also learn that our college expects good teaching. We really do.”

Another support Director Radcliffe had was from the college leadership staff to order lunches, type letters, and assemble new faculty notebooks for the program. The college leadership also made available a place for the faculty development program to store extra notebooks and other teaching resources.

**Challenges**

Director Radcliffe found moving into the position her first year difficult; she went through a transition period. She explained, “It was hard my first year because I wasn’t sure exactly what it would look like. What it would turn out to be. What would be successful and what wouldn’t be successful.” When asked about challenges facing the faculty development program, Director Radcliffe said the biggest challenge was her time. She stated, “I would love to
do more, but I am really busy. I tend to get involved in a lot. I have a very difficult time saying no. So there is never enough time in the day.” She explained:

Fortunately, I have the flexibility of being able to work as many hours as I want and on the weekends. I am single, that makes it easy, no kid responsibilities. I probably use a lot of my own time to do things, but I enjoy it. It is not anything I am complaining about.

Director Radcliffe mentioned it was difficult trying to get some of the college’s more senior faculty to participate in faculty development sessions. She said:

There are some people who just have no interest and they are not going to come. You just have to accept that and hope maybe in the future they might come on occasion or that you can influence the new faculty coming in, making it a valuable enough experience for them so that they will want to stay involved.

During the interview, Director Radcliffe mentioned that the three departments of the college were physically separated and located across the campus of the institution. When specifically asked about the physical separation of the college, Director Radcliffe replied this was not a barrier for the faculty development program. She explained:

I mean it would be certainly nice if we were in the same building, but even our department is not in the same building. I haven’t seen it as a barrier because I am so used to it, our faculty are used to it. I don’t think anyone views it as a barrier.

**Future ideas**

Director Radcliffe had many ideas for the future of the faculty development program generated from her first year in the position. The first group of ideas focused on the visibility of the program in the college. She wanted to create a website and brochure, “possibly a newsletter once a semester even if it is just front and back of one page” that would generate more publicity for the faculty development program in the college. She described the website as a digital resource and presence for faculty. Director Radcliffe wanted to start videotaping activities to develop a digital library of the different sessions the program had offered. The taped activities
would be available on the website so faculty could access them from their home and office. She explained, “I’m not going to do a session every year on iClickers, it’s repetitive, redundant. But for new faculty who might be interested in that topic, they could go to this video source and be able to learn about it.”

Director Radcliffe’s second group of future ideas focused on new activities and audiences for the faculty development program. She had a strong desire to initiate a mentoring program in the college. She explained:

One thing I would like to do for next year is to be able to develop more of a mechanism whereby new faculty can learn from experienced teachers who are considered really to be some of our stars. I think it would be nice for our teachers, our faculty, to be able to see a variety of different teachers.

Director Radcliffe expressed a desire to develop a faculty writing program. The writing program would encourage faculty to write a scholarly article on their experience with the scholarship of teaching and learning. She explained:

I would love to have our faculty write one article a year in which they look at their teaching. That will not happen, I know that, but maybe if a few will do it now and then that is great. I would like them, if we are going to make any kind of bridge between teaching and research, I would like it to be things like “Wow. I have learned to do this in the classroom, working with my undergrads really effective,” “I learned how to communicate this way,” “How can I bring this into my lab,” “How can I become a better lab teacher.”

Director Radcliffe said at the time she was working on a committee in the college to develop a doctoral student teaching program. She explained the three departments were developing the doctoral teaching program and would eventually oversee the program with assistance from her as the director of the faculty development program. Director Radcliffe explained the impetus behind the teaching program for doctoral students came because “department heads would like to make sure that all graduate students before they graduate have
the chance to teach a classroom-based course. So it is not such a shock to them when they leave the institution.” Director Radcliffe explained she approached the college leadership “about potentially opening up the program to those senior Ph.D. people so that they could, during that year in which they are doing their student teaching experience, also attend the faculty development activities.” The college leadership thought it was a good idea and was going to discuss it with all of the department heads to get their support.

**College H**

This case presentation is based on an interview with the associate dean responsible for the faculty development program in College H conducted during the spring semester of 2008. College H had approximately 280 total faculty members amongst 7 departments. College H could generally be classified as soft/pure/non-life (Biglan, 1973a).

**Introduction**

The faculty development program started in 2001 as College H’s response to the Provost advocating to formalize faculty development support in colleges. The former director of the program had been very enthusiastic and energetic about faculty development until he left the college in 2007. An associate dean in the college then became responsible for the faculty development program and tried to continue offering activities the next year. The college officially disbanded the faculty development program in the spring of 2008. See Figure 8 for a more detailed timeline of the faculty development program.
History

The faculty development program in this college started in 2001. Associate Dean Easley, at the time of this study in 2008, was responsible for the faculty development program. He said the program was “primarily a voluntary activity with marginal resources to begin with in its history.” In the spring semester of 2008, the college leadership decided to disband the faculty development program. Associate Dean Easley explained, “While ultimately teacher development does provide service for students, our frontline battles are quite different.” He further explained, “The faculty development program is defunct. The reason for that is in our current resources-starved environment, and it is located in the Office of Undergraduate Academic Affairs where our primary mission is student services.”
Administration

Associate Dean Easley’s responsibilities for the last two years focused on generating and overseeing the curriculum of the college. The faculty development program became an extension of Associate Dean Easley’s responsibilities the fall of 2007 when the professor who had previously led the program left the institution. Associate Dean Easley explained:

We did have another faculty member with a lot of energy and enthusiasm who was assigned to the faculty development program, but he was also the interim coordinator of undergraduate instruction in his home department, which added that many duties in there. I mean, essentially in terms of the administration and development of content, the faculty member was a non-participant this year.

Associate Dean Easley stated:

I don’t blame him and I regret we are losing him. He is not wanting for enthusiasm. It is a time, I said we are in a resource-starved environment right now and when it comes to the end of the day, his priorities are focused elsewhere. This office’s priorities, when it comes to the end of the day, are focused elsewhere.

Associate Dean Easley mentioned the faculty development program would have been better suited under the responsibility of the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the college. However, the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs worked half time and was only responsible for managing the space and equipment in the college. Associate Dean Easley clarified during the interview that nothing changed regarding the faculty development program’s activities when he took over responsibility.

Mission philosophy

According to Associate Dean Easley, the faculty development program had been focused on new tenure-track faculty. He said the mission of the faculty development program had been “to build a sense of community among new faculty focused around teaching.” The faculty development program had also meant to point faculty to other institutional resources if they were interested in improving their teaching.
Activities

Associate Dean Easley continued to offer the same activities the faculty development program had offered prior to him taking over in the fall of 2007. According to Associate Dean Easley, the activities of the faculty development program were “aimed at building a community and network among the cohort of new faculty.” In the fall of 2007, there were only nine out of approximately 40 new faculty who registered to attend the orientation and community building activities. Associate Dean Easley explained:

When we realized we were only going to have nine, we had hoped to have at least half of the cohort; we even changed the format to make it a little more intimate, less didactic, basically shifting from a lecture to a seminar.

Even with the new format, only six of the nine registered faculty actually attended the activities. The orientation to the college was a day-long event that concluded with a social dinner for the new faculty and their families. There were other lunchtime activities offered during the fall semester specifically aimed at new faculty. These lunchtime activities were lectures covering how-to topics with the lunches provided by the college.

There were three additional workshops held during the fall semester of 2007 that were open to all the faculty of the college. The workshops were conducted during lunchtime with lunches provided by the college. The first workshop focused on helping faculty teach more quantitative subject areas they were not use to teaching (e.g., math, science) to undergraduates. The second workshop focused on faculty teaching within their specific disciplines. The maximum attendance for these two workshops was seven out of 280 faculty members. The third workshop focused on faculty starting to prepare for promotion and tenure from their first year. This was the most popular workshop with what Associate Dean Easley considered a good turnout of 12 faculty members. The faculty development program repeated these three workshops every fall semester.
The faculty development program had more of an open curriculum for activities in the spring semester. Associate Dean Easley had solicited the senior faculty in the college looking for presenters to work with younger faculty or with a larger faculty workshop. There were no volunteers for the spring 2008 semester. He believed this was partly due to faculty feeling a little bit underpaid and overworked. He explained the faculty development program was “something extra, there is no additional credit for faculty” to participate. He continued:

I mean it is a service activity, but it doesn’t weigh heavy in a promotion and tenure process. It doesn’t figure highly in any unit executive officer’s decision in awarding merit pay at the end of the year. So, there is really not the incentive for our faculty to join the faculty development program.

Associate Dean Easley even stated that the faculty development program was rarely used in helping faculty with remedial teaching issues. Instead, struggling faculty were sent to the campus teaching center for assistance.

**Perceived impact**

Associate Dean Easley found it difficult to evaluate the success or failure of the faculty development program because of the small amount of faculty participation. He thought the biggest impact the faculty development program had was in building a sense of community across the disciplines of the college. He stated, “I see some of it in terms of the connections in the few faculty that took advantage of the activities in the fall in having others whom they can turn to not just in their unit, but across the college.” Later he explained:

I think the community building aspect of the program was very, very successful and continues to be so with the small group. They build friendships and they rely on them even though some groups may not attend across the whole year they will show up, a couple of them, and they make more and more connections each time.

**Assessment and accountability**

Associate Dean Easley interpreted the results from the end-of-session evaluations to indicate that some of the activities such as the orientation retreat were redundant. He explained,
“The institution has an introduction function. The units all have their functions that they do with their fall retreats. The college function was in many ways redundant information. They felt to have it repeated three times is probably not necessary.” The college leadership did not require any measurable outcomes for the faculty development program.

**College and campus support**

The college paid for participant lunches when the faculty development program held activities. Paying for lunches seemed to be the only monetary support the college offered the faculty development program. The faculty development program did not have any dedicated clerical staff, but Associate Dean Easley used his secretary to send emails and make copies for the activities of the previous year. The faculty development program never worked with a representative from the campus teaching center.

**Challenges**

The faculty development program had also dealt with a lack of faculty participation. Associate Dean Easley believed faculty had not participated in activities because of their other research and teaching commitments. If the faculty development program is restarted in the future, Associate Dean Easley thought one of its greatest challenges would be finding the right mix of activities to interest the diverse disciplines of the faculty in the college. Additional challenges would be effectively utilizing the faculty and resources of the college as well as overcoming the college’s lack of central oversight and communication. He explained:

One of the weaknesses of our college is that there is a lack of central, not necessarily control, but central oversight. We have seven, highly autonomous, passionate, talented groups of faculty. They take initiatives and will be entrepreneurial often without our knowledge or our ability to take a bigger view of those resources.
Future ideas

Associate Dean Easley hoped, if he had a chance in the future, to mobilize the talent and resources of the college to create a regular and predictable curriculum for the faculty development program. He explained:

If we were to start a faculty development program again, I would like to see it start from a grassroots effort that organizes from the units into a program that is meaningful to all of them rather than what we started with, which was working this way [top down]. It has not been successful because there hasn’t been enough at the top to distribute in any meaningful way to the seven distinct communities with the college.

Using an existing model in the college, Associate Dean Easley explained he wanted to create a faculty development committee overseen by a faculty coordinator and consisting of members from each department in the college. The committee would also be given a small amount of start-up money. There would be a college-level coordinator of the faculty development program who would receive release time and a stipend for the position. Each department would then have its own faculty development coordinator who would receive a smaller stipend but no release time. The department-level coordinators would be responsible for organizing faculty development activities in their own departments, but the activities would be open to all the faculty members of the college. The responsibility of the college-level coordinator would be to coordinate the activities of each department into an over-arching curriculum. Associate Dean Easley believed even if each department were responsible for only one activity, there would still be a total of seven faculty development activities offered during an academic year.
Chapter Five

Findings

This chapter provides a cross-case analysis of the findings. The findings are grouped into categories (e.g., history, administration, mission philosophy, etc.) that parallel the structure of the individual cases presented in Chapter 4. These categories reflect the topics in the interviews. An additional category (i.e., documents and artifacts) is included at the end of this chapter that was not part of the previous case presentations.

History

The college faculty development programs in this study began in two different ways with the impetus coming from within the college or from the campus. The first and main approach involved a college faculty member having an idea, for example, for a mentoring program or a college teaching course, and then usually seeking support from the campus. The second approach involved the colleges creating a faculty development program in response to the campus leadership advocating that each college have formalized faculty development support.

The impetus for creating a college faculty development program was a good indicator of the program’s activity level and long-term sustainability in the college (see Table 4). The five faculty development programs in this study that started from motivations internal to the college were consistently active, thereby seeming easier to sustain. The impetus for these five programs originated from an idea or faculty member in the college.

The creation of the remaining three faculty development programs was motivated by a campus initiative. In 2001, the Provost of the institution advocated colleges developing formalized faculty development support. The faculty development programs started by the colleges in response to the campus initiative were inconsistently active over their history, thereby
seeming harder to sustain (see Table 4). The faculty development programs in Colleges A, B, and H had not been active for at least a year when the administrators were interviewed in 2008. The faculty development program in College H was disbanded in the spring of 2008 just prior to the interview with the administrator of the program. The following table lists the faculty development programs in chronological order, the impetus for them starting, and their status at the time of this study in 2008.

Table 4

Faculty Development Programs’ Impetus and Current Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Impetus for Starting</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Provost’s Initiative</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Provost’s Initiative</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Provost’s Initiative</td>
<td>Disbanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The campus played a primary role in providing the initial funding for college faculty development programs. The five colleges of the faculty development programs that started from a faculty initiative sought funding to aid in getting started. Four of these colleges used campus funding when starting (Table 5). The faculty development program in College D was the only one that did not use a campus grant when it started. In 1994, the dean of College D supplied funding for the initial development and implementation of a college teaching course. During the first year the course was offered, a corporate grant was obtained, formally establishing the faculty development program.
Table 5

*Faculty Development Programs’ Initial Funding and Current Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Impetus for Starting</th>
<th>Initial Funding Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Provost’s Initiative</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Provost’s Initiative</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Provost’s Initiative</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These five programs were also able to establish recurring activities with the initial funding aid from the campus. The colleges then provided subsequent financial support for the faculty development programs. However, the administrators of these five programs stated they would apply for campus money to conduct special activities not normally offered. The example they all gave was bringing a special guest speaker from off campus to the college, which might be done every couple of years.

It should be noted that the three faculty development programs that started from the Provost’s initiative were special cases regarding campus funding. College B never used campus funding to help support the faculty development program. College B was the farthest away from the main campus of any colleges in this study. It appears from interviews that this distance influenced the decision to not seek campus funding. College H also did not seek any funding from the campus to support the faculty development program. While College A did not seek campus funding when the faculty development program was started initially, the program has relied mainly on campus funding to offer activities. The faculty development program in College A has used campus funding to put on a couple of faculty development retreats. The findings appear to indicate that a campus initiative for faculty development also should include initial funding support.
Administration

In the case studies, there were two types of administrative structure, either a director or committee chair. Directors administered five of the eight faculty development programs in Colleges A, D, E, G, and H (see Table 6). The programs in College D and E also had assistant directors. Three of the directors were assistant or associate deans who did not receive any compensation for directing the faculty development program. The remaining two directors were tenured professors. The director for College E received an administrative stipend while the director from College G received release time from teaching. The assistant directors in College D and E were both non-tenured faculty who assisted in administering the faculty development programs, but did not receive any compensation.

Table 6

Administrative Structure of the Faculty Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Administrative Structure</th>
<th>Faculty Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Director &amp; Assistant Director</td>
<td>Assistant Dean &amp; Non-tenured faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Director &amp; Assistant Director</td>
<td>Professor &amp; Non-tenured faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three committees administrating faculty development programs all had the exact same structure. The committees were comprised of two faculty members from each of the college’s departments. Two of the three faculty development committees did not have any active members during the year of the study other than the chair. All the members of the faculty development committee in College C left the institution for various reasons. The committee members had not been replaced, but the committee chair continued to oversee the operation of
the faculty development program. There were members assigned to the faculty development committee in College B, but the committee was not active. The chair took responsibility for scheduling and directing the activities instead of delegating responsibilities to the other committee members. The chair in College F assigned the members of the faculty development committee to groups responsible for things like planning the fall retreat, planning the lunchtime seminars, developing the teaching resources brochure, etc. I did not find any relation between the type of administrative structure and the sustainability or activity of a faculty development program.

Mission Philosophy

The mission of faculty development programs at the Division I research institution in these case studies primarily focused on one area of faculty responsibility: teaching (see Table 7).

Table 7

Mission Philosophy of Faculty Development Programs as Stated by Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Mission Philosophy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>“Trying to create a culture, a time, and a space for people at any stage in their career (graduate student to professor) to share, encourage, and focus on teaching.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>“Providing an effective service to help faculty teach.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>“Valuing effective teaching and maximize the level of effectiveness.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>“Improving instruction in the college.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>“Creating a norm and culture of good teaching in the college. Providing some services to the faculty allowing them to reflect on their teaching.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>“Recognizing and supporting excellence in instruction broadly defined.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>“Developing a formalized mechanism whereby new and experienced professors can improve their teaching, strive for excellence, and learn to feel comfortable in the classroom.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>“Building a sense of community among new faculty focused around teaching.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The director and assistant director of the faculty development program in College D were the only administrators who explicitly indicated having activities that also addressed the research role of faculty. The new faculty members who participated in the activities in this college
received a packet that included research topics (e.g., “Developing a Research Proposal” and “Applying for NSF Grants”) as well as teaching topics (e.g., “Planning and Designing Your Course” and “Learning Theories and Principles of Pedagogy”). The topics in the packet were just reference materials for the new faculty and were not actual sessions.

Activities

In all the cases, the demands on faculty time and their schedules influenced administrator’s scheduling of faculty development activities. Administrators tried to increase participation in activities by accommodating faculty schedules. Longer workshops and retreats, usually lasting one or two days, were conducted when classes were not in session. Single session activities were offered generally during the academic year and held in either 60- or 90-minute periods over lunchtime, usually with lunches provided by the faculty development programs.

Target Audience

Faculty development programs typically were focused toward particular instructional groups in the colleges for specific activities (e.g., graduate students, faculty, instructional staff). Administrators determined the target groups to which the faculty development program would offer activities (see Table 8). All of the faculty development programs offered activities for the faculty already present in the college (i.e., established faculty). Only three of the eight faculty development programs included graduate students in the program’s activities; two of those programs were inactive at the time of this research study. While there were graduate teaching assistants in the other five colleges, the faculty development programs did not offer activities for this group. Instead, the graduate teaching assistants in these five colleges were encouraged to attend activities offered by the campus teaching center. Only two out of the eight faculty
development programs offered activities for the non-tenure track, instructional staff in the college.

Table 8

*Cohorts Targeted for Faculty Development Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>New Faculty</th>
<th>Established Faculty</th>
<th>Instructional Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to administrators, targeting new faculty for specific faculty development activities helped perpetuate the importance of teaching in the college. Offering specific activities for new faculty also helped the faculty development programs sustain continuous activity in the colleges (see Table 9).

Table 9

*Approximate Number of Faculty Members by College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Average Yearly New Faculty</th>
<th>Approximate Total College Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>75 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>75 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15 - 25</td>
<td>300 - 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30 - 50</td>
<td>500+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 - 15</td>
<td>100 - 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>75 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>100 - 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five of the six faculty development programs that had activities specifically for new faculty were active at the time of this research study. The faculty development program in College H offered activities for new faculty before being disbanded by the college leadership prior to this research study. The associate dean responsible for the faculty development program
in College H explained that only six of the forty new faculty members had participated in the program’s opening retreat. He also explained that there were no activities offered during the spring semester because none of the faculty in the college wanted to host the activities.

**Perceived Impact**

Administrators viewed the faculty development programs as raising the awareness of teaching and helping signal the importance of teaching in the college. However, the actual impact was indeterminate because faculty and program evaluations were never conducted.

**Assessment and Accountability**

The administrators of the faculty development programs rarely interacted, if at all, with college leadership related to the faculty development programs. The college leadership did not hold the faculty development programs to any measurable outcomes. Additionally, the college leadership’s decisions regarding the faculty development programs operation was not substantiated by any concrete evidence such as a formal evaluation. As an example, when a new dean arrived in College E, the director of the faculty development program actually wanted to conduct a formal evaluation of the program, but the dean thought the faculty development program seemed to be doing fine and therefore an evaluation of the program was unnecessary.

Administrators did not conduct evaluations of the faculty development program activities or impact in the college. None of the current or past administrators of the faculty development programs ever developed or implemented mechanisms for formal assessment. The programs had only two informal assessment metrics for activities: faculty participation and faculty satisfaction. One administrator described assessing faculty participation as “faculty voting with their feet.” The idea was that an activity must be important if faculty were participating. Satisfaction
assessment took the form of a faculty survey handed out at the end of an activity. The assumption seemed to be that the activity would impact a faculty member’s teaching if he or she enjoyed the activity. It should be noted that none of the faculty development programs conducted follow-up surveys. The programs also never had an activity that no one attended.

Support

Program administrators from four of the faculty development programs created a group to support and strengthen their programs. Around 2005, the administrators from Colleges A, C, D, and E began meeting once a month because they saw themselves as like-minded people sharing a similar passion and common purpose. The four non-participating administrators said during interviews that they would have liked to attend the leadership group meetings, but scheduling conflicts prevented their attendance. During meetings, the administrators generally shared information, experiences, and ideas for possible collaborations with other faculty development programs. The participating administrators had proposed and received permission from campus administration to hold large-scale faculty development events, but the group had not offered any events at the time of this study. Their group, however, helped in creating a stronger voice for faculty development on the campus and in the individual colleges.

Colleges supported faculty development programs to differing degrees. Most colleges supported the faculty development programs by providing lunches for participants. Four of the eight colleges did not designate any budgetary support for faculty development programs, but still paid for lunches. College D and College E paid the assistant director’s salaries along with participant lunches and handouts. Only two colleges (College C and College F) dedicated any budgetary money for the actual operation of the faculty development programs. College C paid the campus teaching center to staff and run the college’s faculty development activities, while
College F represented a special case in which an alumni endowment provided the monetary support for the faculty development program. All the faculty development programs had to co-opt clerical staff from the college when needed because none of the programs had dedicated staff.

The campus teaching center did not actively support the college faculty development programs at the institution. The campus teaching center had supported three of the eight faculty development programs at some time during their histories. The center supported these three programs with a representative who worked with program administrators to develop and provide activities for the college faculty. According to administrators, the campus teaching center never worked with the other five faculty development programs. At the time of this research study, a campus teaching center representative was working only with the faculty development program in College D. It should be noted that the faculty development program in College D offered activities and services that were provided only because of the campus teaching center representative’s involvement.

It appeared to be advantageous for colleges to pay the campus teaching center to staff and facilitate faculty development activities. College C consistently offered the most extensive activities of any program in this study, even though the chair of the faculty development committee was the only member of the committee left at the time of this study. College C was also the only college that paid the campus teaching center to run the faculty development activities in the college. The program offered four different curricula specifically targeting faculty at different stages in their careers.
Challenges

Across these cases, it was apparent that maintaining active programs was challenging. Four of the eight faculty development programs in the study struggled to remain active at some point in their histories. Three of these programs were inactive at the time of this research study.

While most challenges faced by administrators in this study were specific to the situation of particular colleges and programs, the challenges could be grouped into some common themes. The first challenge administrators faced was competition for faculty’s attention and time to participate in faculty development activities. The administrators themselves also grappled with having enough time for the faculty development programs. The second challenge administrators faced was the infrastructure of the college. Administrators reported that competing demands for college resources (e.g., staff, money, etc.) impacted their ability to maintain viable faculty development programs. Administrators also indicated that reporting to an office primarily concerned with undergraduate students impacted the operation of the faculty development programs. The third challenge administrators faced was the inconsistent importance placed on research versus teaching across colleges in this study. The final challenge administrators faced was the faculty development programs’ struggle to find an identity in their colleges. The administrators wanted to have a greater influence on faculty teaching but struggled with where the programs fit in the colleges. Administrators were challenged to constantly communicate the existence and importance of the faculty development programs due to the high turnover in department heads and college leaders.

Future Ideas

Faculty development administrators focused on different goals depending on their particular situations. Administrators were interested primarily in three areas—activities,
participation, and resources—when considering the future of their faculty development programs. First, the administrators of faculty development programs wanted to have regular and predictable activities or wanted to offer more and/or different activities. Second, they wanted to increase participation and create a wider presence in each college. Third, they wanted to strengthen the monetary and personnel resources of the faculty development program.

**Documents and Artifacts**

There was an absence of artifacts from the faculty development programs. It was not customary for program administrators to archive documents (e.g., handouts, end-of-session surveys, lists of activities). For example, none of the administrators in this study had documentation that recorded faculty demographics and/or the number of participants for activities offered by the program. Only three of the eight faculty development programs in Colleges C, E, and H had a list of regular activities offered. The faculty development program in College D gave a packet to new faculty members who participated in activities. The administrator of the program in College B also had developed a new faculty packet but had not given it to any faculty at the time of the study. At the time of this research study, four of the eight faculty development programs hosted websites, but the administrators noted that the websites were outdated and in need of redesign.
Chapter Six

Discussion

The primary purpose of this research study was to investigate how colleges of a Division I research institution practiced faculty development. Eight colleges were studied for this research. In this chapter, I discuss how the research findings from the previous chapters connect with the literature reviewed in chapter two. I also discuss the implications of this research study and possible areas for research in the future.

The Organization of College Faculty Development Programs

The first research question focused on understanding how faculty development programs were organized: How do the administrators of faculty development programs describe the organization of their programs? A faculty development program’s organization was determined by how colleges chose to administrate the programs and structure the activities offered to faculty.

Administration

Weimer (1990) concluded from her research on improving college teaching at large in research-oriented institutions that there were three main organizational options for faculty development programs: (a) the administrator model in which an individual was given responsibility for faculty development; (b) the committee model in which a faculty committee ran the activities and services; and (c) the unit/program model in which a program, office, unit or center offered the activities. These organizational options are useful to describe the colleges studied for my research. Table 10 lists the faculty development programs of each college, the administrative structure, and how they are related to Weimer’s models.
Table 10

*Faculty Development Programs’ Administrative Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Administrative Structure</th>
<th>Weimer’s Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Director &amp; Assistant</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Director &amp; Assistant</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Administrator with an advisory group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Administrator with an advisory group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Weimer (1990), regardless of the administrative model, having a background as a faculty developer was not an essential requirement in leading a faculty development program. She concluded that faculty with interest, enthusiasm, and motivation for faculty development could compensate for a lack of formal training. She went on to state that “Many of the practitioners in the field [of faculty development] were at one time or are currently faculty members who have found an appropriate outlet for a long-standing interest in college teaching” (p. 161). Expanding on Weimer’s (1990) research, Mathis (1979) stated that, “The desirability of having someone from within the university who has the confidence and support of his or her colleagues is an important consideration in appointing a faculty development [leader]” (p. 107).

*The administrator model.* The first of Weimer’s organizational structures involved one individual, faculty, or staff having responsibility for the faculty development activities. Brent and co-authors concluded from their research that for a faculty development program to be successful it should have a faculty or staff member from within the college whose principal...
responsibility was coordinating activities (Brent & Felder, 2001; Brent et al., 2000). None of the faculty development programs in this study were the principal responsibility of the administrators. Instead, administrating the program was just one of many other faculty responsibilities.

According to research conducted by Erickson (1986), an individual in the administrator model typically assumed the faculty development duties in addition to his or her other responsibilities. Erickson (1986) discovered that, “The fewest services were available on campuses where faculty development was one among many of an administrator’s responsibilities” (p. 185).

Similarly, Weimer (1990) stated that the administrator option “Severely limits both the kind and quantity of services that can be made available to faculty” (p. 151). She went on to explain that due to faculty time issues, this organizational option primarily involved workshop and/or seminar activities (Weimer, 1990). Another disadvantage to the administrator model, according to Weimer’s (1990) research, was that assigning an individual the responsibility to help faculty “improve” their teaching potentially discouraged the process. Weimer (1990) discovered that, in general, faculty found it difficult to discuss their instructional practices with an administrator and more so if they were experiencing problems.

Erickson (1986) found that a group of faculty advising an individual was the most common structural approach to faculty development within the administrator model. Weimer (1990) found there were four principal ways the administrator gained assistance from the group of advisors. This faculty group (a) advised the administrator as to possible policies and practices of the program; (b) participated in the offerings and activities of the program; (c) evaluated those
activities and offerings; and (d) served as teaching and program advocates throughout the college and institution.

In this study, six of the eight faculty development programs (Colleges A, B, C, F, G, and H) were administered using Weimer’s administrator model (see Table 10). While three programs were structured with faculty development committees (College B, College C, and College F), the faculty development program operated according to Weimer’s administrator model with an advising group. The three groups of faculty were intended to advise the individual administrator of the faculty development program. None of the faculty in any of the groups helped run activities. None of the faculty groups evaluated the activities and services offered by the faculty development program. The three administrators stated that participants for the groups were chosen from college faculty with a reputation for good teaching. However, only the faculty group in College F had active faculty at the time of this study.

The administrators in College B and College C had not had any active faculty groups helping them for at least an academic year. There were faculty assigned to the advisory group in College B, but the group had not been active for more than a year. While the faculty development program in College B had been inactive for some time, the administrator’s delegation of responsibilities to the faculty group might have improved the program’s activity in the college. The administrator in College C said faculty members had stepped down or left the college for various reasons. At the time of the study, new members of the group had not been selected in more than a year.

It should be noted the administrator of the faculty development program in College G created an advisory group from faculty she thought were good teachers in the college. Other
than advising individual administrators, none of the four faculty groups in this study were tasked with running, evaluating, or actively advocating faculty development activities.

**The committee model.** The second of Weimer’s organizational structures, the committee model, involved giving primary responsibility for providing faculty development activities and services to a group of faculty. One of the advantages of the committee model was that it distributed the impetus for faculty development to more than one person. Weimer (1990) discovered that faculty participating in the committee model developed a stake in the outcomes of the faculty development activities, which made running the activities easier and encouraged participation. According to Weimer’s (1990) research, the committee model experience generally had a profound effect on the teaching of those faculty members serving on the committee.

From her research, Weimer (1990) determined several factors that determined the success of a group in the committee model. First, the committee must be able to make decisions, implement plans, pay for activities, and evaluate outcomes. Weimer (1990) discovered from her research that a limited amount of activities were typically offered if a committee had to get approval from college leadership. Second, the committee must have time to plan and implement activities. Third, the committee may need access to outside resources and expertise if they have little or no experience in faculty development. Finally, the committee should be comprised of faculty recognized as good teachers and committed to the scholarship of teaching and learning. None of the faculty development committees in this study were organized using the committee model. Instead, the committees were an extension of the administrator model previously discussed, acting more as advisors to the person responsible for the program.
**The unit model.** The third of Weimer’s organizational structures involved a unit or center dedicated to providing faculty development activities and services. Weimer (1990) found that faculty development programs organized with the unit model were generally small, many times with no more staff than a director and some clerical support. According to Erickson’s (1986) research, the establishment of a dedicated unit appeared to benefit a faculty development program. He found that having a unit devoted to faculty development increased the number of activities, resources, and services a college or institution could offer its faculty. In this study, only two faculty development programs in College D and College E aligned with Weimer’s unit model. These were the only two faculty development programs that had assistant directors helping administrate the programs.

It should be noted that none of the eight faculty development programs had any dedicated clerical staff. Instead, other clerical staff persons in the college were co-opted when needed by the programs.

**Activities**

Staff development for teachers in primary and secondary schools has historically taken place during single session workshops, at a conference, or with the help of a consultant (i.e., staff developer). Researchers found, however, that single session activities have had little impact on participant’s teaching (Linehan, 1996; Marincovich et al., 1998; Prieto, 2002; Sharpe, 2000). According to Lieberman’s research with classroom teachers (1995), the single session approach to teacher development, “Implies a limited conception of teacher learning that is out of step with current research and practice” (p. 591). She went on to explain:

What everyone appears to want for students—a wide array of learning opportunities that engage students in experiencing, creating, and solving problems, using their own experiences, and working with others—is for some reason denied to teachers when they are learners. (p. 591)
Lieberman (1995) described conventional approaches to staff development as “transferable packets of knowledge to be distributed to teachers in small bite-sized pieces” (p. 592), what is typically called direct instruction. Lambert (1989) stated, “Despite our knowledge of the drawbacks of direct instruction, the premiere model of staff development for adults is in many ways parallel to the direct instruction model for students” (p. 79). From her research in K-12 education, Lambert (1989) recommended redesigning staff development efforts to involve and empower the teacher as the learner. She stated, “When teachers engage in reflective practice, collegiality, and shared leadership, they come to understand themselves and their work differently” (p. 80).

Three different research projects (Fullan, 1991; Guskey and Huberman, 1995; Sparks and Hirsh, 1997) came to similar conclusions related to why staff development efforts failed: (a) extensive use of one-shot workshops; (b) topic selection by nonparticipants; (c) a lack of follow-up on related topics; (d) failure to evaluate programs; (e) absence of a conceptual basis for program planning and evaluation; and (f) failure of school culture to recognize the value of staff development. I found in the study I conducted that the majority of faculty development programs demonstrated the same characteristics that researchers have found to fail.

All of the faculty development programs structured activities as single sessions. During the academic year, the activities were held in either 60- or 90-minute periods over lunchtime, usually with lunches provided, although some programs offered longer workshops or retreats when classes were not in session. Three of the eight faculty development programs (i.e., Colleges C, D, and E) offered opening retreats as well as other regularly scheduled faculty development activities during the academic year, however there was no connection between the two. The academic year activities were single sessions offerings with no follow-up, which
according to the previous authors is an indication of program failure. Consequently, offering regular faculty development activities during the academic years seems to support what Wenger (1998) described as “a matter of sustaining enough mutual engagement in pursuing an enterprise together to share significant learning” (p. 86), which in turn creates a source of coherence for a community. It should be noted that while programs offered regular activities this did not necessarily equate to “sustaining mutual engagement” or “shared significant learning.”

It is possible that the effects of offering opening retreats followed by individual activities could convince faculty that the college valued teaching as an enterprise. However, offering an opening retreat and regular activities did not mean there was a structure or connection across all the activities. On the contrary, rarely did any of the faculty development programs in this study offer an activity that was a follow-up to a previous activity. Only the faculty development program in College C, which was run by the campus teaching center, had structured activities with specific purposes and audiences in mind.

While the structure of faculty development activities was consistent across all the faculty development programs in this study, the activities were not structured according to recommendation found in literature. The activities in this study were individual, isolated sessions, which according to research have little impact on participants’ teaching. The vast majority of activities offered by the programs fostered passive participation with a direct instruction format. A couple of faculty development programs (College C and College E) used a book club format to engage participants in talking about their teaching.

The Mission of College Faculty Development Programs

The second research question focused on understanding the mission of faculty development programs: What do program administrators see as the purposes of the faculty
development programs in the college? The mission of a faculty development program was
evidenced from (a) the administrator’s philosophy for the program; (b) the targeted audiences for
activities; (c) the perceived impact on faculty; and (d) the artifacts created by the program.

**Mission philosophy**

The primary mission of research universities, according to Rice and Austin’s (1990)
research, was the “pursuit and production of knowledge in the form of traditional research
projects and publications” (p. 34). The authors found that while good teaching was stated as a
parallel objective, explicit and implicit signals indicated that an institution’s primary goal was
research. Rice and Austin (1990) acknowledged the complex relationship between teaching and
research, especially at a research institution, but concluded, “Encouragement of serious attention
to teaching is important for its implications for the quality of education offered” (p. 34).

According to Wenger, an important aspect of a community of practice is “to create a
picture of the broader context in which its practice is located” (1998, p. 161). In this study, the
practice of teaching was located within the broader context of research. However, the mission of
faculty development programs at the Division I research institution in this study predominantly
focused on teaching with no connection to research. The majority of program administrators
viewed research as separate from teaching; research was done in a lab, while teaching was done
in the classroom. Only the administrators from the faculty development program in College D
had a mission philosophy that considered faculty research as an aspect of faculty development.
As a result, this was the only faculty development program that included activities addressing the
faculty’s research along with the other teaching activities. Weimer (1990) concluded from her
research on improving instructional effectiveness in higher education that, “Until higher
education recognizes the inherent value and equality of both its missions [teaching and research], faculty involvement in instructional improvement will never be what it could be” (p. 21).

**Target audience**

According to research, colleges at research institutions usually did not require current faculty to attend faculty development activities and, most likely, encouraged only new faculty to participate (Brent et al., 2006; Brent et al., 2001; Sorcinelli, 1994). Brent et al. (2001) concluded from their research that, “In the absence of systematic guidance, faculty make common mistakes leading to low scholarly productivity, ineffective teaching, and high stress levels” (p. 1). As a result of their research, Brent and co-authors outlined some components for an influential faculty development program that included (a) activities open to all faculty; (b) activities specifically targeting the needs of new faculty; and (c) activities or a program addressing the needs of graduate students as future faculty members (Brent & Felder, 2001; Brent et al., 2000).

In connection with the previous recommendations, all of the faculty development programs in this study offered activities to the colleges’ current or established faculty. Six of the eight faculty development programs offered activities for new faculty (see Table 11). Only three of the eight faculty development programs (Colleges A, B, and F) had opened faculty development activities to graduate student participation. The programs offering specific activities for new faculty along with general college statistics is shown Table 11. The next two subsections discuss further the specific topics of faculty development programs offering activities to new faculty and graduate students.
Table 11

*Programs With New Faculty Activities and College Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>New Faculty Activities</th>
<th>Average Yearly New Faculty</th>
<th>Approximate Total College Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>75 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>75 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>15 - 25</td>
<td>300 - 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30 - 50</td>
<td>500+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5 - 15</td>
<td>100 - 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>75 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>100 - 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New faculty.* According to Wenger (1998), the existence of a community of practice does not depend on a fixed membership but is defined by a shared area of interest. Wenger (1998) defines membership as a commitment to an area of interest. He also argues that a community of practice is not merely a community of interest but members of a community are practitioners. Therefore, membership in a community of practice adjusts as commitments change and practitioners leave.

Wenger (1998) states that an essential aspect of any sustainable practice is the arrival of new generations of members. He argues that newcomers can be integrated into a community but that there is “some catching up with possible special measures taken to open up the practice to newcomers” before they become full members in the community (p. 102). Wenger’s ideas illustrate the need for faculty development programs to seek out new members of the colleges’ community and to target activities acclimating new members of the college to teaching, research, and service.

Sorcinelli (1994) synthesized numerous research studies on new faculty’s early experiences. She found a common thread that indicated new and junior faculty have the most potential to improve their teaching. While all the faculty development programs in this study
had activities for tenure-track faculty, some of the programs specifically targeted activities for new faculty in the college.

The program administrators thought that activities for new faculty helped to perpetuate the importance of teaching in the college. Five of the six faculty development programs in this study that had activities specifically for new faculty were active at the time of this research study. These five faculty development programs specifically targeted activities for new faculty, which accounted for approximately a tenth of the college faculty each year.

It is interesting to note while the faculty development program in College H had previously offered activities for new faculty, the program disbanded prior to this research study. The administrator explained that only six of the college’s forty new faculty members had participated in the program’s opening retreat that year. It appears that offering specific activities for new faculty seemed to help the programs continuously sustain activity in the colleges, but only when new faculty actually attended the activities.

**Graduate students.** Several authors in the literature review expressed concern with how Division I research institutions prepare future faculty for their jobs. Brent et al. (2006) stated from their research that the “default preparation for a faculty career is none at all” (p. 1). Weimer (1990) discovered from her research that a substantial number of future faculty graduating from academe with Ph.D.s began their careers having never taught before and having no formal education in how to teach. Despite these shortcomings, Division I research universities play a major role in educating the future teaching faculty of academe, which increases the importance of faculty development programs.

While there is the argument that faculty development programs should help new faculty, it can also be argued that their training for teaching should start before they graduate. Research-
trained graduate students ultimately find employment in a range of institutions such as community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and private institutions (Wulff & Austin, 2004). For this reason, many authors concluded from their research that there is a need to include graduate students in faculty development activities prior to entering the professoriate (Marincovich et al., 1998; Jody D. Nyguist et al., 1999; J.D. Nyguist & Sprague, 1998; Prieto, 2002; Sharpe, 2000; Wulff & Austin, 2004). According to research studies conducted by Boice (1992, 2000) and Brent et al. (2001), training future research faculty would shorten their learning curve as researchers and teachers.

None of the programs in this research study specifically targeted graduate students for faculty development activities. Although, three of the eight faculty development programs allowed graduate students to participate in some activities, only one of these programs was active at the time of this research study. The administrators of the five other programs generally directed graduate students to attend activities offered by the campus teaching center. One program administrator felt that graduate students were ultimately another institution’s faculty and stated during the interview, “So why train them for someone else.” In contrast, another administrator felt that their graduate students were basically ambassadors to other institutions and wanted his or her graduate students to garner the reputation of being good teachers. Some of the other administrators felt graduate students did not need to attend faculty development activities because they were rarely allowed to teach a course in the college.

**Perceived impact**

Quality teacher development is a central component in nearly every proposal for improving K-12 education. The proposed teacher development programs vary widely in context and format but generally share a common mission to “alter the professional practices, beliefs,
and understanding of school persons toward an articulated end” (Griffin, 1983, p. 2). In most cases, that end is the improvement of student learning. According to Guskey’s (1986) research, teacher development programs are a “systematic attempt to bring about change—change in the classroom practices of teachers, change in their beliefs and attitudes, and change in the learning outcomes of students” (p. 5). Similar to Guskey, Fenstermacher and Berliner (1985) proposed from their research that the goal of teacher development is “to advance the knowledge, skills, and understanding of teachers in ways that lead to changes in their thinking and classroom behavior” (p. 283).

The expectations for faculty development in higher education appear to be quite different from the expectations for K-12 staff development. The faculty development programs in this study mainly discussed improving teaching without explicit expectations of an improvement in student learning. The connection between better teaching and improved student learning was not apparent from the program administrator’s interviews. Most of the administrators in this study viewed their faculty development programs as raising the awareness of teaching and helping signal the importance of teaching in the college. However, the actual impact of the faculty development programs in this study was indeterminate because none of the faculty development programs in this study had ever conducted faculty or program evaluations.

**Documents and artifacts**

The identity of a community can be seen in the artifacts it has created, what Wenger (1998) called *reification*. He defined reification as “Giving form to our experiences by producing objects that congeal this experience” (Wenger, 1998, p. 58). In other words, a community of practice produces artifacts that make the work of the community more concrete.
This reification, he explained, “Leads to the creation of points of focus around which the negotiations of meaning become organized” (Wenger, 1998, p. 58).

The faculty development programs in this study did not keep historical documentation such as the number or demographics of faculty participants. If documents were produced for activities, such as handouts or end-of-session surveys, they were never archived. Overall, there was some attempt at reification by faculty development programs in the colleges. Only three of the eight faculty development programs had created a list of activities, which were generally offered each year. Only one program created a faculty development packet and gave it to new faculty members participating in activities. Four of the eight faculty development programs had created websites, but all the administrators admitted the websites were outdated and not used actively. The previous examples represent a limited attempt to create faculty development artifacts by the programs in this study.

The Viability of College Faculty Development Programs

The third research question focused on understanding the viability of faculty development programs: How do the program administrators as well as the college leadership determine the viability of a faculty development program? A faculty development program’s viability was determined by (a) the history of the program; (b) the support given by the college and campus; (c) the assessment and accountability of the program; and (d) the administrator’s past challenges and future ideas.

History

One aspect of this study looked at how colleges initially developed their faculty development community. Wenger (1998) proposes that establishing a community of practice, such as faculty development, takes time. The community must be established over time by the
sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise (Wenger, 1998). He argues that, “Developing a practice requires the formation of a community whose members can engage with one another and thus acknowledge each other as participants” (p. 149).

According to research conducted by Rice and Austin (1990), institutions that wanted to motivate faculty to take teaching seriously benefitted from creating faculty communities with a shared commitment to teaching. However, Rice and Austin (1990) did not discuss how these faculty communities could get started. The impetus for starting college faculty development programs in this study originated either from outside the college (i.e., Provost initiative) or from within the college (i.e., faculty initiative). The colleges are grouped in Table 12 according to the faculty development program’s status at the time of the study. The faculty development programs in Group One initially began from ideas generated by college faculty members. The faculty development programs in Group Two initially began as the college’s response to the Provost of the institution advocating formalized faculty development support in colleges.

Table 12

Faculty Development Programs Grouped According to Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Program Status</th>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Program Started from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Faculty Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Provost’s Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Provost’s Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Disbanded</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Provost’s Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from this study showed that the impetus for creating a college faculty development program was closely related to the program’s activity level and long-term
sustainability in the college. The faculty development programs that began from motivations internal to the college were consistently active and appeared more sustainable (i.e., Group One). By contrast, the faculty development programs that began from motivations external to the college were not active at the time of this study and were evidently harder to sustain (i.e., Group Two). This finding has significance for policy and planning at the university level and suggests that encouraging internal development of faculty development may lead to longer sustainability.

**Support**

A lack of institutional support for faculty development can impede its success in improving the teaching quality of faculty members (Skeff et al., 1997). Many of the best teachers in academe have been motivated by their enjoyment of teaching and desire to see students succeed. Regardless, according to research conducted by Rice and Austin (1990), even the most self-motivated teachers in academe required an organizational environment that affirms the value of their work, rewards teaching, and sustains morale over time. The leadership of an institution must commit to a high standard of teaching as part of its central mission if they want to motivate faculty to teach well (Rice and Austin, 1990).

Green (1990) found from his research that making good teaching an institutional priority required changing values, behaviors, and academic norms. Green (1990) stated that, “Faculty development and the encouragement of good teaching are not new issues” (p. 59). Faculty development programs, as well as other centralized services in support of teaching, have been around in various forms for more than 30 years.

Even though Wankat and Oreovicz (2002) found that Division I research institutions did not usually fund faculty development activities, Weimer (1990) explicitly argued from her research that, “If improvement [in teaching] is expected, its pursuit must be supported” (p. 139).
In this research study, colleges supported faculty development programs in many different ways. The vast majority of colleges provided participants’ lunches during lunchtime activities. College D and College E paid the salaries of the assistant directors. College F supported its faculty development program through an alumni endowment. College C paid the campus teaching center to staff and run faculty development activities.

While these kinds of financial supports and faculty assignments were evident, it is unclear from the program administrators’ points of view if these supports had made faculty development and teaching important faculty pursuits in the college. In this study, the support of faculty development was not a stated mission of the colleges. However, a college’s commitment to the successful development of faculty teaching can be evidenced by the support given to the faculty development program.

Brawner et al. (2002) found that for faculty development activities to be successful, departments needed to initiate a reward system honoring faculty’s commitment to good teaching. According to numerous research studies, teaching improved in a climate where instructional excellence is recognized and rewarded (Cashin, 1990; Green, 1990; Rice & Austin, 1990; Seldin, 1990a; Weimer, 1990). College and department leadership must demonstrate with more than rhetoric that they value efforts by faculty members to improve their teaching (Brent & Felder, 2001). Only one faculty development program in this research study recognized faculty within its college for their good teaching by systematically identifying faculty members for college, campus, national, and professional teaching awards.

One approach that did demonstrate support for teaching was evident in the gathering of some of the faculty development program administrators in this research study. They created a group for themselves that helped support and strengthen faculty development on the campus.
These faculty development administrators from across campus saw themselves as like-minded people sharing a similar passion and common purpose, and they met together approximately once a month. Meeting as a group helped them create a stronger voice for faculty development on the campus and facilitated further development of activities in their individual colleges.

At the time of this study in 2008, this group of administrators was organizing a campus-wide, faculty development event focusing on diversity. Each faculty development program was going to host individual activities that focused on diversity as it related to their discipline as well as invite a campus speaker. These four faculty development programs represented a small, but encouraging beginning to supporting campus-wide faculty development activities.

**Assessment and accountability**

Research conducted by Chism and Szabó in 1997 surveyed faculty development program evaluation practices. They found that assessing the impact of faculty development activities on instructional methods was not very common and direct assessment of student learning was never conducted (Chism and Szabó, 1997). The authors reported that survey respondents noted a high cost and extreme difficulty in obtaining meaningful data conclusively connecting student learning to instructional changes in faculty.

The administrators in this research study did not conduct evaluations of the faculty development programs’ activities or impact in the college, which is similar to what Chism and Szabó (1997) found. In contrast, Brent and co-authors concluded from their research findings that there was a need for evaluating and rewarding teaching effectiveness and educational scholarship (Brent & Felder, 2001; Brent et al., 2000). Similar to Brent et al.’s research, Cashin (1990) found from his research that, “One of the most important actions an academic
administrator can take to improve teaching is to assess it accurately and to reward it when effective” (p. 27).

In this study, none of the current or past administrators of the faculty development programs collected formal assessments. Faculty development programs in this study used only two informal assessment metrics: faculty participation and faculty satisfaction. Through anecdotal evidence of a faculty member’s promotion and tenure portfolio, some of the administrators claimed the program had impact. However, none of the administrators formally evaluated their faculty development programs. Similar to the findings of Chism and Szabó’s (1997) research, evaluating the connection between faculty development activities and student learning was never done or even mentioned by any of the administrators in this study.

Weimer (1990) stated, “academic leaders, just like the rest of the faculty, must understand that good teachers are made and not made easily” (p. 138). While the majority of the faculty development programs were under the purview of the Associate Deans of Academic Affairs, none of the college leadership held the programs accountable to any measurable outcomes. Additionally, no empirical evidence was used to substantiate the college leadership’s decisions regarding the faculty development program’s operation.

Five out of the eight faculty development programs were the responsibility of the Associate Deans of Academic Affairs in their colleges. The administrators of these five programs indicated that an office primarily concerned with undergraduate students should not also be responsible for faculty development issues. Consequently, the administrators rarely, if at all, interacted with the college leadership regarding the operation of the faculty development programs. The administrators of the other three faculty development programs did not report directly to any college leadership.
Challenges

While most challenges faced by administrators in this study were specific to the situation of particular colleges and programs, the challenges could be grouped into some common themes. The first challenge administrators faced was competition for faculty’s attention and time to participate in faculty development activities. The administrators themselves also grappled with having enough time for the faculty development programs.

The second challenge administrators faced was the infrastructure of the college. First, administrators reported that competing demands for college resources (e.g., staff, money, etc.) impacted their ability to maintain viable faculty development programs. Second, administrators indicated that reporting to an office primarily concerned with undergraduate students impacted the operation of the faculty development programs. Green (1990) stated, “If faculty are to exert real leadership, they must have the power [i.e., ability] to get things done and the necessary resources to do so” (p. 55).

The third challenge administrators faced was the inconsistent importance placed on both research versus teaching across colleges in this study. Weimer (1990) stated from her research that, “Faculty hear teaching is important, but see research is rewarded.” According to numerous research studies, general discussions of the importance of good teaching is not sufficient to counterbalance (a) the graduate school socialization process (Green, 1990; Rice and Austin, 1990); (b) the usual institutional reward structures (Green, 1990; Rice and Austin, 1990; Weimer, 1990); and (c) the rhetoric regarding the importance of research activity (Green 1990; Rice and Austin, 1990; Weimer, 1990). Research studies showed that in academic settings that recognized and rewarded instructional excellence, faculty not only improved their teaching but the overall quality of teaching at an institution was better (Green, 1990; Weimer, 1990).
appears from this study that the institution did not give an overall support of teaching as it did research.

The final challenge administrators faced was the faculty development programs’ struggle to find an identity in their colleges. The administrators wanted to have a greater influence on faculty teaching, but struggled with where the programs fit in the colleges. Administrators were challenged to constantly communicate the existence and importance of the faculty development programs due to the high turnover in department heads and college leaders. It may be that this challenge is connected to the faculty development programs’ lack of accountability to the college. The programs did not have an opportunity to report successes or needs to the college leadership.

**Future ideas**

When considering the future of their faculty development programs, administrators primarily discussed three areas: activities, participation, and resources. The degree to which administrators focused on these three areas depended on their particular interests at the time. First, the administrators of faculty development programs wanted to have regular and predictable activities or wanted to offer more and/or different activities. Second, they wanted to increase participation and create a wider presence in each college. Third, administrators wanted to increase the monetary and personnel resources for the faculty development programs.

**Discussion of Faculty Development in Academe**

The theoretical framework of this research study is based on Etienne Wegner’s *Communities of Practice* (1998), which espouses a social theory of learning. Wegner (1998) defined a community of practice as people engaged in the pursuit of an enterprise. According to Wegner (1998), participation in a community of practice translates into an identity as a form of
competence. With Wenger’s framework in mind related to enterprise and competence, I noticed from the outset that the faculty development programs tended toward several distinct roles within colleges. A category system for these roles first emerged in a general way while interviewing the program administrators. Following my formal data coding and analysis, I constructed three broad theoretical classifications of roles to explain differences in my data: (a) passive instructional resource; (b) active teaching service; and (c) influential community changer. The following discussion further explains my research findings associated with these three faculty development program roles.

**Passive instructional resource**

In theory, this classification connotes two different situations for a faculty development program. First, teaching might not be a strong measure of faculty competence in the college. Consequently, there is no need for a faculty development program in the college. A second possibility is that teaching is an important measure of faculty competence, yet for some reason the college does not, or cannot, support a faculty development program.

According to Wenger’s (1998) theory, this classification does not align well as a community of practice because (a) faculty in general do not pursue becoming better teachers and (b) faculty do not participate in the community because there is little need to be identified as a good teacher, in the form of competence. Consequently, there is little impetus for the community of practice that a faculty development program would might help to create in the colleges. While some colleges choose not create faculty development programs, other colleges might start a program because faculty do teach in higher education and may need support. Within this classification, faculty development programs would be a passive instructional resource for faculty.
In this study, the passive instructional resource classification included colleges (Colleges A, B, and H) in which a separate faculty development program was not strongly supported. The colleges offered their own faculty development activities rather than supporting the faculty development programs. These college efforts also advocated graduate students attending the colleges’ faculty development activities, more so than the other five colleges in the study. These conflicting actions within a college contributed to a competition for faculty time and resulted in the faculty development programs adopting a more passive role with faculty. Consequently, faculty members had to seek out the faculty development program if he or she wanted help with teaching. While these three programs offered a few intermittent activities, they were primarily used only as a teaching resource for faculty in the college.

**Active teaching service**

In theory, this classification connotes a situation in which teaching is a measure of faculty competence in the college. However, the college does not directly provide faculty development activities that help improve faculty teaching. Therefore, there is a need for the faculty development program to have a more active role in the college.

This classification aligns more with Wenger’s (1998) theory of a community of practice because (a) faculty have support to pursue becoming a better teacher and (b) faculty participate in the community because there is the expectation that they to be good teachers. Consequently, there is a need for the community of teachers that a faculty development program can active help to create. Therefore, the faculty development programs in this classification become an active service for faculty in the colleges. The important difference in this classification from the previous one is that the faculty development programs are actively trying to create a community of practice for those teaching in the colleges.
In this study, the *active teaching service* classification included faculty development programs that had established an identity in the colleges (Colleges D, E, and G). These programs encouraged faculty to attend faculty development activities and advocated the importance of teaching in the colleges. These programs consistently offered regular faculty development activities in an attempt to engage college faculty in thinking about teaching. Unlike the previous group, there were no other college-level development activities competing for faculty time, so the major responsibility for faculty development was relegated to the faculty development program.

**Influential community changer**

In theory, this classification connotes a situation in which teaching is a significant aspect of a faculty member’s identity as well as the college’s measure of the faculty’s competence. The college not only promotes the faculty development program but also encourages development as a faculty pursuit. Therefore, the faculty development community plays a major role and has significant influence in support teaching in the college.

This classification aligns well with Wenger’s (1998) theory of a community of practice because (a) faculty are committed to becoming better teachers and (b) faculty regularly participate in the community because of the clear expectation that they be good teachers.

Consequently, the colleges in this classification use the faculty development programs to create and sustain a community of teachers amongst the faculty. The faculty development programs in this classification are influential in changing the culture of the college and building a community practices that has a strong influence on teaching in the college.

In this study, the *influential community changer* classification included faculty development programs that appeared to play a major role in influencing the importance of
faculty teaching within the college (Colleges C and F). These programs created a teaching discourse amongst the colleges’ faculty. The discourse focused on faculty’s concerns and issues with teaching at a research institution. Good teaching was encouraged and rewarded by the programs or colleges, while poor or bad teaching was noticed and assistance was provided.

As an example, the faculty development program in College F actively solicited recommendations of good teachers in the college and helped these faculty members apply for teaching awards given out by the college or university as well as national or professional organization teaching awards. The faculty development program in College F was also the only active program that allowed graduate students to attend activities. The program administrator stated it was important for the college’s graduate students to have a reputation for being good teachers. Finally, the faculty development program had influenced students in such a way that the program was supported through an alumni endowment.

Another example, the faculty development program in College C, was directly supported from the college budget. The college paid the campus teaching center to run the activities even though the college had a faculty development committee. This type of support allowed the faculty development committee to develop the most extensive curricula for activities in this study. There were four distinct faculty development curricula offered in the college. The curricula were designed to first initiate new members into the faculty development community and then help them remain effective teachers throughout their careers.

Summary

These classifications may be useful to future researchers and administrators of faculty development programs. The classification of the role of faculty development programs is useful in helping to understand and explain the differences among colleges in this study. In each
classification colleges placed an increasing degree of importance on (a) teaching as a measure of faculty competence; (b) faculty support in becoming better teachers; and (c) the need for a faculty development program.

I am interested in conducting future research that would continue to investigate whether these classifications might be useful in describing faculty development programs more generally. Some of the questions driving future study could include: Do faculty development programs fulfill different roles in colleges at other institutions? What determines a faculty development program’s role or degree of influence with faculty? Can a faculty development program change its role within a college? How?

Future Research of Faculty Development in Academe

Additional future research I am interested in conducting would expand two particular areas of this study. First, I would like to replicate this study at other Division I research institutions as well as at more teaching-focused institutions, including additional questions such as: Do faculty development programs at other Division I research institutions focus solely or primarily on teaching? Why or why not? What is the mission of faculty development programs at different kinds of institutions where teaching is valued as a primary aspect of faculty roles and responsibilities? What are the comparisons of faculty development programs in similar colleges across institutions? How can colleges promote reform in teaching, and are faculty development programs the best approach? Are there other viable models that colleges use?

Second, I am interested in conducting future research that would investigate the connection between college faculty development programs and the campus teaching centers at other institutions. Some of the faculty development programs in this study had connections with the campus teaching center. In one case, College C, the campus teaching center ran the faculty
development activities of a program. It appears from this study that a campus teaching center can assist college faculty development programs and influence the program’s viability and sustainability. Some questions guiding a future study could include: What are the specific interaction between a campus teaching center and the different faculty development programs? How do those interactions help or hinder the operation and viability of the college faculty development programs?

**Influencing factors**

There are significant differences in content, expectations, and administrative organization in university colleges today. Biglan (1973a) studied these differences by developing a method of grouping academic disciplines for comparative purposes. Biglan (1973a) found from his initial research that the differences in disciplines could be categorized considering three dimensions: hard versus soft, pure versus applied, and life versus non-life.

Using the three dimensions from his first study, Biglan’s (1973b) research further identified ways that these disciplines differed. He discovered that disciplines or colleges differed as to (a) the degree of social connectedness amongst faculty; (b) the commitment of faculty to teaching, research, and service; (c) the number of journal articles, monographs, and technical reports published by the faculty; and (d) the number of dissertations overseen by faculty. Biglan (1973a, 1973b) also reported that there were differences in how the hard and soft, pure and applied, and life and non-life disciplines conducted research and taught. It seems logical, if disciplines differ in the areas previously discussed, that faculty development in disciplines would differ as well.

I tried to use Biglan’s (1973a, 1973b) dimensions post hoc to try to better understand how a college or discipline could influence a faculty development community. I attempted to
compare a faculty development program’s status (i.e., active or inactive) in connection with the college’s general demographic information and Biglan’s dimensions. Connecting these kinds of information has not been considered in faculty development research. The information from this study provided nothing conclusive about faculty development programs in relation to Biglan’s dimensions.

Further research could be conducted investigating the influences on the organization, mission, and viability of college faculty development programs. Also, a larger data set could be developed that included college’s general demographic information, Biglan’s dimensions, and faculty development programs to check whether there are any positive relationships. I am interested in conducting future research that investigates specifically applying Biglan’s dimensions to college faculty development programs. Some of the questions guiding future studies could include: Can Biglan’s dimensions help identify distinctions in how different types of colleges approach faculty development? Do demographic factors influence the organization, mission, and viability of college faculty development programs? Can Biglan’s dimensions be used to better understand the organization, mission, and viability of college faculty development programs?

**Student learning**

Two assumptions that guided the initial design of this research study were that faculty development programs would assess activities and be accountable to the colleges. While interviewing program administrators, I found that colleges did not hold the faculty development programs accountable to any measurable outcomes. Actually, none of the colleges in this study ever conducted an evaluation of the faculty development programs.
The lack of accountability found in faculty development programs in this study stands in stark contrast to the practices of K-12 staff development in which student learning is an integral assessment metric for the effectiveness of staff development activities. The important connection between faculty development and student learning was absent in all the colleges in this study. The faculty development programs in this study did not connect their activities to student learning. The programs only assessed faculty satisfaction and participation in individual activities.

I am interested in conducting future research on how faculty development activities influence faculty members’ teaching and how that development directly impacts student learning. Some questions guiding this study could include: Does the college hold the faculty development program accountable? Why or why not? What are the assessment metrics used by the faculty development programs? Why are these particular metrics used? What assessment methods or metrics can be used to measure the impact of faculty development activities on faculty teaching and student learning?

Conclusion

A case study approach was used to investigate faculty development from the perspective of program administrators in different colleges at a Division I research institution. The program administrators’ perspectives and experiences provided evidence rarely found in literature. Wenger’s (1998) ideas of a community of practice were used to frame the discussion of this study, and to articulate and support my personal commitment to a particular approach to faculty development. In addition to higher education literature, research literature on staff and professional development in K-12 education was used to better understand development practices in a different educational setting.
The development practices in K-12 education varied widely in context and format, but generally shared a common purpose to “alter the professional practices, beliefs, and understanding of school persons toward an articulated end” (Griffin, 1983, p.2). In most cases, that end was the improvement of student learning. According to Guskey’s (1986) research, staff development programs were a “systematic attempt to bring about change—change in the classroom practices of teachers, change in their beliefs and attitudes, and change in the learning outcomes of students” (p. 5).

In this study, the connections between faculty development and student learning was never directly or indirectly articulated. The administrators of the faculty development programs did not talk about student learning. A discussion of the connection between faculty development and student learning was also absent in the higher education literature. There are some possible reasons for this phenomenon. First, the standards and outcomes of K-12 education are more regulated by state and local governments, whereas there are no educational standards in higher education for governments to regulate. Second, faculty might feel that their academic freedom is being infringed upon if student learning was assessed. Finally, the larger scope and setting of higher education would require a great deal of research and effort to evaluate the connection between faculty development and student learning.

I view faculty development as having the potential to create active communities of faculty with a focus on the practices of good teaching and student learning within a college. Ideally, the faculty development community would be focused on connecting student learning to faculty teaching, research, and service. However, there was no evidence in this study that colleges had established the kind of faculty development community in which teaching was connected to student learning.
The principles I would use in creating a faculty development community would be to first survey the landscape, in other words, to understand the context. I have learned from this study that every college is different, which means that efforts to create a community of practice within a college would differ. However, there are five core concepts from this study and the literature that can be used to create a faculty development community, sustain a community of practice, and make participation in the community worthwhile.

First, a faculty development program should target activities for all the cohorts in the college (i.e., graduate students, instructional staff, and faculty). Second, the program should address the specific needs of each cohort. The needs of graduate students should focus on educating them as future faculty members and training them as teachers and researchers. Instructional staff have more immediate and specific needs, while faculty needs should focus on the longer term professional development. Third, the activities and services of the faculty development program should address all facets of a faculty member’s academic life (i.e., teaching, research, and service). Fourth, the program should design activities where the activities are connected with a purpose to build and/or maintain the communities of practice within each of the cohorts. Finally, the faculty development program should be directly connected to student learning with activities and services offered to faculty. While it would take time and resources to effectively evaluate the impact of professional development activities on participants’ teaching, the program should at least talk with participants about the importance of connecting the activity with student learning.
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Appendix A

Consent Letter

You are invited to participate in a research project about faculty development at a research institution. Jason FitzSimmons and Professor Barbara Hug from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) will conduct this project.

In this project, Mr. FitzSimmons will be interviewing you about your history and involvement with faculty development activities. You will be asked to participate in one 60 to 90-minute interview, which will be conducted by Mr. FitzSimmons during the semester. In this interview, which will be audio-taped with your permission, you will be asked to discuss your faculty development experiences, the history of the program you are involved with, faculty development issues you have encountered, and possibly request data. The audiotapes and all other information obtained during this research project will be kept secure. The audiotapes will be kept in a locked file cabinet and will be accessible only to project personnel. The audiotapes will be transcribed and coded to remove individuals’ names and will be erased after the project is completed. Mr. FitzSimmons might also ask to observe your involvement with and participation in faculty development activities.

We do not anticipate any risk to this study greater than normal life and we anticipate that the results will increase our understanding of faculty development at a research institution. The results of this study may be used for a dissertation, a scholarly report, and a journal article and conference presentation. In any publication or public presentation, pseudonyms will be substituted for any identifying information.

Your participation in this project is voluntary, and you are free to withdraw at any time and for any reason without penalty. Your choice to participate or not, will not impact your job or status at UIUC. You are also free to refuse to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact Mr. FitzSimmons by telephone at 217.384.1969 or by e-mail at jhfitzsi@uiuc.edu or Professor Hug at 244-9090 or bhug@uiuc.edu.

Sincerely,

Jason FitzSimmons
I have read and understand the above information and voluntarily agree to participate in the research project described above. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

Signature  Date

I do agree to have the interview audio taped for the purposes of transcription.

Signature  Date

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant please contact Anne Robertson, Bureau of Educational Research, 217-333-3023, or arobrtsn@uiuc.edu or the Institutional Review Board at 217-333-2670 or irb@uiuc.edu
Appendix B

Interview Question Protocol

To start off: Tell me a little about the history of the teaching academy.

   How did the program get started?
   Does the program have a name? Why not?
   Is there a reason it is called: __________________________? Why?

What is your current position within the program?

   How long have you been working with the program?
   What responsibilities do you have in your role with the program?
   Why did you choose to become a part of the program?
   How do your other responsibilities on campus impact your leadership of the program?

What is your current position (e.g., professor, administration) in the college?

   How long have you been in this position?
   What responsibilities do you have in this position?
   Tell me about your professional and academic background?

How do you see these two roles working together or integrating? Do they?

What do you see as the mission of the program?

   What are the program’s goals in the college regarding faculty?
      How do you meet these goals?
   What about developing the other skills of faculty (e.g., research and service)?
      How does the program help faculty develop these skills?
   What do you feel has been the program’s biggest success?
   What are other ways you know of that faculty use to develop these skills?

What activities does the program offer for faculty / graduate students?

   Who is your target audience? / Whom are your activities geared towards?
   What activities have worked best in this college?
      Why is this, do you think?
   What activities do you feel are characteristic of the strengths of your program?
   What kind of faculty participation do you get with these activities?
      What factors do you see influencing faculty participation?
How many faculty members are there in the college?
What have you observed about faculty’s response to the program’s activities?
Describe the impact you see the program having on the faculty in this college?
How has the program influenced the college?
Describe your experience being a part of the program and working with research faculty?
What other avenues are you aware of that faculty use to develop their teaching, research, and service skills?
What kind of support have you gotten over the years from the college? Faculty?
What sort of connection do you have with the campus teaching center? Liaison?
How is the program funded?
Have you noticed any significant changes in this support?
What do you think caused those changes?
How did you deal with them?
How have the Deans and Department Heads influenced the program?
(e.g., mission, operation, support, promotion, participation)?
Are there any other people having a strong influence on the program? Who?
How has the program stayed active and relevant with faculty at a research institution?
How many staff have you had over the years? What have been their backgrounds?
How many staff do you have currently?
How many staff would you ideally like to have for the program?
How would you use them?
What kind of activities would you like to offer faculty in your college, if you could do anything?
What is the biggest challenge to accomplishing these ideas?
What have been the challenges you have had to face in the past, personally and as a program?
How did you deal with them?
Presently, what major challenges are you facing as a program and personally?
What kind of formal / informal feedback have you received from faculty members who have participated in the program’s activities?
Can you describe a particular response you remember? Why is it memorable?
How do you know the program is accomplishing what it intends with its mission?
What metrics are used to gauge the program’s influence with faculty in the college?
How does the college evaluate the program?

What types of information is gathered on the activities and participants?

What sort of evidence / benchmarks does the college require from the program, if any?

How do they use this evaluation?

Do they use this evaluation to justify support?

Why do they not require any evaluation?

Is it possible to get copies of the information gathered or reported, please?

Do you participate in the Faculty Development Leadership Group on campus? Why/Why not?

If I need clarification later, would it be okay to ask you some follow up questions?