THE IMPACT OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS ON

PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS

IN TEXAS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

North Texas State University in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Ruth Marie Rush McQueen, B.B.A., M.B.A., C.P.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1980

McQueen, Ruth Marie Rush, The Impact of Staff Development Programs on Community College Teachers in Texas. Doctor of Education (Adult Continuing Education), August, 1980, 193 pp., 18 tables, bibliography, 140 titles.

The purpose of this study is to describe the perceptions of two groups of full-time public community college faculty members--Arts and Sciences instructors and Vocational-Technical instructors--of faculty development programs. Four research questions are presented and are discussed.

A randomly selected sample was used of approximately one-fourth of the full-time faculty members in Arts and Sciences and in Vocational-Technical disciplines at fifteen Texas public community colleges. The participants completed a questionnaire containing items dealing with background and general information, rewards, institutional innovation, professional development interests, institutional support, and overall impressions of faculty development.

Responses were encoded and, using four computer programs, were summarized according to the discipline, college, and by totals. Tests were made for significance of differences between means or percentages of responses of the two groups of faculty members. The findings were made from the presence or absence of significant differences.

Both groups of faculty members responded that faculty development has not had many specific effects. Both groups expressed a need for more emphasis on the skill of teaching and a need to organize faculty development by divisions or departments. Both groups gave similar responses on the importance of achievements as they relate to decisions on tenure, promotion, and salary increases. In responding to the importance of achievements for personal satisfaction and gratification, both groups consider teaching and advising students to be their most important achievements.

On the extent of institutional change in the last five years, the overall means of the two groups are exactly the same. The majority of faculty members in both groups indicate that the degree of institutional support is in the midrange between a limited extent and a considerable extent. Both groups of faculty feel strongly about the need for improvement of faculty development programs in terms of rewards, topics, and recognition of the needs of individuals and groups.

The responses of the two groups of faculty members show that they are convinced that the primary mission of the community college teacher is to teach; other achievements, including participation in faculty development, are important, but not foremost. The responses of faculty members in this sample indicate that faculty members at community colleges throughout the state feel that their

participation in faculty development activities should result in more monetary or other tangible reward, or that institutionally oriented faculty development programs should be curtailed in favor of other forms of professional development. Both faculty groups feel that some innovative changes have occurred in the last five years; they also feel that most of these changes are due to factors other than the existence of faculty development programs at their institutions.

The conclusions drawn are that (1) the two groups of faculty members have the same impression of faculty development programs; (2) that both groups of faculty state unequivocally that they are getting, at best, only minor to somewhat less than moderate help from faculty development programs in all areas of professional development; (3) faculty development programs, by virtue of their existence and name, appear to have caused faculty to consider their professional development as being more an individual concern, yet they also consider this an area for needed institutional support; (4) the responses of faculty members indicated they responded as faculty in general and not just as Arts and Sciences or Vocational-Technical faculty; (5) and finally, faculty development at present is none too effective--at least, not in the institutions whose faculty participated in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The community junior college is a relatively new institution of higher education in the United States (15, p. 15). The oldest publicly-supported junior college still in existence is Joliet Junior College in Joliet, Illinois, which was established in 1901 (9, p. 9). By 1921, there were 207 such institutions (8, p. 11). The junior college philosophy continued to gain acceptance and to spread to an increasing number of communities during the 1920s and 1930s. Enrollment increased from 162,005 in 1942 to 1,791,854 in 1972 (16, p. 6). This growth has been unprecedented (12, p. 25). During the ten-year period between 1960 and 1970, the number of two-year colleges increased nationally by 61 per cent and the number of students increased 271 per cent. At the same time, the number of staff increased by 327 per cent with projections for the 1980s of an increase in new and replacement faculty of between 71,000 and 102,000 (11, p. 26; 13, p. 81).

The community and junior colleges have declared a mission that is extremely broad in scope, including college transfer programs, career education, short-term training,

continuing education, community service, and guidance and counseling (1, p. 1). The open-door policy and the wide variety of programs and services have resulted in institutions which are staffed by individuals of many different backgrounds and educational experiences (1, p. 9).

Terry O'Banion of the University of Illinois says that quality of education in the public community college depends in the main on the quality of the staff. Quality means the ability and desire to achieve the goal of providing positive learning experiences for students who are entirely foreign to the traditional post-secondary environment (12, p. 25). The quality of the staff can and should be enhanced by the provision of quality faculty staff development experiences.

Before the 1970s, little action was taken in community college faculty development because enrollment increases strained the capacity of the institutions, and community college educators did not consider it to have a high priority. Instead, it was assumed that new ideas and new teaching techniques would result from the regular influx of new staff (1, p. 2). The new emphasis on faculty development resulted due to a number of forces for change that include decreased faculty mobility, lack of success with poorly prepared students, the changing clientele, (especially the tremendous increase in part-time students), new teaching techniques and technologies, and, finally, the

changing context within which the community college operates (1, p. 3-7; 6, p. 6).

The future priority must be the development needs of the people who staff the people's colleges (11, p. 26). This priority was reflected by the 1973 Second National American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) Assembly on Staff Development:

> This assembly urges in the most vigorous terms that community and junior colleges accept staff development as a first-rank priority and give to it the same total institutional commitment that is accorded to its other programs and curriculums (4, p. 142).

Faculty development has, then, become a major concern throughout many areas of higher education. Therefore, the existing faculty development efforts need to become more firmly entrenched in the institutions and evaluations need to be conducted (2, p. 3). The community colleges have adopted many of the traditions of higher education, but they approach their role by responding in novel ways to the contemporary world. Thus, the dynamics of faculty development in these institutions are not as yet well defined as to approach--what works well at College A may fail at College B (17, p. 55).

More research is needed into how faculty react to faculty development programs. Further, there are many questions about faculty development for which there are no published answers, including those about characteristics of

faculty members who participate in faculty development activities, and the perceived differences among faculty members about the effectiveness of faculty and staff development and its effect on them and their institutions (2, p. 4).

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to describe the perceptions of faculty development programs by two groups of full-time community college faculty members--arts and sciences instructors and vocational-technical instructors.

Research Questions

To guide the development of this study, the following research questions were formulated.

1. Do organized faculty development programs have the same impression on the arts and sciences faculty members as on the vocational-technical members?

2. What specific effects do these faculty members believe that faculty development programs have had on instructional strategies, related faculty activities and professional attitudes?

3. To what extent do these faculty members perceive that the faculty development program is related to the reward system?

4. To what degree do faculty members perceive that institutional or departmental innovations have resulted

from faculty development programs. What types of innovations have occurred, and what types should occur?

Scope and Delimitations of the Study

The participating colleges for this study were chosen from those urban public community colleges in the state of Texas that have faculty development programs. Determination of the colleges having faculty development programs was made from the inclusion of the name of a representative from the college in the <u>Directory</u> <u>of</u> <u>Human</u> <u>Resources</u> of the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCSPOD) (10). This yielded a list of sixteen urban public community colleges. Representatives from fifteen of the colleges chose to participate in the study.

The faculty surveyed were teaching in either arts and sciences or in vocational-technical disciplines. Those selected were all full-time faculty members during the 1979-80 academic year, who had participated in faculty development activities. Participation was determined by requesting the faculty development representative at each participating institution to delete from the list of prospective study participants the names of persons who had not participated in faculty development activities. Faculty development representatives were also asked to delete the names of persons no longer employed and to substitute the

names of previously unlisted full-time faculty members who had participated in faculty development activities.

Definitions of Terms

Community college.--a college typically organized to meet the educational needs of a particular community that offers two-year training, either terminal or preparatory, in preprofessional and liberal arts fields; most community colleges are publicly controlled and are coeducational (5, p. 114).

Community or junior college.--a two-year, comprehensive institution of higher education aimed at servicing the educational needs of a particular community or geographical area (7, p. 6).

Faculty development.--programs aimed at improving faculty efficiency and effectiveness (6, p. 3). Faculty development concentrates on developing the individual faculty member to his or her full potential, particularly in his or her role as instructor (3, p. 14; 14, p. 80).

Full-time faculty member.--a faculty member who teaches at least twelve semester hours or twenty clock-hours per week.

Impact.--the impact of faculty development is determined by the way its effectiveness is perceived by the individual faculty member.

Inservice education.--efforts to promote by appropriate means the professional growth and development of workers while on the job; in supervision of teaching it is one of the major tasks; planned and organized efforts are included to improve the knowledge, skill, and attitudes of instructional staff members to make them more effective on the job; examples of related activities are role-playing, intervisitations, demonstrations, and laboratory sessions (5, p. 294).

Inservice training.--instruction provided to employed persons on the job while normal performance of their occupational duties is continued (5, p. 616).

Instructional development.--focuses on the courses themselves, or on the learning materials used in those courses (14, p. 80).

Junior college.--traditionally a two-year institution of higher learning; similar to a community college; an educational institution having as an admission standard the applicant's completion of the tenth grade of a standard high school or its equivalent (5, p. 321).

Management development.--management improvement measured in terms of increased efficiency and effectiveness (6, p. 3).

<u>Organizational development</u>.--attempts to create a concern for teaching and learning within an institution and an environment that encourages it (14, p. 80) Organizational development refers to changes in the organizational structure of the college and its climate (6, p. 4).

<u>Personal development</u>.--the improvement of people--their attitudes about themselves, their jobs, their personal lives (6, p. 3).

<u>Public community college</u>.--a two-year, coeducational, publicly-controlled college set up to be responsive to the educational needs of a particular community. Similar to junior college or community college.

<u>Staff development</u>.--programs intended for all persons who staff the college that include provisions for both personal and professonal improvement (6, p. 3).

Summary

The purpose of this study is to describe the perceptions of two groups of full-time community college faculty members (arts and sciences instructors and vocational-technical instructors) on faculty development programs. The research questions deal with

1. The similarities of impressions of the two groups;

2. Specific effects that faculty members believe the faculty development programs have had on instructional strategies, faculty attitudes and professional attitudes;

3. The extent to which the two groups of faculty members perceive that the faculty development program is related to the reward system;

4. The perceptions of the two groups about institutional or departmental innovations that have resulted from faculty development programs.

The participating colleges were chosen from those urban public community colleges in the state of Texas having faculty development programs. The faculty surveyed were either teaching in arts and sciences or in vocational-technical disciplines and were all full-time faculty members in the 1979-80 academic year who had participated in faculty development activities. Participation was determined by the faculty development representative at each participating institution.

The remainder of the study is divided into four chapters. Chapter II contains a review of the literature on community college faculty development. Chapter III is concerned with the methodology of data collection and analysis used in this study. Chapter IV presents the detailed data analysis and a discussion of results. Chapter V completes the study with a summary of the findings, the conclusions, and the recommendations.

CHAPTER I

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Claxton, Charles S., _Community College Staff Development: Basic Issues in Planning_, Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1976.

2. Gaff, Jerry, "Current Issues in Faculty Development and Evaluation," _Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper_, 3, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 2-4.

3. _____, _Toward Faculty Renewal_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1975.

4. Garrison, Roger H., "Report of the 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges," _New Staff for New Students_, Washington, 1974, pp. 138-150.

5. Good, Carter V., Editor, _Dictionary of Education_, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

6. Hammons, James O., "Faculty Development in the Community College," discussion paper presented at the National Conference on Faculty Development in Two-Year Postsecondary Institutions, St. Louis, Missouri, January, 1976.

7. Hillway, Tyrus, _The American Two-Year College_, New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958.

8. Medsker, Leland R., _The Junior College: Progress and Prospect_, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

9. Monroe, Charles R., _Profile of the Community College_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972.

10. National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, _Directory of Human Resources_, 1978.

11. O'Banion, Terry, "Staff Development: A New Priority for the Seventies," *College Board Review*, 99 (Spring, 1976), 26-33.

12. _____, "Staff Development: A Priority on Persons," *New Staff for New Students*, Washington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974, pp. 23-40.

13. _____, *Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior Colleges*, Tucson, The University of Arizona Press, 1974.

14. Stice, James E., "A Bargain at Any Price; A Steal at $1.24," *Educational Horizons*, 55, No. 2 (Winter, 1976/77), 80-85.

15. Thornton, James W. Jr., *The Community Junior College*, 2nd ed., New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

16. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Fiscal Year 1974*, No. 76-003, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

17. Vincent, William E., "Locked In and Locked Out," *Community and Junior College Journal*, 50, No. 5 (February, 1980), 54-55.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature that deals with faculty development in the community colleges yielded items based on research studies as well as items that share the knowledge, experiences, and observations of various authors. The publications will be examined and discussed according to the following three basic categories:

1. Literature regarding the need for faculty development and the needs of faculty and staff members;

2. Literature regarding ways to meet the needs of faculty in terms of approaches, organization, and administration;

3. Literature regarding perceptions teachers have of faculty development.

The Need for Faculty Development

The need for faculty development is not a new topic; universities have long provided various kinds of faculty development. This need, however, was not recognized in the literature about community colleges until the end of the 1960s.

The faculty development efforts of the early 1960s were directed mainly toward preservice teacher training and the orientation of huge numbers of new personnel. The reason for this limitation was that the community college boom was in full swing. During the sixties, 442 new community colleges were established in this country. The enrollment on two-year college campuses increased from 750,000 to 2,500,000 full-time and part-time students. The number of faculty and professional staff correspondingly tripled from 41,000 to 130,000 (131, p. 68). The pace of the expansion, coupled with a shortage of teachers and employment mobility, overshadowed the need for inservice training. Time after time it seemed both easier and quicker to try to hire staff with the required capabilities and attitudes than to retrain those already employed.

Of course, it was always suspected and it is now a fact, that the boom could not last indefinitely. Between 1968 and 1974, the rate of expansion slowed and then stabilized. There have, in fact, been instances where enrollments and professional staff have declined. With stabilization came the end of faculty employment mobility. A change in the focus and direction of faculty and staff development was the natural outgrowth of the other changes.

Thus, toward the end of the decade, concern for inservice education (which meant keeping the existing personnel professionally renewed) became a major concern. About the

same time catalysts for significant faculty development appeared on the national level through the passage and funding of the Education Professions Development Act by the U. S. Congress, and in the receipt of significant staff and faculty development grants from the American Association of Junior Colleges through several foundations (49, p. 7). The growing interest in inservice education was soon reflected in expanded research on the subject.

In 1966, Roger Garrison (44) interviewed community college faculty across the nation and found they had a serious interest in quality inservice programs for professional improvement. At about the same time, J. R. Samlin (111) in Illinois and Clyde H. Colman (24)in Nebraska completed doctoral dissertations containing data from national surveys that showed the inadequacy of and lack of support for inservice programs then in existence. In California in 1967 Gordon Kilpatrick (72) stressed the need for a change in the purpose of faculty development from the emphasis or elimination of inservice deficiencies to emphasis on the contemporary problems facing faculty on the job.

Then, in 1969, the American Association of Junior Colleges published a survey (64) of junior and community college administrators which reflected a belief in inservice education as a way to keep existing personnel professionally vibrant and upgraded. In that same year, the

U. S. Congress passed the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969; (128, p. 3,435) this act called for a master plan to be developed within each state jointly by the state and the post-secondary institutions in the state. The act included language calling for consideration to be given to the training and development of faculty and staff.

Between 1969 and 1972, articles on faculty development appeared infrequently. In 1971, an article on faculty development in American community colleges (36) urged further study of the area and pointed out the need for faculty development. In 1973, a landmark work appeared that contained a summary of community college faculty development needs, a description of the then current efforts in preservice and inservice training and recommendations. The report, written by Terry O'Banion (105) of the University of Illinois, and entitled "People for the People's Colleges," was presented to the President's National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development (EPD). The report was immediately recognized and articles began to appear referring to it as a catalyst for staff development (92, p. 12).

In the same period O'Banion wrote a summary of the report for the Community and Junior College Journal (96, pp. 10-11); he also published it in book form with the title, Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the

<u>Community</u> <u>Junior</u> <u>Colleges</u> (100). One of his recommen-
dations was that every state should have a staff
development program coordinated by the educational unit
responsible for community colleges, and that it should be a
purpose of the state program to insure that every college
had a staff development program. He also recommended that
every staff member in every community college have a pro-
fessional development plan individually tailored in terms
of the goals and resources of the college as well as to the
needs of the individual staff member. He further suggested
that this plan should be developed in consultation with
college officials and that it should form the basis for
staff evaluation (100, p. 156).

The O'Banion work was soon followed by reports spon-
sored by the American Association of Community and Junior
Colleges (AACJC), which had identified staff development as
an area of prime attention (133, p.6). The steering com-
mittee for the 1973 assembly of the AACJC felt so strongly
about the importance of staff development that it selected
as the 1973 assembly topic, "Educational Opportunity for
All: New Staff for New Students" (132).

The AACJC made a list of needed background study
papers and assigned them to authors early in 1973. These
papers were presented at the November, 1973, assembly;
along with the report of the assembly, all papers were
published by the AACJC in 1974 under the title <u>New Staff</u>

<u>for</u> <u>New</u> <u>Students</u>. The many articles contain ideas and theories of staff development. The concerns were mainly of development as a priority and of the need for faculty development in the community colleges (4; 46; 81; 97; 133).

During 1973 several other works appeared dealing with the need for faculty development. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. of the AACJC gave his predictions for the future of the community colleges (51). He included ten characteristics of community-based, postsecondary education, as well as characteristics of the community college of the future. Continuing objectives of a community-based, performance-based, postsecondary institution includes the need to have

1. Current, accurate, and comprehensive information about the community and how the institution is serving its community;

2. Access to information that enables development of human resources consistent with national needs;

3. A comprehensive plan expressed in understandable terms that the community will support;

4. The ability to justify needs for resources and to demonstrate their effective use.

Raymond Schultz (112) sees the stabilization of the community college staff, after a decade of rapid expansion, changing the direction of staff development away from orientation of new personnel toward maintenance of a vital, professional staff. He presents guidelines for effective

staff development and suggestions for activities. Richard Wilson (131) is mainly concerned with problems of staff confusion and disagreements over the goals and purposes of the community college. He views continuing and comprehensive staff development as the solution for crippling differences of opinion, and he suggests that the AACJC can provide a significant impetus toward improving inservice education and making it a more common practice.

Terry O'Banion (99, pp. 10-13) wrote a follow-up article, reemphasized the need for faculty and staff development, and reviewed the continuing of legislative developments on the state and national level, growth of inservice programs, and new developments in the area of graduate preservice and inservice education. The other major work dealing with the need for faculty development is a collection of articles on the positive and negative factors associated with the professionalization of faculty. This work, edited by Arthur M. Cohen (19), titled <u>Toward</u> <u>a</u> <u>Professional</u> <u>Faculty</u>. <u>New</u> <u>Directions</u> <u>for</u> <u>Community</u> <u>Colleges</u>, <u>No. 1</u>. Current community college teaching is examined and the suggestion is made that further professionalism should be centered around the discipline of instruction rather than along traditional departmental lines.

Another major work that helped to crystallize national attention on the professional development of faculty is a

booklet, <u>Faculty</u> <u>Development</u> <u>in</u> <u>a</u> <u>Time</u> <u>of</u> <u>Retrenchment</u> (35). This work discusses the problems of how to find innovative ways to further stimulate quality and excellence in teaching as a performing art, mid-career transitions, need for faculty development, campus programs in teaching, and purposes of evaluation. It is chiefly oriented to university and four-year college situations but many observations appear to be applicable to community colleges.

Other writers actively encouraged the emphasis on inservice education. These include Roy Edefelt (33, pp. 250-252), who urged that inservice education of teachers be considered a priority for the next decade, and that varied approaches be used to achieve inservice training, such as the teacher center concept, mini courses, protocol materials, inservice packages and modules. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. (48, pp. 16-30), who viewed the expansion of staff development programs in the community colleges as permanently important to prepare staff to meet the new demands of a community-based educational community. The establishment of a delivery mechanism for meeting staff and institutional development demands, which is capable of operating without third-party funds by the end of the decade, is given as one of the major objectives of the community college movement.

Hammons and Wallace (59, pp. 38-43) raise questions and issues to be considered prior to initiating a program

for staff development that include the responsibility for planning, identification of staff development needs, staff participation, program flexibility, instructional techniques, funding, and scheduling and support. In 1974, O'Banion (98, pp. 12-20) defined staff renewal as a program which should be planned to help all members of the college community to realize their potential. Such a program appears to be one of the better ways to prepare faculty members to help students to realize their potential. He discusses the assumptions underlying the declared need for staff development, the inadequacy of current inservice programs, some serious misconceptions about staff development and misuses of staff development. He also presents parts of a concentrated model for a faculty renewal program, and he gives the basis of a philosophy of staff development, which includes balancing individual and institutional needs, leadership, and financing.

A major work, Gaff's <u>Toward Faculty Renewal</u> (41), presenting a conceptual framework for approaching instructional improvement, was published in 1975. Generally, it is an attempt to delineate current development status. It contains definitions of faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development. Descriptions of the focus, purpose, and intellectual basis of each are given, as well as examples of types of activities and specific programs to illustrate each concept. This book

deals mainly with four-year staff development efforts, but it does have some coverage of community college efforts. The author states that the reward structure of the institution must recognize the development efforts of faculty, if not, they will not long strive for improvement (41).

In January, 1976, James O. Hammons (56) presented a discussion paper at the National Conference on Faculty Development in Two-Year Postsecondary Institutions, in St. Louis, Missouri. Hammons specifically addressed the problems of an individual college in implementing and evaluating a college-sponsored faculty development program for full-time faculty members, and he emphasized the need for research in the area of staff development. This paper also included a discussion of conceptual relationships and a rationale for faculty development. Also in 1976, Hammons and Wallace (58, pp. 20-21) reported a summary of the results of their study of 294 two-year college presidents in the thirteen northeastern states. Included are the presidents' assessments of staff development needs and their thoughts on where, when, and how staff development is best achieved.

A 1976 article by Terry O'Banion (95, pp. 26-33) included several rationale for staff development programs and approaches that are used by various community colleges. In this article, O'Banion presents his view of staff development as an instrument of institutional change, and

he submits examples where change has occurred. O'Banion lists six approaches to staff development: retreats, interpersonal relations, personal renewal, instructional improvement, curriculum or staff institute, and staff development with organizational development.

Also in 1976, the Project on Institutional Renewal published a Resource Notebook which encompasses articles on many aspects of teaching. Included is an article, "Faculty Development," by Sally Shake Gaff (42, VII 1-14) which states the predicament of faculty members who ask themselves how they, as individuals, can continue to be effective, creative, and challenged, when they have less opportunity for mobility and more likelihood of spending a large portion of their individual teaching lives at a single institution.

During this same year, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) sponsored a project; the results were reported by Charles S. Claxton (16). The report touches on all areas of public community college staff development, using the stages of adult development as part of its theoretical basis. The project included a workshop on planning for staff development that was attended by four-person teams from each of twelve two-year Southern colleges. One of the participating colleges agreed to participate in the research for this study and, as a result of the SREB work-shop, began a comprehensive staff development program.

At the 1976 National Assembly of the National Center for Higher Education Management, Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. (50), delivered an address that was published in _Responding to the New Spirit of Learning_. Gleazer is concerned with the community college boom, with coping with the end of that boom, with future goals, services, and needs. He contends that education is no longer detached from community life and its problems, and that the community college, in particular, is more and more a part of life's other meaningful activities.

The next year, 1977, Charles S. Claxton (17) presented a paper, "Comprehensive Staff Development in the Community College: Implications for the Office of Institutional Research and Planning," at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. He described an emerging model for a comprehensive staff and organizational development program as a continuous and integral part of the college; he also discussed the role of the office of institutional research in such programs. Claxton believes that if staff development is to become a vital instrument in human resource development and utilization, planning for such programs must be a key part of an institution's overall planning.

At about the same time, Jerry Gaff (39, pp. 2-4) wrote that faculty development has become a major preoccupation throughout higher education and that signs of such growth

can be seen all around. Gaff also discussed several areas of needed research on faculty development, one of which was investigation of the charactistics of faculty who participate in staff development activities.

Marvin White (126) completed his study of the relationship of faculty characteristics to faculty development needs in 1977. His respondents were faculty members in the state of Mississippi's public junior colleges. The faculty agreed that the areas of greatest need are curriculum and course development, classroom teaching, and general factors; the greatest agreement of need was on the item regarding learning more about different teaching methods.

In 1977, two important articles appeared in community college journals. Alvarado and Rinnander (1, pp. 103-110) reviewed selected ERIC staff development literature on implementing programs, the role of graduate schools, developing administrative and other staff, and staff development in perspective. Hammons and Wallace (60, pp. 55-76) summarized the results of a national study of 1,100 public community college chairpersons that revealed the developmental needs of the chairpersons and that outlined the most convenient times and conditions for inservice training. The results indicated that chairperson training areas of need are knowledge of the community college, management, personnel, curriculum and instruction, administration, and student personnel services.

In 1978, H. L. Gray's paper (54), "Staff Development", reiterated the points of others and added to the body of knowledge with a thorough treatment of three levels of organizational activity--technology, administration, and the social and interpersonal relationships--that make up the culture of the organization. His thesis is that organizational problems arise within all three levels, but that the problems become increasingly difficult at the higher (psycho-social) level because of the very personal view of the organization that is held by each member thereof.

Thus, a fundamental problem in any discussion of staff development is that each member perceives the organization in some way differently from anyone else, and his view is subjective as to staff and organizational needs. Gray stated that a prior condition to learning technical competence is the affective attitude towards the skills--the emotional orientations. A teacher's openness to change is basic to understanding the tasks; it does not develop as a natural result of changed circumstances.

Gray concluded with a reiteration that facilitating staff development includes recognition of organizational and personal needs, but that it works through individuals and groups of individuals. Structural changes will, according to Gray, almost always occur as a consequence; but structural change cannot be imposed as if behavior were a consequence of structure.

Also in 1978, several papers dealing with the necessity of staff development were presented. W. J. Collin (21) stressed the concept of staff and organizational development as a planned educational activity designed to provide the organization with an on-going renewal capacity.

He presented a model for staff development having dimensions of need, focus, mode of operation, and strategy or method, along with a number of examples of staff development activities in a community college that illustrate each dimension of the model. Goodwin and Young (53) discussed the problem of increasing productivity in community colleges. They remarked that although escalating costs and decreasing revenues over the past decade have given sudden urgency to the problem of productivity, the community colleges would be greatly mistaken in settling for cost reductions that reduce their ability to deliver high-quality educational programs. They further suggested that faculty productivity can be augmented through differentiated staffing, staff development programs, and new instructional delivery systems.

Sutton and Armfield (117) discussed staff development for small and rural community colleges and the unique problems of those institutions. They point out that since larger and more urban community colleges are often closer to graduate schools and workshop or seminar offerings, staff in these colleges have relatively easy access to

those opportunities for professional growth. This is especially true when on-campus efforts have no incentives or rewards for participation. Thus, staff development for the sake of continuous growth does not seem to be enough. There is great need for all community colleges to evaluate and document the positive impact of staff development. Sutton and Armfield consider staff development as one component in a total program of institutional development with the role of assisting individuals of the college to seek ways to create a more productive and satisfying working environment. College staff members must have a sense of ownership in both the decisions for change and the means for change.

Tamara Coward (27) edited a report on projects funded by the Advanced Institutional Development Program. The report includes an exploration of the need for and importance of professional development at the community college level. Chapters on the essential elements of a staff development program and examples from the Seattle Community College District are also included.

Parker and Parker (103) reported on a questionnaire survey of community college faculty and administrators in the nineteen Kansas institutions that assessed staff development needs in the areas of instructional activity. The survey identified a significant demand within the Kansas community colleges for professional improvement in

areas of instructional activities, understanding the unique role of the community college in higher education, and administrative skills.

In 1978, Vauncille Jones (70) completed a study on the perceptions of administrators and faculty on staff development needs in the Los Angeles Community College District. She concluded that there is strong demand for staff development in the district because the administrators and faculty identified all questionnaire items as either critical needs or areas in need of some assistance. Needs identified included utilizing cognitive mapping, evaluating the effectiveness of instructional strategies, applying research findings to teaching and learning, student motivation, student attendance, and accommodating different learning rates.

Finally, Vincent (121) emphasized the continuing concern about the need for staff and faculty development in his article, "Locked in and Locked Out." It is a strong appeal for more attention to be given to faculty development for faculty who have fewer and fewer employment-mobility options to prevent stagnation and regression.

Summary

Mentions of faculty and staff development began to appear in the literature on community colleges in the late

1960s. Before that, the literature was concerned mainly with preservice training and the orientation of new personnel. Then the boom in community-college growth slowed, and the rate of expansion stabilized with the result that employment mobility ended for most faculty. This caused a shift in the focus and direction of faculty and staff development.

National surveys in the late 1960s showed the inadequacy or lack of support for the inservice programs then in existence. In 1969, the U. S. Congress passed the Comprehensive Community College Act that called for, among other things, consideration to be given to the training and development of faculty and staff. In the early 1970s several articles and reports appeared that urged further study and stressed the need for faculty development. Among these was O'Banion's report (100) that recommended every state have a staff development program for the purpose of insuring that every community college had a staff development program.

In 1973 the Assembly of the AACJC selected staff development as its topic, and this resulted in several more articles and reports. These articles presented specific needs of faculty and staff, such as more study of the mission of the community college, improved instruction, and recognition of individual and personal growth opportunities. One writer suggested that there is great need for

all community colleges to evaluate and document the positive impact of staff development. Others urged that staff development should be viewed as one component in a total program of institutional development.

Articles and papers on the necessity for staff development and studies of needs have continued to appear regularly. Models have been presented and discussed, and many studies of staff needs by institution, by district, by state, and nationwide have been written. The literature focuses on the need for staff development programs. Needs have been identified repeatedly in all areas of instruction and interaction with students, such as evaluating effectiveness of instructional strategies, motivating students, and accommodating different learning rates. The need for faculty and staff development and the needs of faculty are continuing topics for research.

Ways to Meet the Needs

Although there is much repetition in the literature on ways to meet the needs of faculty, there are some basic approaches and some differences in emphasis or in selected activities. The review of this part of the literature resulted in four categories of ways to meet the needs:

1. General guidelines and models;

2. Handbooks, manuals, and notebooks;

3.   Regional and state plans and consortium arrange-
ments;

4.   Specific examples from the colleges

This division of the discussion of the literature on ways
to meet faculty development needs is required in order to
make some logical statements about the literature. There
are items in each of the sections which are repetitive, and
these will be discussed together when appropriate.

General Guidelines and Models

The content of the literature on general guidelines
and models for faculty development ranges from very theo-
retical to very practical. In 1973, Mervin Freedman (37)
edited Facilitating Faculty Development, which contained
the components of a model program for faculty development.

O'Banion's (94, p. 115) article on patterns of staff
development identifies several activities for inservice
development, as follows:

1.   Summer and year-long institutes;
2.   Short-term workshops;
3.   Staff retreats;
4.   In-house continuing seminars;
5.   Encounter groups;
6.   Conventions and professional meetings;
7.   Visitations;
8.   Packaged programs;
9.   Apprenticeships.

In 1975, W. B. Martin (76, p. 193) contributed to the
developing theory of faculty development, stressing the
needs for an omnibus approach and an adequate theory of

faculty development. He also believed that such a theory should include a sophisticated understanding of the process of professionalization in historical, social, and institutional terms, along with integration into the theories of human development. Martin considers it of primary importance for teachers to gain self-fulfillment in order to be effective with students and to provide positive impact in the educative community.

In 1975, Bergquist and Phillips (5, pp. 177 -211) presented a thorough treatment of a comprehensive approach to faculty development. Their article deals with the development needs of faculty in a four-year institution of higher learning, and it includes a suggested model for effective faculty development. Many parts of the model apply to community college faculty as well. In the same vein Richardson, (110, pp. 303-311) presented a conceptual framework stressing the integration of faculty development with organizational development. He emphasized that failure to link organizational development with faculty development will lead to disappointing results from both efforts.

A June, 1975, symposium in Squaw Valley, California was the stage for a prescribed problem-solving process with 127 participants. The proceedings (106) of the conference presents twenty-three problem situations with tentative solutions and five position papers written by workshop

consultants. The outcome is a model for a workshop design on two-year campuses that includes working forms, guidelines, and reference materials. The phases of the process include brainstorming, needs assessment, resource specification, strategy development, evaluation, and redesign.

Two interesting articles appeared in the ADE Bulletin (Association of Departments of English). In the November, 1975, issue, W. T. Furniss (38) criticized the current efforts on faculty development; he was even suspicious of what was sometimes done for the purpose of promoting greater effectiveness among faculty. He argued that in the right atmosphere—one that approximates the ideal of a community of scholars—faculty members will develop on their own initiative. The rejoinder in May, 1976, by S. R. Phillips (107), purported to clarify the misconceptions that people have about the faculty development effort. He indicated that it is possible for colleges and universities to establish programs to stimulate and facilitate the full development of faculty members.

In 1976, John Centra (13) presented the results of a major survey of practices at 756 colleges and universities. The types of programs and practices were categorized into four major areas:

1.   Seminars and workshops;

2.   Evaluation of instruction;

3. Course development involving audio-visual aids and technology;

4. Institutional practices, such as teaching awards and sabbaticals.

In a 1977 report, Charles Claxton (17) describes a model of comprehensive, integrated staff development that involves instructional, organizational, and personal development.

In 1978, the Tennessee State Board of Regents sponsored a conference on improving college teaching. The conference report by Mayo and Claxton (79) included a description of the conference plan; it also included highlights from sessions on faculty development and the specific instructional improvement sessions on developmental education, individualizing instruction in various disciplines, experiential learning, and learning styles.

Also in 1978, the AACJC published Organizing Staff Development Programs That Work by the prolific faculty development author, Terry O'Banion (93). This work included guidelines for organizing a staff development program in a community college with a step-by-step description of what must occur and when in order to create a successful program. Suggestions were made concerning needs assessment, program philosophy, organization, activities, incentives and rewards, funding, and evaluation.

Along the general lines of what makes a successful program, the literature contains several items. Daniel

Wick (127, pp. 8-10) wrote in 1979 about individualizing the process of faculty development by beginning where faculty members actually are in their development and appreciating the unique situation of each individual faculty member. Hipps and Winstead (63, pp. 1-7) reported on experiences at Furman University, giving a detailed model (called the planning model) and guidelines for implementation of the simple, ten-step model in a management planning program. Johnson and Johnson (69, pp. 83-84) described an inservice workshop strategy for training teachers to create self-instructional materials. The following steps are included:

1. Defining instructional objectives;

2. Developing a post-test;

3. Choosing an instructional strategy;

4. Trying out the strategy;

5. Revising the instruction.

In 1974, Kenny Dean (30) discussed an attempt to improve instructional skills at Paducah Community College (Kentucky) through a voluntary workshop-seminar offered in cooperation with Murray State University. He described the basic commitments of the participants, and the components and results of the seminar--workshop format. He also included guidelines for continuous seminar-workshops for other institutions. Articles appeared in 1972 and again in 1976 that discussed the implications of collective

bargaining as they affect faculty development. In the 1972 article, J. H. Nelson (88) calls attention to collective bargaining as a potentially significant instrument for staff development. In 1976 article, Terry Wallace (122) concluded that the trend is toward piecemeal negotiation of provisions rather than with the goal of establishing comprehensive professional improvement programs.

Cohen and Brewer (20) in 1972 discussed the important role that faculty evaluation can play in the professional growth of the individual instructor. O'Connell and Smartt (101) wrote a summary of their Southern Regional Education Board report on improving faculty evaluation. They described the two-year (mid-1977 to mid-1979) Faculty Evaluation Project of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), which sought to promote principles of comprehensive, systematic faculty evaluation. In an eighteen-month period, the project worked closely with thirty institutions (eight were public two-year colleges) to assist them in developing such programs. At each institution there was an on-campus team that worked with the project staff to define the faculty evaluation needs of its own institution.

The report stated that one often overlooked point is the need to define the purpose of evaluation (formative or summative) at the beginning. Also, the preferred method

for development of evaluation forms was local development, with input from all concerned. A basic component to nearly every plan was either an emphasis on advancement or the consideration of faculty development.

The following four conditions were found to be necessary to the success of any faculty evaluation scheme:

strong administrative support, full and extensive faculty involvement, an available base of expertise for faculty and administration, and a generally recognized need for change in the faculty evaluation system.

Three articles appeared in the early 1970s on the induction and training of new community college faculty. Charles Collins (122) described a model program for the induction of new community college instructors that utilizes an internship format. He suggested that is a better way to ease the transition into community-college teaching. Stewart Marsh (75) suggested helping the new community-college instructor by providing him with a written handbook of information, and by introducing the new person to other departments and services through the use of a visitation format. James Hammons (57) offered suggestions for institutional training of new faculty from the institutional viewpoint. He cited the need for funds, planned activities and measurable objectives.

In 1972, Wilson, Fain, and Preslar (129) wrote a guide for conducting a teacher self-improvement program.

Included are many suggestions for helping teachers help themselves; it is a guide for use by those responsible for administering the program. Joyce and Weil (71) have more suggestions for administrators in their paper about the concepts of teacher centers; they also deal with helping teachers toward self-improvement.

Robert Birnbaum (9), Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh analyzed the roles of faculty and the usage of time. He detailed a modular calendar approach [two main semesters (each with three modules of seven, seven, and three weeks) plus a two-module summer semester], and described how faculty vary their teaching and other professional responsibilities in relation to it. He also explained the four main parts of the university's faculty development program, which are faculty research, curriculum development, university institutes, and faculty college.

Richard Gross (55), President of Gordon College in Wenham, Massachusetts, stated his general guidelines for faculty development programs in an article that supported faculty growth contracts as a tool for faculty development. His guidelines are as follows:

1. Faculty development programs must be individualized to a particular institution and its faculty;

2. A climate of readiness must be created if faculty development programs are to be accepted by future participants;

3. The faculty must sense ownership of the development program before it can be fully accepted and successful;

4. Faculty development programs must have budgetary support;

5. Provision for reward must be part of any faculty development program.

In the Spring, 1977, issue of New Directions for Community Colleges, Wanda Thomas (119) wrote about the chairperson's role in promoting better teaching. She said that the role of the chairperson is critical, but she suggested that simultaneous faculty and chairperson training along with planning and the use of a flexible approach to innovation, can result in effective instructional innovation even when there are some adverse circumstances.

In May, 1977, Charles R. Doty (31) discussed the major characteristics of the development and implementation of a professional staff development program for technical teachers. His guidelines covered long-term and short-term improvements, motivation of staff, budgeting, the legal aspects of teacher evaluation, the roles of universities, colleges, federal, state, and local agencies, special skills needed by teachers, and other administrative concerns.

In 1978, Philip Stec (116) completed his study on the theoretical and practical approaches to staff development.

He focused on the structural and philosophical frameworks that must be considered in the design, development, and implementation of comprehensive staff development programs. He discussed the complexity of institutional dynamics and the numerous agendas (which are generated during program design and implementation) in the context of their effect on initial design and subsequent developmental stages.

Summary.--The literature on general guidelines and models for faculty development contains items ranging from very theoretical to very practical in content. Theoretical treatments include the pieces that discuss guidelines for successful staff development programs by Gross (55) in 1977, Doty (31) in 1977, and Stec (116) in 1978.

Furniss (38) contributed an article on the negative aspects of institutionally fostered faculty development, and Phillips (107) rejoined with the positive aspects. Wick (127) urged in 1979 that faculty development administrators attempt to help faculty to develop from where they are professionally, instead of where they "ought" to be. Discussions of the importance of faculty evaluation in professional growth of individual faculty members came from Cohen and Brewer (20) in 1972 and O'Connell and Smartt (101) in 1979. Model programs were presented and discussed in works by Collins (22) in 1971, Freedman (37) in 1973, Bergquist and Phillips (5) in 1975, Richardson (110) in

1975, Peterson (106) in 1975, Claxton (17) in 1977, and Hipps and Winstead (63) in 1979.

The more-practical items cover several specific topics. In 1976, John Centra (13) reported the results of his national survey of staff development practices. Guidelines for inservice workshops were presented by Johnson and Johnson (69) in a 1977 article and by Dean (30) in a 1974 article. The use of a modular-calendar approach for faculty development is the topic of Birmbaum's (9) 1975 work. Marsh (75) in 1972, and Hammons (57), in 1973, presented ideas to help new community-college instructors. The implications of collective bargaining agreements for staff development are discussed by Nelson (88) in 1972 and by Wallace (122) in a 1976 article. Specific guidelines for instructional improvement are given in works by Wilson, Fain and Preslar (129) in 1972, Joyce and Weil (71) in 1973, Mayo and Claxton (79) in 1978, and O'Banion (93) in 1978.

Handbooks, Manuals, and Notebooks

This area of the literature is comprised of a small number of potentially useful and practical items. These works contain specific step-by-step guidelines and procedures, and they include such topics as "the responsibilities of the inservice coordinator" and "how to use a consultant".

Roger Garrison's (45, pp. 18-20) 1975 article, "A Mini-Manual on Inservice," contained notes and comments about faculty development. It also included a list of what inservice training should and should not be, as well as notations on the necessary commitment of the college administration.

To the people who must implement, operate, and evaluate public community college faculty and staff development programs, two other works of great potential usefulness are A Handbook for Faculty Development 1 (6) and A Handbook for Faculty Development 2 (7), by Bergquist, Phillips and Quehl. These works were published in 1975 and 1977, and they were received with great enthusiasm by inservice program administrators. These volumes contain theoretical background and exercises, instruments and handouts on such topics as models for faculty development, faculty motivation, portfolio evaluation, instructional development, course design, organizational and personal development, leadership, interpersonal skills, life planning, values clarification, program development and evaluation, the community development approach, and the evaluation of faculty development programs.

In 1976, the Project for Institutional Renewal through the Improvement of Teaching (40) published a Resource Notebook which is a collection of articles on the general subject of improving teaching and which includes sections

on faculty development and faculty evaluation. This work is particularly good for its approach of background description and theory, as well as its practical approaches.

Jim Hammons, Terry Wallace and Gordon Watts (61) collaborated on a 1978 handbook on staff development in the community college. This comprehensive handbook presented essential topics in planning, implementing, and evaluating staff development programs. The appendices included a staff development questionnaire, needs survey instruments and interview questions, and suggested topics for inclusion in a needs-assessment query. Also included are a practitioner's bibliography and a list of references.

Summary.--The area of the literature comprised of handbooks, manuals, and notebooks has a small number of potentially useful and practical items. Roger Garrison (45) contributed with notes and comments on faculty development in a "Mini-Manual on Inservice." Bergquist, Phillips, and Quehl (6; 7) have developed two handbooks containing very thorough information ranging from the theoretical background of faculty development to sample instruments and handouts for use with various faculty development projects. The Project for Institutional Renewal through the Improvement of Teaching (40) published a Resource Notebook in 1976, which is a collection of articles on background, theory, and trends of improving teaching, also

including sections on faculty development and faculty evaluation. Jim Hammons, Terry Wallace, and Gordon Watts (61) collaborated on a 1978 handbook on staff development in the community college. This comprehensive book contains planning, implementation, and evaluation guides along with suggested forms and survey instruments.

Regional and State Plans and Consortium Arrangements

One of the early articles (126) about state plans for faculty development was published in the summer of 1970 issue. The topic was the use of Florida state funds (3 per cent of the total community-college budget) for individual faculty and departmental improvement. Florida has been quite innovative in its statewide leadership of attention given to faculty development. Also presented are the philosophy, outline, and procedures for implementing a development plan. An example of Florida's continued leadership is outlined in a June, 1975, article (124), that reported the results of a 1974 survey of Florida's community-college administrators and faculty to determine their perceptions of the content and methods that should comprise a faculty inservice program. The authors recommended that faculty values, needs, and perceptions should be central to the planning of all inservice experiences.

In 1974, Adrien Beaudoin (3, pp. 28-30) described a method for creating a statewide plan for staff development

of community college faculties. Working from the Florida model, he discussed three possibly major considerations in developing a statewide plan: development of enabling legislation, organization of special task forces to prepare general state requirements, and establishment of a format allowing each college to begin a program designed to fit its particular needs.

In 1975, George R. McCormick (82) completed his study on the perceptions of selected groups concerning the role of the university in community college staff development. Results indicated that the staff development programs at many community colleges were not comprehensive or well financed. Problems were compounded by the lack of staff development officers, lack of faculty participation in staff development planning, and lack of faculty evaluation of staff development activities. University assistance to community colleges in staff development was limited to the more traditional forms of staff development activities, e.g., credit courses. A substantial amount of conflict existed between university assistance received by the community colleges and the amount of assistance stated to be available by the universities.

Publication of papers on three other statewide faculty development efforts occurred in 1975. These were in South Carolina, Alabama, and North Carolina, each report details goals, steps taken, and preliminary results (34, 108, 115).

In 1978, John Van Ast (120, pp. 34-40) developed guidelines for a personnel development system, which reported the application of a systems approach to the planning of a personnel development system, for Iowa's vocational personnel at the state's fifteen public community colleges. Success was suggested by the fact that most colleges were developing a local plan of action.

In 1973 two items dealing with interinstitutional cooperation for faculty development were published. One, by John Noonan (89, pp.93-103) was a part of Facilitating Faculty Development. The other was an article (2, pp. 32-33) on cooperative faculty development between the community college and the graduate training institution. This article reviewed a model of successful cooperation between two such institutions, New River Community College in southwestern Virginia, and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute State University.

In 1975, a lengthy report (77) was published on a conference sponsored by the National Board on Graduate Education to assess the need for improved graduate programs for present and future community college teachers. The issues raised included current trends in community college need for staff development, responses to those needs, and perspectives of graduate faculty, deans, and schools of education. Also in 1975, William Taylor (118, pp. 17-22) described the successful venture of the American Historical

Association (AHA) in faculty development for the social sciences through a consortium approach with Long Island two-year colleges. He detailed the background of the project, the results in terms of teaching effectiveness, its sources of support, and new AHA staff development projects. In 1976, John Scigliano and Eugene DuBois (133, pp. 38-39, 41) outlined an overview of Nova University's practical, problem-oriented approach to staff development. They described the Nova curriculum and discussed the cluster organization.

Quentin Bogart and Ellen Elson (10, pp. 219-30) reported in 1977 the results of their survey of community college leaders and university professors involved in community college education to determine their opinions of the current status of community college inservice education and the role of the university in community college inservice activities. They made recommendations for better inservice training and for more university participation in that training (10, pp.219-230). In 1978, Jael Zickel (134) presented a paper at the Fourth International Conference for Improving University Teaching in Aachen, Germany. He described the Center for Excellence in College Teaching of the Consortium of East Jersey that serves 1,000 faculty. Since the number of faculty served is so large, a program was developed to train faculty facilitators to strengthen the Center's resources with in-house capabilities.

Michael Parsons (104) described the Appalachian Staff Development Consortium, comprised of three community colleges and the state college in Appalachian, Maryland, in a 1978 paper. He reviewed the following five management strategies used by the steering committee to integrate activities into an operational framework: linking agent, climate developer, information disseminator, insularity reducer, and regional revitalizer.

Summary.--This section includes descriptions of several regional and state plans as well as consortium arrangements for staff development activities. The Florida plan that devotes 3 per cent of the state's community-college budget to staff development activities is described in a 1970 article (125). Another article (124) from 1975, reported the results of a 1974 survey of community college administrators and faculty in Florida which included a recommendation that faculty values, needs, and perceptions be the foremost considerations in planning all inservice experiences.

In 1974, Adrian Beaudoin (3, pp. 28-30) described three major considerations in developing a statewide plan for staff development of community college faculties. In 1975, three papers (34; 108; 115) appeared that detailed goals, steps taken, and preliminary results of statewide plans for faculty development in South Carolina, Alabama,

and North Carolina. John Van Ast (120, pp. 34-40) wrote in 1978 about guidelines for the application of a systems approach to the planning of a personnel development system for Iowa vocational personnel at the state's fifteen public community colleges.

In 1973, two items dealing with interinstitutional cooperation for faculty development were published (89, pp. 93-103; 2, pp. 32-3). Several articles and papers (10, pp. 219-30; 77; 104; 118, pp. 17-22; 133, pp. 38-9, 41; 134) have been written since 1974 that deal with consortium arrangements between community colleges and universities for community college staff development. Most of these articles describe arrangements in the northern and eastern United States and all have recommendations for improving such arrangements.

Specific Examples from the Colleges

The examples of community college staff development programs appeared in profusion in 1976. Prior to that time, such articles appeared only infrequently. One early example is a report by John Birkholz (8) about the faculty internship program at William Rainey Harper College.

In 1973 Carol Zion and Connie Sutton (135, pp. 41-51) described the role of the Miami-Dade Junior College-North office of staff and organization development. Details were given on program assumptions, evolution, organization,

offerings, administrative leadership, and results. Also in 1973, Richard Mills (85) completed his study that surveyed the perceptions of community college program directors and deans of instruction on the community college teacher preparation programs. The results indicated that the respondents felt that the community college teacher preparation programs should be strengthened, and that there should be more cooperation between community colleges and teacher preparation programs.

In 1974, Collins and Case (23) presented a paper on the on-site, programmatic approach to staff development to a conference on graduate education and the community college. In justification for their approach they point out that little, if any, budget money is allocated for staff development and that responsibility for planning and carrying out a first-rate program is too often simply added to the duties of an already busy administrator. Also in 1974, Betty Chan (15, pp. 21-25) described the staff development program at Parkland College. It is a carefully structured model program, administered by faculty, of staff development that originated in faculty interests. Chan also reviewed the background, philosophy, structure, content, and evaluation of the program. The program stresses instructional growth, individual responsibility for staff development, voluntary participation, program flexibility, and nonpunitive evaluation.

In 1976, there was a noticeable increase in the number of articles that examined the ways to approach faculty development. One article (102) described an innovative grant program, which includes elements for professional development, as established at Morgan Community College in Fort Morgan, Colorado. The Opportunity-Incentive Grant (OIG) program was developed through joint faculty and administrative effort after an objective merit system was found to be very unwieldy and a subjective merit system was found to be threatening to individuals. The purpose of the OIG is to enhance effectiveness of the college in meeting student and community needs. The intent is to create and support incentives for development and completion of progressive development activities among all full-time teaching faculty.

Another document (80) described a coordinated college-wide staff development plan at Southeastern Community College in Whiteville, North Carolina. The rationale, development, and implementation of the plan, which was devised as a result of faculty and staff input, provides for the professional development and evaluation of all college staff. The components of the plan for faculty included evaluation by students, evaluation by supervisor, and evaluation of non-instructional activities (committee work, student advisement). After consultation, all faculty members annually submitted an Individual Professional

Development Plan that specified short-and long-range goals and means of attainment which is later evaluated on the progress made toward the specified goals.

Theodore Rabb and Anita Levine (109, pp. 33-5) studied the Princeton graduate interns as a staff development program for community colleges. The internship program consisted of a one-semester introductory colloquium to the two-year institution, followed by a one-semester teaching internship, for those who desired it, at a New Jersey community college. An omnibus work, published in 1976, was Post-Secondary Personnel Development, edited by Doty and Gepner (32). This document identified exemplary personnel development programs for staff at twenty-five colleges in eighteen states. The descriptions of programs include the following elements:

1. Objectives of the program;
2. Organization of the program;
3. Cost of the program;
4. Motivation of staff;
5. Pedagogical skills emphasized;
6. Technical content emphasized;
7. Constraints on the program;
8. The evaluation process;
9. Program changes needed).

Paul L. McQuay's (84) study of vocational and staff development in the community college which was presented at the Pennsylvania Vocational Education Conference in June, 1976, described the plan and procedures for staff development at Williamsport Area Community College in Pennsylvania. Program objectives were established and questionnaires were

used to survey needs of the trustees, and the professional and classified staffs. A five-part recommendation included the following:

1.   The placement of responsibility for directing staff development;

2.   Upgrading skills and instructional techniques through volunteer workshops, industrial training subsidies, new teacher apprenticeships, trustee retreats, administrative seminars, credential upgrading, and salary credit for non-academic training programs;

3.   Orientation for new, returning and part-time staff, with audio-visual orientation for mid-year hires;

4.   Research, renewal, and self-development activities including summer research and development grants, professional meeting reports to colleagues, informal discussion groups, use of campus recreational facilities, college chartered travel, a professional library for current articles, and training of audio-tutorial materials facilitators within instructional divisions;

5.   Exchange programs of faculty with other Pennsylvania colleges.

John Cooper (25) reported on a process to develop a comprehensive professional development plan at Lansing Community College in Lansing, Michigan. Included are details about the process of needs assessment, the rationale for professional development, identification of

potential programs, and proposals for their implementation and evaluation. The results of the needs assessment survey indicated that respondents felt a serious need for clarification of the college's philosophy and in understanding of innovative instructional methods. The staff indicated a desire for opportunities to pursue advanced degrees and to obtain college credit. Workshops and institutes were preferred during summer scheduling and respondents generally indicated a preference for small-group participation in staff development activities.

In the final quarter of 1976, Glenn Johnson (68, pp. 51-57) wrote an article on Delphi-process evaluation of the effectiveness of several selected inservice training techniques to improve community college instruction. Teaching modalities and inservice training activities that showed promise of increasing student learning and teaching effectiveness were identified by twenty-five community college teachers who participated in the six-week institute for training in Flanders Interaction Analysis and questioning strategies.

Three documents with examples from colleges were published in 1977. Terry Wallace (123, pp. 65-74) wrote about the rationale and operations of the professional growth and instructional development committee at the Harrisburg Area (Pennsylvania) Community College. The history of the committee, its purposes, membership, rationale,

philosophy, operations, accomplishments, advantages and disadvantages were discussed.

Harold G. McMullen (83) presented a paper at the 57th Annual AACJC Convention in Denver in April, 1977, that described the instructional development clinic approach for faculty development at Lord Fairfax Community College. At the time the paper was written the college had for four years conducted voluntary, bi-weekly instructional development clinic sessions to provide assistance to individual faculty members asking for help on improving specific course practices. The sessions usually focused on diagnostic, prescriptive, or prognostic instructional considerations, drawing on the competencies and resources available within the college. Further, the clinic served as a sounding board for faculty concerns, giving supportive assistance to faculty research teams, and fostering a sharing relationship among faculty. The leadership was managed by the faculty on a rotating basis. David W. Cox (28, pp. 47-54) wrote about the steps taken by Broward Community College in Florida to create a caring staff community. These steps included a weekend retreat, a Wednesday activity period, and an annual community development day. Recommendations for implementation at other colleges were included.

In 1978, Howard Harris (62) reported on a flexible calendar project at Cosumnes River College in Sacramento,

California. In 1975, the traditional eighteen-week semester was reduced to sixteen weeks and a three-week intersession was added. This intersession was the focal point of change at the college, especially in its approach to learning and teaching with faculty and instructional development activities. The report included details of survey responses from students and faculty, with lists of activities and suggestions for improvements.

Another report that appeared in 1978 was by Marc Glucksman (52) and it described the flexible calendar approach for staff development at El Camino College in Torrance, California, which provided ten days during the academic year for staff development. He reported the results of evaluation questionnaires from faculty which showed that about 75 per cent of the respondents felt that the staff development program had been beneficial. In early 1978, fourteen college administrators were interviewed as to their points of view about staff development improvement. In February 1978, the Calendar Committee, after weighing the advantages and disadvantages of several options, and noting that participation in staff development activities was lower than expressed interest, and that a significant drop in student enrollment might have been related to the early-start calendar, the Committee voted to eliminate the staff development period and return to the traditional calendar.

Also in California, Mount San Jacinto College in San Jacinto developed a competency-based teacher education program. Helding Nelson's paper (87), outlines the basic structure, content, and organization of the partially self-paced program package which can be obtained from the multimedia office at the college.

A report that was sponsored by the Office of Education (DHEW) (74) on the application of the Management Organization Systems Technique (MOST) at Wayne County Community College in Detroit, Michigan was published in May, 1978. This publication was the fifth of a six-part series, and it described the staffing and staff development component that is committed to a vigorous, institution-wide approach to optimizing staff performance and enhancing opportunities for professional growth. MOST first identifies the organizational structure of a college in terms of its relationship to a set of prescribed objectives, and then it clearly defines the responsibilities for each job. Staff recruitment and selection are based on the matching of individual capabilities with institutional needs. The on-going staff development uses professional conferences and seminars, on-the-job training, sabbatical leaves and formal classroom instruction. Success in the staffing and staff development sub-system of MOST is equated to continual upgrading of the

effectiveness of staff members and the most appropriate use of each individual's capabilities.

An article published in September, 1978, by John Cooper and others (26) is also concerned with a Michigan college. It reports on the third year of the Professional Development Program at Lansing Community College, and it included a discussion of alternative approaches to professional development in the appendix. A professional development laboratory and office is in support of individuals, programs, and divisions throughout the college that are relative to needs assessment and evaluation, campus-wide programs, and maintaining quality instructional programs.

In April, 1979, Victor Garlock (43) presented a paper at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association reporting the results of surveys at Cayuga County Community College in Auburn, New York. This research attempted to determine who participates in faculty development programs. A strong correlation significant to the .01 level was found to exist between faculty participation and faculty competence, which means that those faculty members rated as most effective participated more often in the workshops and seminars. Another significant finding was that participation was greater among untenured faculty, whose job security is the most threatened. In essence, his results seem to support the idea that faculty

development efforts tend to help those most who need help the least.

Finally, in 1979, the University of Florida presented audio tapes of sessions by various faculty development authorities at the third annual conference on faculty development. The list was published in article form, and it contained titles encompassing all areas of faculty and staff development (73, pp. 11-13).

Summary.--Descriptions of faculty development programs at specific community colleges have appeared much more frequently since 1976. The articles and papers usually include the history of the particular college's program, the rationale, and goals and objectives; results of some sort of survey or evaluation technique are also included. Some programs are described as tremendous successes, others as hardly worth the effort.

Most staff development programs discussed in the literature have some kind of different or unusual approach. Examples of unusual techniques are (1) the coordinated college-wide staff development plan at Southeastern Community College in Whiteville, North Carolina (80), (2) the Princeton graduate internship program (109), (3) the comprehensive professional development plan at Lansing (Michigan) Community College (25), (4) the instructional development clinic approach for faculty development at Lord

Fairfax Community College (83), (5) the flexible calendar project at Cosumnes River College in Sacramento, California (62), (6) the competency-based teacher education program at Mount San Jacinto (California) College (87), and (7) the application of the Management Organization Systems Technique (MOST) at Wayne County (Detroit, Michigan) Community College (74).

Teacher Impressions of Faculty Development

Relatively few pieces have appeared in the literature of faculty development that address teacher impressions. The earliest item was an October, 1972, article (114, pp. 14-19) in which seven educators from around the country discussed the "People for the People's Colleges" (105) report and made observations on the status and need for faculty and staff development in community colleges.

In 1973, Ronald Mongano (86, pp. 208-210) explored the relationship between faculty attitudes and the teaching improvement finding that faculty with good attitudes tend to seek improvement. In November of the same year, John E. Croy (29, pp. 28-29) produced a report on his study of the feelings of various community college personnel about inservice programs. He reported that these administrators and faculty preferred that inservice development programs be organized and administered by the individual institutions rather than by state, region, and so forth; they also

opposed the organization and administration of inservice faculty development by outside experts.

Charles Novak (91) completed his study in 1974 on the perceptions of selected community college staff toward inservice staff development programs in Illinois community colleges. The data reveal a broad range of differences in perception between administrators, faculty, and division chairpersons. Administrators generally viewed the components of inservice faculty development to be more desirable than did either the faculty or the division chairpersons.

Jabker and Halinski's (66, pp. 15-17) 1977 research study on the relationship between instructional development and faculty rewards in higher education indicated that, for the faculty studied, their colleagues were unwilling to recognize their efforts to improve instruction. The conclusion reached is that effective instructional development programs are contingent on an effective reward system.

Also in 1977, Novak and Barnes (90, pp. 11-18) described the results of a survey of Illinois and Florida faculty, student personnel workers, and administrators. The study indicated differences and similarities of attitudes toward inservice development programs. Included in the study were purposes, outcomes, administration, formats, rewards and incentives, and evaluation.

Charlotte Mastellar (78, pp. 25-29) reported the results in 1978 of her study of community college business

teachers perceptions of professional growth and development programs. Five specific recommendations were made that were based on twenty-four listed study findings and conclusions. The recommendations included the following:

1. That differences in personal characteristics be considered in the development of professional growth and development programs;

2. That teachers are most interested in participating in learning experiences to develop competencies for the roles they perceive as most important and that specific role competencies should be given first priority for professional growth and development programs;

3. That professional growth and development programs should be based on teacher self-evaluation;

4. That a variety of professional growth and development programs should be made available;

5. That since teachers have different needs and interests, professional growth and development programs should offer a variety of learning experiences to accommodate these differences.

Sebetha Jenkins (67) completed her study in 1978 of the perceptions of selected administrators and faculty toward faculty inservice training programs in Mississippi junior colleges. Results indicated a high degree of congruity between administrators and faculty members relative to the importance of goals and outcome of faculty inservice

training programs. Vocational education faculty perceived as essential the goal that related to increasing opportunities for them to work with people in industries that related to their teaching fields. Faculty who had worked in "other" fields prior to joining the present institution emphasized goal-outcome statements that related to (1) developing greater competency in subject area, (2) increasing opportunities for faculty to work with people in related industries, (3) using human relations skills in order to communicate more effectively, and (4) developing and evaluating student-centered programs.

Robin Buchan's (11, pp. 1-17) 1979 report on teachers' perspective on community college faculty development included a lengthy discussion of the reasons why teachers tend to be suspicious of faculty development. Many teachers felt that faculty development programs were a euphemism for "teacher performance evaluation," and that many hastily-conceived programs were generally bad experiences. Another interesting finding is that the teachers maintained that no serious student of staff development would credit any instant improvements simply from implementing a program. Buchan cited E. H. Jabker (65, p. 175) who said basically that no matter how effective the faculty development program, it is not likely to alter the ways in which most faculty members teach and think and all that can be expected are relatively small changes. Further,

Buchan stated, the viewpoint of many teachers is that faculty development programs have been aimed not at support but have, rather, been attempts to solve what the administrators think are the institutional problems related to teaching. Buchan concluded by reiterating that any faculty development programs undertaken must be consistent with the personality and goals of the affected faculty.

Geis and Smith (47) presented a paper in 1979 on professors' perceptions of teaching and learning and the implications of those perceptions for faculty development. Geis and Smith suggest that many professors have difficulty in talking about (perhaps, in conceptualizing) teaching. The most important need identified by these teachers is to increase content expertise. Also suggested is the idea that underuse of instructional and faculty development resources may be related to views that teaching is not a discipline and that teaching improvement is merely a personal or individual activity.

Summary.--Relatively few studies have appeared in the literature of faculty development that address teacher impressions. An item from 1972 contained impressions of seven educators around the country that pointed out the need for faculty development, providing sketches of faculty development problems and programs (114, pp. 14-19). Several studies have explored the perceptions of faculty

and administrative groups about inservice programs, with most exposing various differences in perception and weaknesses or lack of programs (29, pp. 28-29; 66, pp. 15-17; 67; 78, pp. 25-29; 86, pp. 208-10; 90, pp. 11-18). A different approach was taken by Robin Buchan (11) who explored the negative teacher impressions of faculty development; he made a strong plea for faculty development programs to be made consistent with the personality and goals of the affected faculty. Geis and Smith's paper (47) on professors' perceptions of teaching and learning and the implications for faculty development suggested that many professors have difficulty in talking about (perhaps, in conceptualizing) teaching. The most important need identified by the teachers studied is to increase content expertise.

Summary

The literature of community college faculty development suggests that a great need for inservice development programs exists, and that a substantial amount of effort is being made in faculty development. The literature does suggest that many common factors exist in community college faculty development programs, and that there are also many differences between individual community colleges. The literature also agrees on the need for a coordinated effort to identify, collect, report, and distribute information

concerning effective faculty development programs. Connie Sutton (117, p. 5) says that there is a great need for all community colleges to measure and record the positive impact of faculty development and that this should be done even if it is only to secure the necessary funding to continue such activities and programs.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alvarado, Andrew, and Elizabeth Rinnander, "Sources and Information: Developing Staff Potential," _New Directions for Community Colleges_, 5 (Autumn 1977), 103-110.

2. Atwell, Charles A. and Robert W. Sullivan, "Cooperative Faculty Development," _Community and Junior College Journal_, 44 (November 1973), 32-33.

3. Beaudoin, Adrien P., "A State Plan for Staff Development," _Community College Frontiers_, 2, 2. (Winter 1974), 28-30.

4. Bender, Louis W., "Government Actions Affecting Staff Development," _New Staff for New Students_, Washington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974, pp. 41-54.

5. Bergquist, William H., and Steven R. Phillips, "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program," _Journal of Higher Education_, 46, No.2 (March-April, 1975), 177-211.

6. Bergquist, W. H., S. R. Phillips, and G. Quehl, _A Handbook for Faculty Development_ 1, Washington, Council for Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

7. _____, A Handbook for Faculty Development_ 2, Berkeley, Pacific Soundings Press, 1977.

8. Birkholz, John R., _A Faculty Internship Program for William Rainey Harper College_, Bethesda, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 035 407, 1969.

9. Birnbaum, Robert, "Using the Calendar for Faculty Development," _Educational Record_, edited by Clifford B. Fair, 56, No. 4 (Fall 1975), 226-230.

10. Bogart, Quentin J. and Ellen A. Elson, "Role of the University in Community College In-Service Education," _Community/Junior College Research Quarterly_, 1, 3, (April-June 1977), 219-230.

11. Buchan, Robin G., "Community College Staff Develop-
     ment: The Teachers' Perspective," unpublished
     paper presented at the Community College Social
     Science Association Conference, San Diego, March,
     1979.

12. Carpenter, Robert Scott, "Instructional Competencies
     and Implementation Methods for Community College
     Faculty Service Programs," unpublished doctoral
     dissertation, Gainesville, The University of
     Florida, 1974.

13. Centra, John A., Faculty Development Practices in U.S.
     Colleges and Universities, Princeton, Educational
     Testing Service, 1976.

14. _____, Strategies for Improving College
     Teaching, Washington, American Association for
     Higher Education, 1972.

15. Chan, Betty, "Branching Out: The Staff Development
     Program at Parkland College," Community College
     Frontiers, 2, No. 2, (Winter 1974), 21-5.

16. Claxton, Charles S., Community College Staff Develop-
     ment: Basic Issues in Planning, Atlanta,
     Southern Regional Education Board, 1976.

17. _____, "Comprehensive Staff Development
     in the Community College: Implications for the
     Office of Institutional Research and Planning,"
     Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 1
     (July-September 1977), 397-408.

18. Clements, Clyde C., Jr., "Staff Development for Com-
     munity Education Teachers," Faculty Development
     and Evaluation Newspaper, 5, No. 2 (Summer 1979),
     10-13.

19. Cohen, Arthur M., "Towards A Professional Faculty,"
     New Directions for Community Colleges, 1, (Spring
     1973), 101-117.

20. Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brewer, "Evaluating
     Faculty," Community Colleges, 4, 7, (September
     1972), 33a-33d.

21. Collin, W. J., "Staff Development: An Organizational
     Skill for Survival," paper presented at the
     International Institute on the Community College,
     Sarnia, Ontario, June 12-15, 1978.

22. Collins, Charles, "The Induction of Community College Instructors: An Internship Model," Bethesda, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 056 684, 1971.

23. Collins, Charles C. and Chester H. Case, "The On-Site, Programmatic Approach to Staff Development," paper presented at the Conference on Graduate Education and the Community College, ED 101 780, Warrenton, Virginia, November, 1974.

24. Colman, Clyde H., "Organization and Administration of In-Service Programs for Public Junior College Teachers," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lincoln, University of Nebraska, 1968.

25. Cooper, John D., "Professional Development Plan, Lansing Community College, 1976-77," Lansing, Michigan, ED 140 923, September 1976.

26. Cooper, John, and others, "Professional Development Plan, Lansing Community College, Lansing, Michigan, ED 162 688, September, 1978.

27. Coward, Tamara B., "Professional Development in Higher Education," Advanced Institutional Development Program Two-Year College Consortium: Central YMCA Community Coll., Chicago, Illinois, 1978.

28. Cox, David W., "Creating a Caring Community," New Directions for Community Colleges, 5, No. 5, (Autumn 1977), 47-59.

29. Croy, John E., "How Do You Feel About In-Service Programs?", Community and Junior College Journal, 44 (November, 1973), 28-29.

30. Dean, Kenny S., "In-Service Workshops for Community College Teachers," Community College Frontiers, 2, No. 2, (Winter, 1974), 26-7.

31. Doty, Charles R., "Major Characteristics in the Development and Implementation of a Professional Staff Development Program for Technical Teachers," Canadian Vocational Journal, 13, No. 1, (May 1977), 5-11.

32. Doty, Charles R., and Ronald Gepner, editors., Post-Secondary Personnel Development, Vol. 2, Mercer County Community College, Trenton, New Jersey, Department of Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, 1976.

33. Edefelt, Roy A., "In-Service Education of Teachers: Priority for the Next Decade," _Journal of Teacher Education,_ 25 (Summer, 1974), 250-252.

34. _Faculty and Staff Development Manual for South Carolina Technical Education System._ Columbia, South Carolina State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, July, 1975.

35. _Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment,_ New Rochelle, The Group for Human Development in Higher Education, 1974.

36. Fordyce, Joseph W., "Faculty Development in American Community Junior Colleges," _Peabody Journal of Education,_ 48 (January, 1971), 270-275.

37. Freedman, Mervin, editor, _Facilitating Faculty Development,_ San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1973.

38. Furniss, W. T., "Faculty Development and the Department," _ADE Bulletin,_ (Association of Departments of English), 47, (November, 1975), 30-35.

39. Gaff, Jerry G., "Current Issues in Faculty Development and Evaluation," _Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper,_ edited by Dr. Albert B. Smith, Gainesville, 3, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 2-4.

40. _____, "Faculty Evaluation," _Resource Notebook_ IX-1 to IX-5, Project on Institutional Renewal through the Improvement of Teaching, Washington, June, 1976.

41. _____, _Toward Faculty Renewal,_ San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1975.

42. Gaff, Sally Shake, "Faculty Development," _Resource Notebook,_ VII-1 to VII-14, Washington, Project on Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching, June, 1976, VII-1 to VII-14.

43. Garlock, Victor P., _Faculty Development at the Community College: Who Participates,_ unpublished paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, ED 168 621, April, 1979.

44. Garrison, Roger H., _Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems,_ Washington, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

45. Garrison, Roger H., "A Mini-Manual on In-Service," Community and Junior College Journal, 45, No. 9, (June-July, 1975), 18-20.

46. _____, "Report of the 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges," New Staff for New Students, Washington, 1974, pp. 138-150.

47. Geis, George L., and Ron Smith, "Professors' Perceptions of Teaching and Learning: Implications for Faculty Development," unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1979.

48. Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr., "Beyond the Open Door: The Open College," Community and Junior College Journal, 45 (August-September, 1974), 16, 17, 28, 29.

49. _____, "Faculty Development Project," Junior College Journal, 38 (April, 1968), 7.

50. _____, Responding to the New Spirit of Learning, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, 1976.

51. _____, "What Now for the Community Colleges?" Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (December/January, 1973), 9-13.

52. Glucksman, Marc, "Flexible Calendar and Staff Development 1977-1978," Maryland, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 156 227, March, 1978.

53. Goodwin, Gregory, and James C. Young, "Increasing Productivity in the Community College," Topical Paper Number 67, ED 156 239, (July 1978).

54. Gray, H. L., Staff Development, North East London Polytechnic (England), Division of Staff and Educational Development, January, 1978.

55. Gross, Richard, "Faculty Growth Contracts," Educational Horizons, 55, No.2 (Winter, 1976-77), 74-79.

56. Hammons, James O., "Faculty Development in the Community College: A Discussion Paper," at St. Louis, Missouri, National Conference on Faculty Development in Two-Year Postsecondary Institutions, January, 1976.

57. _____, "Suggestions Concerning Institutional Training of New Faculty," Community College Review, 1, No. 2 (July-August, 1973), 49-60.

58. Hammons, James O., and Terry H. Smith Wallace, An Assessment of Staff Development Needs in the Northeastern United States, University Park, The Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 1976.

59. _____, "Planning for Staff Development," Community College Frontiers, 3, No. 1, (Fall, 1974), 36-43.

60. _____, "Staff Development Needs of Public Community College Department/Division Chairpersons," Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 2, No. 1 (October-December 1977), 55-76.

61. Hammons, Jim, Terry H. Smith Wallace, and Gordon Watts, "Staff Development in the Community College: A Handbook," California University, Los Angeles, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, June, 1978.

62. Harris, Howard L., "Intersession '78: A Report for the Flexible Calendar Project," Bethesda, Maryland, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 154 862, 1978.

63. Hipps, G. Melvin and Philip C. Winstead, "Faculty Development: A Planned Approach at Furman University," Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper, edited by Albert B. Smith, 5, No.1, (Spring, 1979), 1-7.

64. In-Service Training for Two-Year College Faculty and Staff: A Survey of Junior and Community College Administrators. Washington, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

65. Jabker, E. H., "Initiating Faculty Development Programs: Some Observations," *Planning and Changing*, 8 (March, 1977), 171-184.

66. Jabker, Eugene H. and Ronald S. Halinski, "Instructional Development and Faculty Reward in Higher Education," *Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper*, 3, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 15-17.

67. Jenkins, Sebetha Lee, "The Perceptions of Selected Administrators and Faculty Toward Faculty Inservice Training Programs in Junior Colleges of Mississippi," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Mississippi State, Mississippi State University, 1978.

68. Johnson, Glenn R., "Delphi-Process Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Selected In-Service Training Techniques to Improve Community/Junior College Instruction," *Community/Junior College Research Quarterly*, 1, No. 1, (October-December, 1976), 51-57.

69. Johnson, Rita B., and Stuart R. Johnson, "A Strategy for Inservice Instructional Development," *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 5, No. 3 (Autumn, 1977), 83-9.

70. Jones, Vauncille Braddy, "Administrative and Faculty Perceptions of Staff Development Needs in the Los Angeles Community College District," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Los Angeles, University of Southern California, 1978.

71. Joyce, Bruce R. and Marsha Weil, "Concepts of Teacher Centers," Bethesda, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 075 375, 1973.

72. Kilpatrick, Gordon, "In-Service Education with Recommendations Concerning Its Implementation in American Junior Colleges," Bethesda, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 020 721, 1967.

73. "A List of Audio-Tape Cassettes Now Available from the Third Annual Conference on Faculty Development: Lessons Learned and Unfinished Agendas," *Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper*, 5, No. 1, (Spring, 1979), 11-13.

74. Management Organization Systems Technique: A Management System for Higher Education Staffing and Staff Development, No. 5 of 6 in series, Detroit, Michigan: Wayne County Community College, Sponsoring Agency: Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, 1978.

75. Marsh, Stewart, "Helping the New Community College Instructor," College Management, 7, No. 8 (August, 1972), 26-27.

76. Martin, W. B., "Faculty Development as Human Development," Liberal Education, 61 (May, 1975), Washington, Association of American Colleges, 187-96.

77. Martorana, S.V., William Toombs and David W. Breneman, eds., Graduate Education and Community College Cooperative Approaches to Community College Staff Development, Technical Report No. 5, ED 111 479, Washington, National Board on Graduate Education, August, 1975.

78. Mastellar, Charlotte, "Community College Business Teacher Perceptions of Professional Growth and Development Programs," Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 20, No. 3, (July, 1978), 25-9.

79. Mayo, C. Douglas, and Charles S. Claxton, Conference Report: Improving College Teaching, ED 157 494, Memphis, Tennessee: Memphis State University, 1978.

80. McCarter, W. Ronald, and Charles E. Grigsby, Staff Development: A Community College Plan. ED 129 359, Whiteville, Southeastern Community College.

81. McClelland, William A., and David S. Bushnell, "A Futuristic Look at Training," New Staff for New Students, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, 1974, pp. 10-22.

82. McCormick, George Robert, "The Perceptions of Selected Groups Concerning the Role of the University in Community College Staff Development," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Auburn University, 1975.

83. McMullen, Harold G., "The Instructional Clinic and Staff Development: When Faculty Come From Behind the Classroom Door," paper presented at the 57th Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, ED 144 630, Denver, Colorado, April, 1977.

84. McQuay, Paul L., "Vocational and Staff Development in the Community College," unpublished paper presented at the Pennsylvania Vocational Education Conference, ED 148 449, Seven Springs, Pennsylvania, June, 1976.

85. Mills, Richard Ottis, "An Assessment of Selected Community College Teacher Preparation Programs as Perceived by Program Directors and the Dean of Instruction of the Community or Junior College They Serve," unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, College of Education, Commerce, 1973.

86. Mongano, Ronald M., "Faculty Attitudes and Teaching Improvement," Improving College and University Teaching, 21 (Summer, 1973), 208-210.

87. Nelson, Hilding E., Competency Based Teacher Education for Community College Instructors: A Partly Self-Instructional Staff Development Program, ED 158 829, Mount San Jacinto College, San Jacinto, California, April, 1978.

88. Nelson, James H., "Collective Bargaining: An Instrument for Staff Development," Community and Junior College Journal, 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), 27.

89. Noonan, John F., "Faculty Development Through Experimentation and Interinstitutional Cooperation," Facilitating Faculty Development, edited by M. Mervin Freedman, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1973, pp. 93-103.

90. Novak, Charles R., and Barbara K. Barnes, "Florida and Illinois: Views on Staff Development," New Directions for Community Colleges, 5, No. 3 (Autumn, 1977), 11-8.

91. Novak, Charles Richard, "The Perceptions of Selected Community College Staff towards Inservice Staff Development Programs in Illinois Community Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, 1974.

92. O'Banion, Terry, "A Catalyst for Staff Development," Community and Junior College Journal, 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), 12-13.

93. _____, Organizating Staff Development Programs that Work, Washington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978.

94. _____, "Patterns of Staff Development. Toward Professional Faculty Patterns," New Directions for Community Colleges, edited by Arthur Cohen, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, Spring, 1973, pp. 9-29.

95. _____, "Staff Development: A New Priority for the Seventies," The College Board Review, 99 (Spring, 1976), 26-33.

96. _____, "Staff Development: Priorities for the Seventies," Community and Junior College Journal, 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), 10-11.

97. _____, "Staff Development: A Priority on Persons," New Staff for New Students, Washington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

98. _____, "Staff Development for Student Development," Community College Frontiers, 2, No. 2, (Winter, 1974), 12-20.

99. _____, "Teachers for Tomorrow: One Year Later," Community and Junior College Journal 44 (November, 1973), 10-13.

100. _____, Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community - Junior Colleges, Tucson, The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

101. O'Connell, William R. and Steven H. Smartt, Improving Faculty Evaluation: A Trial in Strategy, Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1979.

102. Opportunity/Incentive Grant. Fort Morgan, Morgan Community College, 1976.

103. Parker, Paul W. and Patrick W. Parker, Kansas Community Colleges: Assessing Staff Development Needs, Kansas State College of Pittsburgh, 1978.

104. Parsons, Michael H., "Targets of Opportunity: Strategies for Managing a Staff Development Consortium," paper presented at the Northeast Regional Conference of the National Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development, ED 161 485, Mt. Laurel, November 1978, ED 161 485.

105. People for the People's Colleges: Community-Junior College Staff. Washington, D.C.: Priorities National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, ED 061 942, 1973.

106. Peterson, Gary T., editor ,Staff Development: Mini Models for College Implementation, proceedings of a conference, Squaw Valley, California, June 24-26, 1975.

107. Phillips, S. R., "What, Then, Is Faculty Development?" ADE Bulletin (Association of Departments of English), No. 49 (May, 1976), 11-17.

108. Preus, Paul K., and Douglas F. Williams, "Statewide Community College Faculty Development: A Personalized Approach," unpublished paper, ED 118 168, November, 1975.

109. Rabb, Theodore K., and Anita E. Levine, "Princeton Graduate Interns: A Staff Development Program for Community Colleges," Community and Junior College Journal, 46 (March, 1976), 33-35.

110. Richardson, Richard C., Jr., "Staff Development: A Conceptual Framework," Journal of Higher Education, 46, No. 1 (1975), 303-311.

111. Samlin, J. R., "Inservice Education in American Public Junior Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Normal, Illinois State University, 1967.

112. Schultz, Raymond E., "Low Turnover Creates Staff Development Problems," Community College Review, 1, No. 1 (April, 1973), 22-8.

113. Scigliano, John A., and Eugene E. DuBois, "Staff Development: Nova Style," Community and Junior College Journal, 55, No. 2 (October, 1976), 38-39, 41.

114. "Some Perspectives on Staff Development," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (October, 1972), 14-19.

115. Staff Development: A Profile of Local Institutional
     Effort. Raleigh, North Carolina State Department
     of Community Colleges, ED 139 465, December,
     1975.

116. Stec, Philip Joseph, "Staff Development: Approaches
     in Theory and Practice," unpublished doctoral
     dissertation, College of Education, Amherst,
     University of Massachusetts, 1978.

117. Sutton, Connie, and George W. Armfield, "Staff
     Development for Small/Rural Community Colleges:
     Effective Renewal with Less Resources," paper
     presented at the First National Conference on
     Small/Rural Colleges, Blacksburg, Virginia,
     August, 1978.

118. Taylor, William R., "A Consortium Approach to Faculty
     Renewal," New Directions for Community Colleges,
     1, No. 2, (Winter, 1975), 17-22.

119. Thomas, Wanda E., "The Chairperson's Role In Promoting
     Better Teaching," New Directions for Community
     Colleges, 5, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 13-18.

120. Van Ast, John, "Guidelines for a Personnel Development
     System," Journal of Epsilon Pi Tau, (Spring,
     1978), 34-40.

121. Vincent, William E., "Locked In and Locked Out,"
     Community and Junior College Journal, 50, No. 5
     (February, 1980), 54-55.

122. Wallace, Terry H. Smith, "Provision for Community Col-
     lege Faculty Development in Collective Bargaining
     Agreements," Research in Higher Education, 4, No.
     4, 1976, 381-92.

123. _____, "The Staff Development
     Committee: A Model for Instructional Change,"
     New Directions for Community Colleges, 5, No. 1
     (Spring, 1977), 65-74.

124. Wattenbarger, James L., and Robert S. Carpenter, "Fac-
     ulty Development: Let Teachers Take the Initia-
     tive," Community College Review, 3, No. 1 (June,
     1975), 25-30.

125. Wetzler, Wilson F., "A Breakthrough for Faculty and
     Program Development," Junior College Journal, 40,
     No. 9 (June-July, 1970), 13-15.

126. White, Marvin, "A Study of the Relationship of Selected Faculty Characteristics and Faculty Development Needs as Perceived by Faculty Members in Mississippi Public Junior Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Hattiesburg, University of Southern Mississippi, 1977.

127. Wick, Daniel L., "Towards a Phenomenological Approach to Faculty Development," Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper, edited by Albert B. Smith, 5, No. 2 (Summer, 1979), 8-10.

128. Williams, Harrison, "Introduction of Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969, S. 1033," Congressional Record: Senate, February 17, 1969, 3,435.

129. Wilson, Leon L., James H. Fain, and Otis M. Preslar, "A Guide for Conducting a Teacher Self-Improvement Program," Bethesda, Maryland, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 079 259, 1972.

130. Wilson, Reginald, "Humanizing Community-Junior College Environment: Toward Change--Staff Development," paper presented at American Association of Community and Junior Colleges National Convention, ED 088 555 (February, 1974).

131. Wilson, Richard E., "Staff Development an Urgent Priority," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (June-July, 1973), 68-69.

132. Yarrington, Roger, editor, Educational Opportunities for All: New Staff for New Students, Washington, Report of the 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

133. _____, "Introduction," New Staff for New Students, Washington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

134. Zickel, Jael Noam, "A Consortium Approach to Faculty Development: Use of Faculty Facilitators to Enhance Teaching Performance," paper presented at the Fourth International Conference for Improving University Teaching, Aachen, Germany, July, 1978.

135. Zion, Carol, and Connie Sutton, "Integrated In-Service Development, Towards a Professional Faculty," 1, New Directions for Community Colleges, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1973, 41-51.

CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents a description of the methods used for data collection and analysis. Included are discussions of the sample, the instrument, and the treatment.

Population of this Study

The population from which the sample for this study was drawn was comprised of all full-time faculty members employed during the 1979-80 academic year in the selected Texas public community colleges; this number totaled 2,000 persons. The population was divided into the two groups of Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical faculty members. The sample was made up of faculty from each group who had participated in faculty development activities. The colleges selected were those which had faculty development programs as reflected by the inclusion of the name of a representative from the college in the Directory of Human Resources of the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (4). This source yielded a list of sixteen urban public community colleges in Texas. The colleges were assigned numbers from 1 to 16 for reference purposes. The administrators of the college which was

designated as number 9 decided not to participate in the study. Therefore, although the college identification numbers range from 1 to 16, there are only 15 colleges represented in the data.

The sample consisted of approximately one-fourth of the full-time faculty members in Arts and Sciences and in Vocational-Technical disciplines, or 490 faculty members. Full-time faculty were chosen because they were more likely to be interested and to have participated in faculty development.

The sample was selected in the following way. The faculty directory from each institution was used as the source for lists of both full-time Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical faculty members from each of the fifteen colleges. A copy of the list for each institution was sent to the person functioning as staff development coordinator. The coordinators were asked (1) to strike from the list the name of any person who had not participated in faculty development, and (2) to strike the name of any persons no longer employed at the institution and to substitute names of others who had participated in faculty development and who were not already on the list. When each list was returned, a name was randomly selected from the first page of the Arts and Sciences list from each institution (by throwing a single die), and every fourth name was selected. The same procedure was used to obtain

the same proportion of the Vocational-Technical faculty members who had participated in faculty development at each institution. The random selection of the first name removed potential bias from the sample selection process.

Questionnaires for the chosen faculty members were distributed by the staff development coordinator at each institution. Stamped return envelopes were attached to the questionnaires so that the subjects could freely answer the questions with the assurance that the coordinator could not examine their responses. The envelopes were coded to indicate the college and group of the faculty member, and the returns were checked against the master list. Since a 70.4 per cent return was received as a result of the first mailing, a second mailing was not necessary. The return percentages did vary widely from college to college and between the Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical groups within each college. The highest response rate was a phenomenal 96 per cent of the surveyed Arts and Sciences faculty from one college, and the lowest response rate was zero per cent of the surveyed Vocational-Technical faculty at another college.

Instrument

The data were gathered using a survey instrument (Appendix A) that is a derivation of two survey instruments which were developed through similar research projects.

The survey instrument was tested in a pilot study using the full-time faculty of Amarillo College to determine the feasibility of using the instrument for this study. All full-time faculty were given questionnaires and the rate of return was 68 per cent within two weeks.

Both of the source instruments were published in A Handbook for Faculty Development, by Bergquist and Phillips (2). The authors prefaced both volumes with invitations to use, modify or develop this material in ways appropriate to the user (1, p. vii).

Items used from the first source instrument, the Professional Development Questionnaire, were those designed to survey the faculty backgrounds, professional development objectives and the sense of institutional support for professional development. The Professional Development Questionnaire was designed, piloted, and revised on two occasions. It was given initially to faculty at six liberal arts colleges and two universities across the country. The questionnaire included items from the Lipsett and Ladd surveys of faculty attitudes (1, p. 31).

The remaining items on the survey instrument were from the Faculty Questionnaire that was devised for use in the Project on Institutional Renewal through the Improvement of Teaching as a means for helping teams from each campus learn about the experiences, views and perceptions of large

numbers of their faculty colleagues. The faculty questionnaire drew heavily on earlier instruments. The greatest legacy was to the "Faculty Characteristics Questionnaire," which was developed by Robert C. Wilson and others (1, p. 44).

Other sources consulted were a faculty questionnaire prepared under the leadership of Martin Trow, University of California, Berkeley, for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, and a faculty questionnaire devised by Joseph Katz and his colleagues at the State University of New York, Stony Brook (1, p. 44). The questionnaire for this study does include one open-ended question to allow subjects to express their perceptions of faculty development and its rewards.

Treatment

The questionnaires returned were coded as to college number and whether the respondent was an Arts and Sciences or Vocational-Technical faculty member. Each questionnaire also was assigned a number within the college and discipline to which the respondent belonged. The data were then encoded onto magnetic floppy diskette for use in computer analysis. Four different computer programs were used to summarize the responses to each question according to discipline, college, and total.

In subsequent sections of this study, the major findings are described and reported in tabular form to indicate either frequencies and percentages of respondents in each group of faculty members or frequencies and means of responses. Responses to many of the items were coded on a scale of zero to four or five. All data have been summarized and reported for each of the two groups of faculty members in total and by categories or within each institution. The small number of zero responses did not affect the totals. Institutions have been referred to by a reference number rather than by name. Since there are no data for college number 9, it does not appear in any of the tables.

The demographic data (age, sex, years of service, professional rank, and highest degree earned) have been reported as means for each of the two groups of faculty members. Some of these data are also reported by individual institutions for comparison purposes.

Opinions about institutional innovations and rewards were compiled by institution, and differences between opinions of the Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical faculty members within and between are noted. This contrast is valid because all of the selected institutions are public community colleges in urban areas.

In order to test the significance of an obtained difference, the Standard Error of the difference is computed.

Then, from the difference between the sample means and the Standard Error of the difference, it can be determined whether a difference probably exists between the population means. A difference is called significant when the probability is so high that it cannot be attributed to chance and hence represents a true difference between population means. A difference is nonsignificant or from chance when it appears reasonably certain that it could easily have arisen from sampling fluctuations, and hence, imples no real or true difference between population means.

Whether the mean difference is large enough to indicate a significant difference is determined by computing a critical ratio (CR) by dividing the difference between the sample means by its Standard Error. When the Ns (Number of subjects) of the samples are large (30 or more is large), the distribution of CRs is known to be normal around the true difference between the population means. When a CR is 1.96 or more, the null hypothesis is rejected at the .05 level of significance. If the CR is 2.58 or larger, then the null hypothesis is rejected at the .01 level of significance (3, pp. 213-215).

To test if a true difference exists between two percentages, a pooled estimate of P, the population percentage can be determined, and then Q (Q is the residual percentage) and P thus estimated can be inserted into a formula to give the Standard Error of the difference between the

two sample percentages. This Standard Error of the dif-
ference can be used to calculate a Critical Ratio (CR)
which can be measured directly along the baseline of the
sampling distribution of differences to determine whether
the percentage difference is significant. The difference
is significant at the .05 level if CR is 1.96 or greater
and is significant at the .01 level if CR is 2.58 or
greater (3, pp. 234-237).

The findings are derived from the presence or absence
of significant differences between the means or percentages
of the responses of the two groups of faculty members.
Conclusions are drawn from the findings and recommendations
are based on the conclusions.

CHAPTER III

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bergquist, William H., Steven R. Phillips, and G. Quehl, <u>A</u> <u>Handbook</u> <u>for</u> <u>Faculty</u> <u>Development</u>, <u>1</u>, Washington, Council for Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

2. _____, <u>A</u> <u>Handbook</u> <u>for</u> <u>Faculty</u> <u>Development</u>, <u>2</u>, Berkeley, Pacific Soundings Press, 1977.

3. Garrett, Henry Edward, <u>Statistics</u> <u>in</u> <u>Psychology</u> <u>and</u> <u>Education</u>, 6th ed., New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1966.

4. National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, <u>Directory</u> <u>of</u> <u>Human</u> <u>Resources</u>, 1978.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

The purposes of this chapter are (1) to present a descriptive analysis, as reflected by responses to the questionnaire, of certain personal and professional traits of those community college faculty members who comprise the sample for the study, and (2) to present an analysis of their perceptions about faculty development. The data are presented in both tabular and narrative form. The section on personal and professional traits is followed by the data applicable to each of the research questions as stated in Chapter I.

Personal Traits

The personal traits included are the age and sex of each respondent. These data are presented and discussed for the Arts and Sciences faculty as compared to the Vocational-Technical faculty. Data for individual colleges are also presented and detailed where there are notable differences between colleges.

Age

The ages of the respondents are presented in Table I. The ages are broken down into categories of no answer, below 25, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, and 60

and over. The largest percentage of the respondents in both Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical is in the 35-39 age group. In the 35-39 age group, there are 61 persons for 26.9 per cent of the Arts and Sciences group, and 28 persons or 22.9 per cent of the Vocational-Technical group.

TABLE I

AGES OF ARTS AND SCIENCES FACULTY AS COMPARED
TO AGES OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL FACULTY

Age Group	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
No Answer	1	0.4	0	0.0
Below 25	0	0.0	1	0.8
25-29	8	3.5	4	3.3
30-34	36	15.9	16	13.1
35-39	61	26.9	28	22.9
40-44	31	13.7	24	19.7
45-49	38	16.7	19	15.6
50-54	20	8.8	13	10.7
55-59	23	10.1	8	6.5
60 & Over	9	4.0	9	7.4
Totals	227	100.0	122	100.0

In Arts and Sciences, the second largest representation is 38 persons or 16.7 per cent in the 45-49 age group; the third largest representation is 36 persons or 15.9 per cent in the 30-34 age group. The second largest representation in Vocational-Technical is 24 persons or 19.7 per cent in the 40-44 age group; the third largest representation is 19 persons or 15.6 per cent in the 45-49 age group. These data

yielded no significant differences and indicate a similarity in ages of the two groups of faculty respondents.

The similarity of ages of the two groups of faculty is also evident when mean ages by groups within colleges and

TABLE II

AGES OF ARTS AND SCIENCES FACULTY AND
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL FACULTY
BY COLLEGES

College Number	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Mean Age	Number	Mean Age
1	48	43.3	34	43.9
2	38	44.5	20	46.8
3	14	44.0	5	48.0
4	17	46.1	9	45.3
5	9	38.7	7	38.4
6	17	42.6	15	40.1
7	7	52.6	7	42.7
8	11	47.0	5	46.0
10	5	40.0	0	0.0
11	4	34.5	2	37.0
12	8	47.0	3	37.0
13	11	35.2	5	40.0
14	12	38.3	1	47.0
15	6	36.2	3	35.3
16	20	40.0	6	42.8
Totals	227	42.4	122	43.2

the totals are examined. Table II shows the mean ages of the Arts and Sciences faculty compared to the mean ages of Vocational-Technical faculty by colleges. The mean ages are

quite similar in all except four schools. The highest mean age in the Arts and Sciences group is 52.6 at one college followed closely by two colleges where the mean age is 47.0. The highest mean age in the Vocational-Technical group is 48.0 at one college, followed by 47.0 and 46.8.

The lowest mean age in Arts and Sciences is 34.5 at one college; the next lowest is 35.2. The lowest mean age in the Vocational-Technical group is 35.3 at one college; the next lowest figure is 37.0 at two colleges. The mean ages of 42.4 for all Arts and Sciences faculty and 43.2 for all Vocational-Technical faculty again show that the two groups are quite similar. There is no significant difference between the overall mean ages.

Sex

The tabulation by colleges of male and female respondents in the Arts and Sciences group compared to the male and female respondents in the Vocational-Technical group is presented in Table III. Both groups are composed of more males than females. The Arts and Sciences group is composed of 57.7 per cent males and 42.3 per cent females. The Vocational-Technical group is composed of 63.9 per cent males and 36.1 per cent females. The higher percentage of males in the Vocational-Technical group apparently reflects the larger number of traditionally male occupations, and the fact that, therefore, more of the qualified teachers are

male. It is important, at this point, to recall that this sample is composed of all full-time faculty who have participated in faculty development and that, as will be seen in

TABLE III

SEX OF ARTS AND SCIENCES FACULTY AND VOCATIONAL-
TECHNICAL FACULTY BY COLLEGES

College Number	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
1	26	22	13	21
2	28	10	19	1
3	8	6	2	3
4	12	5	8	1
5	2	7	2	5
6	10	7	7	8
7	3	4	7	0
8	6	5	5	0
10	2	3	0	0
11	3	1	2	0
12	5	3	2	1
13	5	6	4	1
14	8	4	0	1
15	2	4	3	0
16	11	9	4	2
Total	131	96	78	44
Percentage	57.7	42.3	63.9	36.1

the data on length of service in post-secondary education, these respondents are the older, more experienced teachers. There are no significant differences between the percentage of males in the Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical groups nor between the percentage of females in the two groups.

Professional Traits

The professional traits included in this study are rank, years of service to the institution, years of service in post-secondary education, number of academic appointments held, highest degree earned, and strongest group identity. The traits are discussed in that order. Some tables also present data for individual colleges. Data for individual colleges are detailed where there are interesting differences between colleges.

Rank

The data on rank reflect a strong trend in the Texas urban community colleges toward deemphasizing academic ranks. As can be seen in Table IV, instructor is the rank of the preponderance of respondents from both groups. In the Arts and Sciences group, 110 persons out of 227 (48.5 per cent) are instructors; in the Vocational-Technical group, 60 of 122 persons (49.2 per cent) are instructors. The second largest rank in the Arts and Sciences group is 35 persons (15.4 per cent) who are professors; this is followed by 29 assistant professors (12.8 per cent) and 27 associate professors (11.9 per cent). The second largest representation in the Vocational-Technical group is 23 associate professors (18.8 per cent); while the third largest number is 18 assistant professors (14.8 per cent).

TABLE IV

RANKS OF ARTS AND SCIENCES FACULTY AND
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL FACULTY

Rank	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Not Given	3	1.3	0	0.0
Instructor	110	48.5	60	49.2
Ass't. Prof.	29	12.8	18	14.8
Assoc. Prof.	27	11.9	23	18.8
Professor	35	15.4	9	7.4
Other	23	10.1	12	9.8
Totals	227	100.0	122	100.0

There are no significant differences between the percentages
for the two groups.

Years of Service

The respondents answered two questions dealing with
years of service: (1) the number of years employed at their
current institution, and (2) the number of years spent in
post-secondary education. Mean years of service by colleges
at the current institution of Arts and Sciences respondents
is compared to mean years service of Vocational-Technical
faculty in Table V.

The mean years of service for the Arts and Sciences
group ranges from a low of 2.2 years to a high of 10.5 years
at the current institution. The Vocational-Technical group

TABLE V

YEARS OF SERVICE AT CURRENT INSTITUTION OF ARTS AND
SCIENCES FACULTY AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL
FACULTY BY COLLEGES

College Number	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Mean Years	Number	Mean Years
1	48	8.2	34	7.8
2	38	9.9	20	8.1
3	14	8.1	5	10.6
4	17	9.2	9	7.6
5	9	7.0	7	6.1
6	17	4.3	15	5.3
7	7	4.1	7	5.4
8	11	10.4	5	8.4
10	5	2.2	0	0.0
11	4	3.1	2	2.5
12	8	10.5	3	8.0
13	11	7.8	5	8.7
14	12	7.8	1	5.0
15	6	2.5	3	2.5
16	20	7.0	6	8.8
Totals	227	7.8*	122	6.9*

*CR = 2.11

reported similar figures, from a low of 2.5 years to a high
of 10.6 years at the current institution. The mean for
years of service for all Arts and Sciences respondents is
7.8 years; it is 6.9 years for all Vocational-Technical
respondents. This difference is significant at the .05
level with a CR of 2.11. These figures reflect the noted
trend toward and older, more experienced faculty in urban
community colleges.

The lower numbers of mean years of service generally indicate the newer community colleges. This is further evidenced by the data in Table VI which presents mean years

TABLE VI

YEARS OF SERVICE ALL POST-SECONDARY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL FACULTY
BY COLLEGES

College Number	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Mean Years	Number	Mean Years
1	48	9.3	34	8.2
2	38	10.0	20	8.7
3	14	9.6	5	10.6
4	17	9.5	9	6.8
5	9	7.9	7	6.8
6	17	6.6	15	6.0
7	7	7.4	7	6.5
8	11	10.7	5	11.2
10	5	9.0	0	0.0
11	4	5.9	2	2.5
12	8	9.3	3	8.0
13	11	7.5	5	7.1
14	12	10.1	1	5.0
15	6	9.0	3	4.2
16	20	9.7	6	9.3
Totals	227	9.1*	122	7.9*

*CR = 2.97

in all post-secondary institutions of Arts and Sciences faculty compared to Vocational-Technical faculty by colleges. These data show that the faculty of reporting colleges with low mean years of service in Table V generally show much longer mean years of service in all post-secondary

teaching. The ranges of mean years of service in all post-secondary are much narrower with higher low points. The range for Arts and Sciences respondents is from a low of 5.9 years in one college group to a high of 10.7 years in another college group. The Vocational-Technical range is much broader and still shows a low of 2.5 years post-secondary experience in one college group and a high of 11.2 years in another. The mean years of service for the Arts and Sciences group is significantly greater than the mean years of service for the Vocational-Technical group. The CR is 2.97 which makes the difference significant at the .01 level.

Academic Appointments

The data on academic appointments (meaning the number of institutions of post-secondary education where the respondent has held a full-time faculty position) held by the two groups of faculty by colleges and in total are presented in Table VII. At every college, the Vocational-Technical faculty has a lower mean number of appointments, with one exception in which the means for the two faculty groups are equal. The lowest mean number of appointments for the Arts and Sciences group is 1.2 and the highest is 3.2. The range for the Vocational-Technical group is from 1.0 at several schools to 2.2 mean appointments at another.

The mean number of appointments for all Arts and Sciences faculty members is 1.9, and the mean for all Vocational-Technical faculty members is 1.5. The mean number of academic appointments for the Arts and Sciences group is significantly greater than the mean number for the

TABLE VII

MEAN NUMBERS OF ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS HELD
FOR ARTS AND SCIENCES FACULTY COMPARED
TO VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL FACULTY
BY COLLEGES

College Number	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Mean Appts.	Number	Mean Appts.
1	48	1.8	34	1.3
2	38	1.6	20	1.6
3	14	1.9	5	1.4
4	17	2.1	9	1.1
5	9	1.2	7	1.6
6	17	1.8	15	1.7
7	7	2.6	7	1.6
8	11	1.3	5	1.6
10	5	2.8	0	0.0
11	4	1.8	2	1.0
12	8	2.4	3	1.0
13	11	2.2	5	1.2
14	12	2.1	1	1.0
15	6	3.2	3	1.3
16	20	2.4	6	2.2
Totals	227	1.9*	122	1.5*

CR = 3.60

Vocational-Technical group. The CR of 3.60 makes the difference significant at the .01 level. These data, both for individual colleges and for the total, indicate that the

Vocational-Technical faculty members tend to remain at one institution of higher learning throughout their teaching careers while Arts and Sciences faculty exhibit a tendency to change institutions more frequently.

Highest Degree Earned

The data on highest degree earned for the two groups parallel the data generally reported for the two groups. These data for the Arts and Sciences compared to Vocational-Technical faculties in the sample are summarized in Table VIII. In the Arts and Sciences group, 152 respondents

TABLE VIII

HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED FOR ARTS AND SCIENCES FACULTY
COMPARED TO VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL FACULTY

Degree	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Bachelor or less	15	6.6	32	26.2
Masters	152	67.0	68	55.8
Doctors	54	23.8	15	12.3
Other	6	2.6	7	5.7
Totals	227	100.0	122	100.0

(67.0 per cent) indicated that a Master's degree is their highest earned degree, while 54 (23.8 per cent) have earned doctorates. In the Vocational-Technical group, 32 respondents (26.2 per cent) have up to a Bachelor's degree as

their highest earned degree, while 68 (55.8 per cent) have earned Master's degrees and 15 (12.3 per cent) have doctorates. The Arts and Sciences group has nearly 12 per cent more Master's degrees and 12 per cent more Doctoral degrees, while the Vocational-Technical group has 20 per cent more persons with up to a Bachelor's as the highest degree earned. None of the percentage differences is statistically significant.

Strongest Group Identification

The responses to the question that asked the respondent to name the group with which he felt the strongest identification elicited similar responses with the same overall pattern from both sets of respondents. The differences, as shown in Table IX, are in the percentages. In both Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical, the highest number and percentage of persons identify most strongly with their department or division--for Arts and Sciences, 92 persons (40.5 per cent) and in Vocational-Technical 39 persons (32.0 per cent). The second largest group, 68 persons (30.0 per cent), identify with their discipline; followed by 33 persons (14.5 per cent) who identify most strongly with their students. In the Vocational-Technical group, the second and third largest numbers are the reverse of those from the Arts and Sciences respondents; 31 persons (25.4 per cent) identify more with their students, and 30 (24.6 per cent) identify with their discipline. Only about 10 per

TABLE IX

STRONGEST GROUP IDENTIFICATION FOR ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY COMPARED TO VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL FACULTY

Group Degree	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
No Answer	4	1.8	4	3.3
Dept. or Div.	92	40.5	39	32.0
Discipline	68	30.0	30	24.6
Institution	22	9.7	14	11.4
Students	33	14.5	31	25.4
Special Interest	8	3.5	4	3.3
Totals	227	100.0	122	100.0

cent of each of the respondent groups feel their strongest
identity with their institutions. These data show the
diversity of interests and opinions that exist among com-
munity college faculty. At the same time the figures do
show a great similarity between the Arts and Sciences and
the Vocational-Technical faculty. Again, none of the per-
centage differences is statistically significant.

Impressions of Faculty Development Programs

The first research question asks if faculty development
programs have the same impression on Arts and Sciences
faculty as on Vocational-Technical faculty. Several, in
fact, most of the questionnaire items were aimed at the
gathering of this information; therefore, the discussion

includes responses indicating the assistance of faculty development programs in professional development, responses on the extent of institutional support, and the responses to the open-ended item asking for other comments about perceptions of and rewards from faculty development. The small number of zero responses did not cause a variation in the results. Data for individual colleges are detailed where there are notable differences between colleges.

Professional Development Help

The pattern of responses of the Arts and Sciences faculty and Vocational-Technical faculty regarding help received from faculty development in various professional development areas is quite similar. The means of the responses of the two groups are presented in Table X. The values assigned to responses on each area are 0 for no answer, 1 for very little or no help at this time, 2 for minor help, 3 for moderate help, and 4 for a great deal of help.

The mean value of the Arts and Sciences responses to whether faculty development helped in refining current teaching style is 2.1, while the mean of the Vocational-Technical responses is 2.3. Thus, both groups indicate that this area of faculty development has been of only minor help. The means of responses on whether faculty development helped in attempting to improve ability as an advisor of

students are 1.9 for the Arts and Sciences and 2.3 for the Vocational-Technical. The Vocational-Technical faculty indicate that they received somewhat more help than did the Arts and Sciences respondents. The mean for the Vocational-Technical group is significantly greater than the mean for the Arts and Sciences group. The CR of 3.62 makes the difference significant at the .01 level.

The Arts and Sciences faculty have a 1.9 mean score on faculty development help in strengthening knowledge, skill, and productivity in their academic fields while the Vocational-Technical faculty have a 2.2 mean. The mean for the Vocational-Technical group again is significantly greater than the mean for Arts and Sciences group. The CR of 2.66 makes the difference significant at the .01 level. The pattern is repeated in means of responses to faculty development help in introducing changes to make the educational process more responsive to student needs with Arts and Sciences at 2.3 and Vocational-Technical at 2.5. Similarity is again shown in the means of responses to faculty development assistance improving the standards and accuracy of their approaches to evaluating students with Arts and Sciences reporting 2.0 and Vocational-Technical reporting 2.1.

Arts and Sciences respondents have a 1.8 mean score on faculty development as a type of assistance in improving

TABLE X

ARTS AND SCIENCES AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL RESPONSES ON
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ASSISTANCE
IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional Development Interests	Arts and Sciences	Vocational-Technical
Refine and improve my current teaching style	2.1	2.3
Attempt to improve my ability as an advisor of students	1.9[a]	2.3[a]
Strengthen my knowledge, skill, and productivity in my academic field	1.9[b]	2.2[b]
Introduce changes to make educational process more responsive to student needs	2.3	2.5
Improve the standards and accuracy of my approach to evaluating students	2.0	2.1
Improve my skills as a committee member	1.8[c]	2.0[c]
Attempt to broaden my knowledge outside my discipline	2.0	2.2
Develop new courses and programs	2.2	2.4
Strengthen my consulting, writing or other skills related to community service	1.6[d]	1.8[d]
Seek to learn about and try teaching innovations	2.2	2.4
Improve my research skills	1.5[e]	1.7[e]
Improve my administrative knowledge and skills	1.8[f]	2.1[f]

*Means are of responses on a scale of 0 = no answer,
1 = very little or no help at this time, 2 = minor help,
3 = moderate help, 4 = a great deal of help.

[a]$CR = 3.62$; [b]$CR = 2.66$; [c]$CR = 1.93$; [d]$CR = 1.98$;
[e]$CR = 2.24$; [f]$CR = 2.78$.

skills as a committee member, while the Vocational-Technical faculty have a 2.0 mean score. The Vocational-Technical group mean is very close to being significantly greater than the Arts and Sciences mean score. The CR is 1.93, which would be significant at the .05 level if it was 1.96 or greater.

On faculty development assistance in attempting to broaden knowledge outside of their disciplines, Arts and Sciences have a mean response of 2.0 and Vocational-Technical have a mean response of 2.2. Again, following the pattern are the Arts and Sciences group's mean score of 2.2 and the Vocational-Technical group's mean score of 2.4 on faculty development assistance in developing new courses and programs. The same mean scores of 2.2 from Arts and Sciences and 2.4 from Vocational-Technical appear for faculty development assistance in seeking to learn about and try teaching innovations.

Arts and Sciences respondents have a 1.8 mean score on faculty development assistance in improving administrative knowledge and skills while the Vocational-Technical faculty have a 2.1 mean score. This difference is significant at the .01 level with a CR of 2.78.

The lowest pairs of mean scores come in two areas where low scores would generally be expected from community college teachers--the two are areas dealing with writing and research. The Arts and Sciences respondents have a mean

score of 1.6 on faculty development assistance in the strengthening of skills for consulting, writing, or other skills related to community service, and Vocational-Technical respondents have a mean score of 1.8. The Vocational-Technical respondents, however, feel that they have had slightly more assistance in this area. The difference is significant at the .05 level with a CR of 1.98. The only scores that fall lower are Arts and Sciences at 1.5 and Vocational-Technical at 1.7 on faculty development assistance in improving research skills. This difference is also significant at the .05 level with a CR of 2.24.

The message from the two groups of faculty in response to all the previous questions is that they are getting, at best, only minor to somewhat less-than-moderate assistance from faculty development in all the areas of professional development. The mean scores of Arts and Sciences faculty are consistently lower by between one-tenth and four-tenths than those of the Vocational-Technical faculty. This probably reflects the fact that most Vocational-Technical faculty have had few or no education courses in their preparatory work and thus they find more of the basic topics in education, which are so often covered during faculty development sponsored courses, seminars, and workshops, to be helpful in their teaching. An observation about this set of information is the remarkable consistency of the responses from the two groups of faculty. Every pair of mean

scores is generally very similar with the largest difference being only four-tenths of a point. Judging by these data, the Arts and Sciences faculty and the Vocational-Technical faculty appear to have the same perceptions.

Extent of Institutional Support

The mean scores of responses from the faculty of the two groups about the extent of institutional support by colleges and in total are presented in Table XI. There are

TABLE XI

ARTS AND SCIENCES AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL RESPONSES
ABOUT EXTENT OF INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT
BY COLLEGES

College Number	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Means	Number	Means
1	48	2.5	34	2.7
2	38	2.2	20	2.4
3	14	2.4	5	2.8
4	17	2.1	9	2.3
5	9	2.6	7	3.4
6	17	2.8	15	2.7
7	7	2.9	7	1.4
8	11	2.7	5	1.8
10	5	3.0	0	0.0
11	4	2.5	2	4.0
12	8	3.0	3	3.3
13	11	2.2	5	2.6
14	12	2.0	1	3.0
15	6	2.3	3	3.3
16	20	1.7	6	3.0
Totals	227	2.4	122	2.6

*Means are of responses on a scale of 0 = no answer, 1 = hardly at all, 2 = to a limited extent, 3 = to a considerable extent, 4 = to a great extent

several variations in means and interesting similarities between the two groups of faculty at different colleges. These means are of responses scored on a scale of 0 = no answer, 1 = hardly at all, 2 = to a limited extent, 3 = to a considerable extent, and 4 = to a great extent.

The responses to the extent of institutional support range from a low mean score of 1.4 for the Vocational-Technical faculty at one college to a high mean score of 4.0. The lowest mean score from Arts and Sciences is 1.7 and the highest is 3.0 from two colleges. These data reflect the respondents' feelings about their institutions and their perception of how they have been treated. Except for one Arts and Sciences group and two Vocational-Technical groups who have mean scores of below 2.0 for their colleges, the means are above 2.0. Also, with the exception of two Arts and Sciences groups and three Vocational-Technical groups, the means are below 3.1.

Thus, the majority of the respondents indicate that the degree of their institutional support ranges from a limited extent to a considerable extent. The overall mean scores of 2.4 for Arts and Sciences and 2.6 for Vocational-Technical show that the two groups generally agree in their perceptions of the extent of institutional support received. The difference is not statistically significant. The fact that these mean scores do not fall in the range from "a considerable extent" to "a great extent" of support may indicate

that the administrations of urban community colleges need to work on improving institutional support for all faculty members.

Comments on Faculty Development

Although fewer than half of the respondents included in this study commented about their perceptions of and rewards from faculty development, many were interesting and informative. This section of the questionnaire was open-ended and thus additional data on faculty impressions was received from those persons who chose to respond. Many respondents almost filled the page instead of restricting themselves to the eight lines on the questionnaire.

To give a perspective on the number of respondents who wrote comments, the number and percentage of questionnaires that each of the two groups returned with and without

TABLE XII

PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES WITH AND WITHOUT
COMMENTS ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Type of Response	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
No Comments	142	62.6	70	57.4
Comments	85	37.4	52	42.6
Totals	227	100.0	122	100.0

comments is detailed in Table XII. In the Arts and Sciences group, 85 persons (37.4 per cent) wrote comments; in the Vocational-Technical group, 52 persons (42.6 per cent) commented. A slightly higher percentage of the Vocational-Technical faculty took the time to compose comments. The difference is not statistically significant.

TABLE XIII

COMMENTS CATEGORIES BY ARTS AND SCIENCES
AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL FACULTY
FREQUENCY OF MENTION

Comment Category	A and S Frequency	V and T Frequency
Rewards for faculty development not adequate or not monetary	38	16
Things offered do not fit my needs	36	15
Should be based on individual needs	32	11
Topics too general, waste of time	24	13
Attendance should be voluntary	22	3
Prefer to have "speaker" money added to salary	19	5
Little or no administrative support for faculty development	17	8
Faculty development _is_ essential	14	6
Faculty development here is "mickey mouse"	12	1
Need emphasis on skills of teaching	11	7
Need to do faculty development by department or division	10	7
Activities not scheduled at convenient times	9	8
Need released time and travel money	9	4
Good, helps give better perspective	6	9

An analysis of the comments yielded several categories into which the comments generally fit. A summary of the frequency of various comments from the two groups appears in Table XIII. The categories of comments in the table are arranged by the frequency of occurrence from the Arts and Sciences respondents. For most categories, the Vocational-Technical response frequency generally parallels the Arts and Sciences pattern. There are some exceptions that will be noted. The frequency figures do not agree with the number of comments given because many of the comments embraced several categories. The comments have been arranged by Arts and Sciences or Vocational-Technical within colleges and may be examined in Appendix B.

The most frequently mentioned comment category from both groups is that rewards for faculty development are neither adequate nor monetary. Second, both groups stated that things offered do not meet needs. Third in frequency from Arts and Sciences faculty and fourth from Vocational-Technical faculty are comments that faculty development should be based on individual needs. The comment that the topics are too general and thus a waste of time ranks fourth from the Arts and Sciences faculty and third from the Vocational-Technical faculty. The comments are repeated from college to college and are in generally the same proportion between Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical as in the sample. These first four comment categories show

that both groups of faculty feel strongly about the need for improvement of faculty development programs in terms of rewards, topics, and recognition of needs. In these most frequently mentioned areas, the impressions of both faculty groups about faculty development appear to be the same.

The remainder of the comment categories are mentioned much less frequently. For the Arts and Sciences group, the fifth, sixth, and seventh most frequently mentioned categories are attendance should be voluntary, "speaker" money should be added to salary, and that there is little or no administrative support for faculty development. For the Vocational-Technical group, the fifth, sixth, and seventh most frequently mentioned categories are faculty development is good and helps give a better perspective, there is little or no administrative support for faculty development, and activities are not scheduled at convenient times. Both groups, in about the same proportions mention the need for emphasis on the skills of teaching, the need to establish faculty development by department or division, the need for a statement that faculty development is essential, and an expression of need for more released time and travel rather than for more of the present type of faculty development program.

The only point of departure between the two groups is that several Arts and Sciences respondents commented that they feel faculty development is trivial or "mickey mouse,"

while this is specifically mentioned by only one Vocational-Technical respondent in the group; a greater proportion of the Vocational-Technical faculty commented that faculty development is good and helpful. Again, this may reflect the fact that more of the Vocational-Technical faculty members have never been exposed to formal courses in education, so they do not feel the material to be nearly so repetitive or general.

Specific Effects of Faculty Development Program

The second research question asked the respondents what specific effects have faculty development programs had on instructional strategies, related faculty activities, and professional attitudes. Several sections of the questionnaire applied to these effects.

The faculty responses on faculty development program help in several professional development areas have been discussed Professional Development Help previously in this chapter. The means of the responses of the two groups of faculty are presented in Table X and discussed in that section. In review, the general pattern of means is quite parallel for the two groups and the faculty members believe that they are getting, at best, only minor to somewhat less-than-moderate assistance from all of the areas of faculty development. In the context of the specific effects that faculty development has had, the respondents in both

groups consider the effects to be of slight value. Both groups responded that faculty development has been of minor-to-moderate help through the following:

1. In the introduction of changes to make the educational process more responsive to student needs;

2. In the investigation and establishment of teaching innovations;

3. In the development of new courses and programs;

4. In the refinement and improvement of current teaching style;

5. In the attempt to broaden knowledge outside of discipline;

6. In the improvement of the standards and accuracy of current approaches to student evaluation;

7. In the improvement of the ability to advise students;

8. In the strengthening of academic knowledge, skills, and productivity;

9. In the improvement of administrative knowledge and skills;

10. In the improvement of skills as a committee member.

This list enumerates some of the specific areas where faculty development has been of help in instructional strategies, related faculty activities, and professional attitudes. The faculty members apparently feel that faculty

development has provided them with some minor-to-moderate help, but that more could be done through faculty development programs in these areas.

Other specific effects which the faculty respondents believe have resulted through faculty development programs have been discussed in the preceding section, <u>Comments</u> <u>on</u> <u>Faculty</u> <u>Development</u>. The frequencies of fourteen categories of comments are tabulated for the two groups of faculty and presented in Table XIII. In the context of specific effects, faculty members appear to feel that faculty development programs have been of little assistance in improving instructional strategies, related faculty activities and professional attitudes. The comments indicate that some members of both groups feel that faculty development is essential, and that the effects have been good and helpful to them as faculty members.

Members of both groups also expressed a need for emphasis on teaching skills and a need to organize faculty development activities by divisions or departments. The most frequently expressed feeling from both groups indicates a need for reappraisal of the rewards from participation in faculty development and of the topics offered. The respondents also requested programs with an emphasis on individual needs; they stated that the topics currently offered are often too general.

Most of the comments are constructive criticism of current faculty development, and this appears to be a specific effect of faculty development. The faculty development programs apparently _have_ had the specific effect of causing faculty to react to the strengths and weaknesses of the programs at the various institutions. Faculty development programs, by their very existence and name, appear to have caused faculty members to consider their professional development as more of an individual concern yet also as an area in need of institutional support.

Faculty Development and Reward System

The third research question asks to what extent the faculty members perceive the faculty development program to be related to the reward system. One section on the questionnaire dealt with the respondents' perceptions of the reward system, and many respondents mentioned the reward system in comments at the end of the questionnaire. These two areas are discussed separately, and the discussion includes comparisons of Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical responses.

Importance of Achievements

The section of the questionnaire dealing with rewards asked for faculty members' opinions of the importance of

TABLE XIV

ARTS AND SCIENCES AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL RESPONSES ON
IMPORTANCE OF ACHIEVEMENTS IN DECISIONS ON TENURE,
PROMOTION OR SALARY INCREASE

Achievements	Arts and Sciences	Vocational-Technical
Publishing professional works	2.0^a	1.7^a
Being a challenging teacher	2.8	3.0
Participating in departmental and institution-wide governance affairs	2.3	2.3
Exercising innovativeness in teaching	2.7	2.9
Being knowledgeable, sensitive advisor	2.6^b	2.9^b
Participating as consultant, scholar, and leader beyond the institution	2.1^c	2.4^c
Participating in staff development	2.3	2.5

*Means are of responses on a scale of 0 = no answer,
1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = quite
important, 4 = extremely important.

^{a}CR = 3.33; ^{b}CR = 2.46; ^{c}CR = 2.90.

their achievements in decisions on tenure, promotion, or
salary increases, and for their opinions of the importance
of their achievements in providing a sense of personal
satisfaction and gratification. The achievements listed on
the questionnaire for their consideration included parti-
cipation in staff development. The data on the relationship
and importance of achievements to decisions on tenure,
promotion, or salary increase are presented in Table XIV.
The means are from responses on a scale of 0 = no answer, 1

= not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = quite impor-
tant, and 4 = extremely important. Again, these responses
are quite similar for the two groups of faculty. The Arts
and Sciences faculty have a mean response of 2.0 on publish-
ing professional works, while the Vocational-Technical
faculty rate this at a less important 1.7. The difference
is significant at the .01 level with a CR of 3.33.

In response to the importance of the other six areas of
achievement in decisions on tenure, promotion, or salary
increases, the means of responses of the Vocational-
Technical faculty are higher than those of the Arts and
Sciences faculty. The difference on being a knowledgeable,
sensitive advisor is significantly higher for the
Vocational-Technical group with a CR of 2.46, which is
significant at the .05 level and approaches the .01 level.
The Vocational-Technical mean with a CR of 2.90 on parti-
cipating as a consultant, scholar, and leader beyond the
institution is also significantly higher than the Arts and
Sciences mean, making the difference significant at the .01
level. It must be noted that the responses of both groups
are so nearly the same. The means of the responses to the
item on participating in staff development are 2.3 for Arts
and Sciences and 2.5 for Vocational-Technical.

The second part of the section on the importance of
achievements deals with the opinions of the two groups on
the importance of certain achievements in providing a sense

of personal satisfaction and gratification. The achieve-
ments listed are the same as discussed in the first part of
this section but also included is participation in staff
development as one of the achievements. The data on im-
portance of achievements in providing a sense of personal
satisfaction and gratification are presented in Table XV.

TABLE XV

ARTS AND SCIENCES AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL RESPONSES
ON IMPORTANCE OF ACHIEVEMENTS IN PROVIDING
A SENSE OF PERSONAL SATISFACTION

Achievements	Arts and Sciences	Vocational-Technical
Publishing professional works	2.3	2.1
Being a challenging teacher	3.4	3.3
Participating in departmental and institution-wide governance affairs	2.4	2.2
Exercising innovativeness in teaching	3.2	3.3
Being knowledgeable, sensitive advisor	3.2	3.3
Participating as consultant, scholar, and leader beyond the institution	2.6	2.7
Participating in staff development	2.2	2.4

*Means are of responses on a scale of 0 = no answer,
1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = quite
important, 4 = extremely important

The means are of responses on a scale of 0 = no answer, 1 =
not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = quite important,
and 4 = extremely important. Again the responses and means
are quite alike for the two groups of faculty. None of the

differences is statistically significant. The Vocational-Technical group rates publishing professional works, participating in departmental and institution-wide governance affairs, and being a challenging teacher as slightly less important than do the Arts and Sciences respondents. On the other four areas of achievement, the Vocational-Technical faculty have a slightly higher mean response. The most important achievements according to the faculty respondents are teaching and advising students. These data appear to confirm the thesis that the mission of the community college teacher is mainly to teach, with all the other achievements, including participation in faculty development, being important but not foremost.

Comments on Rewards

As has been discussed in the section on comments received, many of the faculty members in both groups chose to provide sometimes lengthy comments on faculty development and the reward system. The comments are categorized and presented in Table XIII. The comments may be read in their entirety by turning to Appendix B where they have been collected and collated by college number.

The most frequently repeated comment from both groups of faculty is that the rewards for faculty development are either not monetary or, if monetary, are not adequate. This comes from both groups and from practically every college

represented. Related comments also appear quite often. These are an indication of a preference for having "speaker" monies added to salary, and an expression of more need for released time and travel money more than for institutionally provided faculty development activities.

The overall impression is that faculty members over the state feel that participation in faculty development activities should either carry more monetary or other tangible rewards, or that institutionally organized faculty development program activities should be curtailed in favor of other forms of professional development. This is a matter which should be of immediate concern to any community colleges having a faculty development program.

Institutional Innovation

The final research question asked to what degree faculty members perceive that institutional and departmental innovations have resulted from faculty development programs and what types have occurred and should occur. The types of innovation perceived to have occurred in the last five years and as needing to occur are discussed first, followed by the discussion of perceived institutional innovation.

The data are presented in Table XVI for the two faculty groups on responses about areas of institutional improvement perceived to have occurred in the last five years and as needing to occur soon. The means are of responses on a

scale of 0 = no answer, 1 = none or little, 2 = a minor amount, 3 = a moderate amount, and 4 = a major amount. The pattern of responses from the two groups is again very similar. The means of the Vocational-Technical group's responses in all areas of concern for institutional improvement that had occurred in the last five years are higher than the means of the Arts and Sciences responses. The Vocational-Technical mean with a CR of 2.16 on preparing students for careers during the last five years is significantly greater than the Arts and Sciences mean, making the difference significant at the .05 level. Similarly, the Vocational-Technical mean with a CR of 1.96 on developing student's intellectual skills the last five years is significantly greater than the Arts and Sciences mean, making it barely significant at the .05 level.

On making governance and administration more effective during the last five years, the Vocational-Technical mean with a CR of 2.57 is significantly greater than the Arts and Sciences mean, making the difference significant at the .05 level and nearly significant at the .01 level. The Vocational-Technical mean with a CR of 2.00 on providing students breadth of learning having occurred during the last five years is significantly greater than the Arts and Sciences mean, making the difference significant at the .05 level.

The Arts and Sciences respondents tend to rank the institutional improvements that need to occur soon slightly higher than do the Vocational-Technical respondents. The only two exceptions are that the Vocational-Technical faculty rank preparing students for careers and establishing comprehensive faculty development slightly more important needs. Both groups rate preparing students for careers as the most important occurrence in the last five years. The Arts and Sciences mean is significantly greater with a CR of 3.34 on the need to prepare students in academic concentrations making the difference significant at the .01 level. They rank the need to develop students' intellectual skills as the most important area of concern; the difference is significantly greater for the Arts and Sciences group with a CR of 3.46, making the difference significant at the .01 level.

The other two questions in this section on institutional innovation asked to what extent the respondents felt their institutions had been involved in innovative changes in curriculum, teaching, or evaluation in the last five years, and to what extent they feel that faculty development has encouraged innovative changes in these areas. The responses to both questions have been summarized and means are calculated for the two faculty groups within colleges and as total groups.

TABLE XVI

ARTS AND SCIENCES AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL RESPONSES ON AREAS
OF INSTITUTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

Areas of Concern in Institutional Improvement	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Has Occurred Last 5 Years	Needs to Occur Soon	Has Occurred Last 5 Years	Needs to Occur Soon
Preparing students for careers	3.1^a	2.6	3.3^a	2.7
Advancing scholarship and research	1.8	2.5	1.9	2.3
Developing students' intellectual skills	2.5^b	3.1^e	2.7^b	2.7^e
Preparing students in academic concentrations	2.6	2.8^f	2.7	2.4^f
Making governance and administration more effective	2.2^c	2.8	2.5^c	2.7
Helping students clarify purposes develop self-understanding	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.7
Serving local, or national needs	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.5
Providing students breadth of learning	2.6^d	2.7	2.8^d	2.6
Establishing comprehensive faculty development	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.6

*Means are of responses on a scale of 0 = no answer,
1 = none or little, 2 = a minor amount, 3 = a moderate amount,
4 = a major amount.

[a]CR = 2.16; [b]CR = 1.96; [c]CR = 2.57; [d]CR = 2.00;
[e]CR = 3.46; [f]CR =3.34.

The numbers and means of responses from Arts and Sciences faculty by colleges on the extent of institutional innovative change in the last five years as compared to numbers and means of Vocational-Technical faculty responses are presented in Table XVII. The means are of responses on a scale of 0 = no answer, 1 = very little or not at all, 2 = less than most institutions, 3 = about the same as most

TABLE XVII

ARTS AND SCIENCES AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL RESPONSES
ON EXTENT OF INSTITUTIONAL INNOVATIVE
CHANGE LAST FIVE YEARS BY COLLEGES

College Number	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	*Mean	Number	*Mean
1	48	3.6	34	4.1
2	38	3.1	20	3.2
3	14	3.9	5	2.8
4	17	3.2	9	3.7
5	9	4.2	7	4.6
6	17	3.5	15	3.7
7	7	3.9	7	3.6
8	11	3.5	5	2.2
10	5	4.4	0	0.0
11	4	4.3	2	5.0
12	8	4.5	3	5.0
13	11	4.5	5	3.8
14	12	4.8	1	5.0
15	6	4.3	3	5.0
16	20	3.8	6	4.5
Totals	227	3.8	122	3.8

*Means are of responses on a scale of 0 = no answer, 1 = very little or not at all, 2 = less than most institutions, 3 = about the same as most institutions, 4 = somewhat more than most institutions, 5 = considerably more than most institutions

institutions, 4 = somewhat more than most institutions, and 5 = considerably more than at most institutions. The Arts and Sciences respondents show a smaller range of means but the range tends to have a higher low point than does that of the Vocational-Technical respondents. The Arts and Sciences means range from a low of 3.1 for one school to a high of 4.8 for another with an overall mean of 3.8. The Vocational-Technical means of responses range from a low of 2.2 for one school to a high of 5.0 for four different schools. The overall mean is 3.8. The wider range may reflect that the Vocational-Technical faculty have less information on other colleges and thus are probably less knowledgeable about the kinds of improvements at other institutions.

The numbers and means of Arts and Sciences responses by colleges on the extent to which faculty development has encouraged institutional innovation as compared to Vocational-Technical numbers and means are presented in Table XVIII. When compared college by college to the means by colleges in Table XVII, the data show that in every instance and for both groups the means for responses to this question are considerably lower. None of the differences is statistically significant. This indicates that although both faculty groups at nearly all the community colleges feel that some amount of innovative change has occurred in the last five years, they also feel that most of it has been

TABLE XVIII

ARTS AND SCIENCES AND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL RESPONSES
ON EXTENT FACULTY DEVELOPMENT HAS ENCOURAGED
INSTITUTIONAL INNOVATIVE CHANGE BY COLLEGES

College Number	Arts and Sciences		Vocational-Technical	
	Number	*Mean	Number	*Mean
1	48	2.5	34	3.0
2	38	2.8	20	2.6
3	14	2.7	5	2.2
4	17	1.9	9	3.3
5	9	3.7	7	3.7
6	17	2.9	15	3.3
7	7	3.1	7	3.1
8	11	2.7	5	2.2
10	5	3.4	0	0.0
11	4	3.5	2	3.0
12	8	3.3	3	3.4
13	11	3.3	5	2.8
14	12	2.8	1	4.0
15	6	3.3	3	3.0
16	20	2.6	6	2.7
Totals	227	2.8	122	2.9

*Means are of responses on a scale of 0 = no answer,
1 = very little or not at all, 2 = less than most insti-
tutions, 3 = about the same as most institutions, 4 =
somewhat more than most institutions, 5 = considerably
more than most institutions

due to factors other than the existence of faculty develop-

ment programs at their institutions. This is still another

signal to community colleges that now is the time for a

reappraisal of all aspects of faculty development. Faculty

development should be a force for fostering innovation at

the institutions. Presently, it is none too effective--at least in the institutions whose faculty members participated in this study.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study is to describe the perceptions of two groups of full-time public community college faculty members--Arts and Sciences instructors and Vocational-Technical instructors--of faculty development programs. The data analysis is divided in six parts: personal traits, professional traits, impressions of faculty development programs, specific effects of faculty development programs, faculty development and the reward system, and institutional innovation.

Personal Traits

The ages are grouped into ten categories. The group with the largest frequency in both Vocational-Technical, 28 respondents (22.9 per cent), and Arts and Sciences, 61 respondents (26.9 per cent), are in the 35-39 age group. The second largest representation in Vocational-Technical is the 40-44 age group with 24 faculty (19.7 per cent). The second largest representation in the Arts and Sciences is the 45-49 age group with 38 faculty (16.7 per cent). The mean age of the Arts and Sciences faculty in the sample is 42.4 years, while the mean age of the Vocational-Technical faculty is 43.2 years. None of these differences is statistically significant.

The Arts and Sciences faculty in the sample is 57.7 per cent male and 42.3 per cent female, while the Vocational-Technical group is 63.9 per cent male with only 36.1 per cent female. Again, none of these differences is statistically significant.

Professional Traits

Of the Arts and Sciences faculty respondents, 110 (48.5 per cent) hold the rank of instructor, while 60 (49.2 per cent) Vocational-Technical respondents hold that rank. The second largest representations are 35 (15.4 per cent) Arts and Sciences' full professors, and 23 (18.8 per cent) Vocational-Technical associate professors. None of the percentage differences is statistically significant.

The overall mean years of service at the current institution is 7.8 years for the Arts and Sciences faculty sampled, and 6.9 years for the Vocational-Technical faculty sampled; this difference is significant at the .05 level. The overall mean years of service in post-secondary education for the Arts and Sciences faculty is 9.1 years, while the corresponding figure for Vocational-Technical faculty is 7.9 years; this difference is significant at the .01 level.

The mean number of academic appointments at different post-secondary institutions for the faculty sampled is 1.9 for Arts and Sciences and 1.5 for Vocational-Technical. This difference is significant at the .01 level. The Arts and Sciences faculty group has 152 persons (67 per cent) who

hold a Master's degree as their highest educational level; 68 persons (55.8 per cent) of the Vocational-Technical faculty report the Master's degree as their highest educational level. The second largest representation in Arts and Sciences is 54 persons (23.8 per cent) who do hold doctorates. The second largest group in the Vocational-Technical is 32 persons (26.2 per cent) who have up to a Bachelor's degree as their highest educational level. The third largest group in Vocational-Technical is 15 persons (12.3 per cent) who hold doctorates. None of these differences is statistically significant.

The respondents were asked to choose the group with which they felt the strongest identity. Of the Arts and Sciences faculty, 92 (40.5 per cent) members identify with their department or division while 39 (32 per cent) members of the Vocational-Technical faculty identify with the department or division. The second largest representation in the Arts and Sciences faculty is 68 (30 per cent) members who identify mostly with their disciplines; of the Vocational-Technical faculty the second largest number, 31 (25.4 per cent) members, identify mostly with their students. The third largest areas are reversed: 33 (14.5 per cent) Arts and Sciences faculty members identify mostly with their students, while 30 (24.6 per cent of the Vocational-Technical faculty members identify mostly with their disciplines. Only about 10 per cent of each of the respondent

groups feel their strongest identity with their institutions. None of these differences is statistically significant.

Impressions of Faculty Development Programs

The two groups of faculty represented in the sample have quite similar responses to questions on the amount of assistance they have received in twelve areas of professional development. The means of the responses vary for the Arts and Sciences faculty from 1.5 (very little to minor help) to 2.3 (minor help to moderate help). For the Vocational-Technical faculty, the means range from a low of 1.7 (very little to minor help) to 2.5 (minor help to moderate help). In every instance, the means follow the same pattern for both groups with the largest difference in means for any one item being only four-tenths of a point. The means of the Vocational-Technical faculty are consistently slightly higher than the means of the Arts and Sciences faculty. The differences are significant on whether faculty development helped the respondents to improve as an advisor of students or to improve his academic skills. Further significant differences are on faculty development as a type of assistance in improving skills as a committee member, on faculty development assistance in improving administrative knowledge and skills; on faculty development assistance in strengthening skills for use in

consulting, writing, or other skills related to community service; and on faculty development assistance in improving research skills.

On extent of institutional support, there is considerable variation between scores of the two groups in various colleges. The range of means for Vocational-Technical faculty is from 1.4 for one college to highs of 3.4 and 4.0 (1.0 = hardly at all, etc.) at two other colleges. The Arts and Sciences means range from 1.7 at one college to 3.0 at two others. The overall means of the two groups are 2.4 (2.0 = a limited extent, etc.) for Arts and Sciences respondents and 2.6 for Vocational-Technical respondents, which indicates virtually the same perceptions by both groups of faculty. The difference is not statistically significant.

The most frequently mentioned comments from both the Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical respondents are in the category of rewards for faculty development being neither adequate nor monetary. The second most frequently mentioned comment for both groups is that the programs offered do not meet the faculty members' needs. The third and fourth most frequently mentioned comments from both groups are that the topics are too general and thus a waste of time, and that faculty development should be based on and planned to reflect the individual needs of the individual faculty member.

Specific Effects of Faculty Development Programs

Both groups of faculty report that faculty development has had few specific effects; in every one of twelve areas of professional development, they have received only minor to moderate help. Members of both groups express a need for more emphasis on the skills of teaching and a need to organize faculty development by division or department.

Faculty Development and Reward System

Both faculty groups responded similarly on the importance of achievements in relation to decisions on tenure, promotion, and salary increase. The Arts and Sciences faculty mean is significantly greater on publishing professional works. The Vocational-Technical faculty mean is significantly greater on being a knowledgeable, sensitive advisor and on participating as a consultant, scholar, and leader beyond the institution. On the importance of staff development as an achievement, the Arts and Sciences respondents have a mean score of 2.3 (2.0 = somewhat important) and the Vocational-Technical faculty have a mean response of 2.5 (3.0 = quite important).

On the importance of the same list of achievements in providing a sense of personal satisfaction, the same pattern with nearly the same figures appears. On the importance of staff development participation as an achievement for personal satisfaction and gratification, the Arts and Sciences

respondents have a mean of 2.2 and the Vocational-Technical respondents have a mean of 2.4. In responding to the importance of achievements, both groups of faculty consider teaching and advising students to be their most important achievements. None of the differences is statistically significant.

Many of the respondents' comments deal with faculty development and the reward system. The most frequently repeated comment from both groups is that the rewards for faculty development are either not monetary or, if monetary, are not adequate. Related comments also appear quite often.

Institutional Innovation

The overall means for both groups of respondents on the extent of institutional change in the last five years are exactly the same at 3.8 (3.0 = about same as most institutions, 4.0 = somewhat more than most institutions). For both groups compared college by college on the extent to which faculty development has encouraged institutional innovation, the means of responses show that in every instance the means here are considerably lower.

The Vocational-Technical means on four areas of institutional improvement occurring in the last five years are significantly greater than are the Arts and Sciences means. The areas are preparing students for careers, developing students' intellectual skills, making college governance

and administration more effective, and providing students with the breadth of learning. The Arts and Sciences means are significantly greater on two areas of institutional improvement that need to occur soon--preparing students for careers and developing students' intellectual skills.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study is to describe the perceptions of two groups of full-time public community college faculty members--Arts and Sciences instructors and Vocational-Technical instructors--of faculty development programs. The data analysis is divided into the six parts of personal traits, professional traits, impressions of faculty development programs, specific effects of faculty development programs, faculty development and the reward system, and institutional innovation.

Summary of Findings

The following findings are summarized and listed according to the research questions:

1.   The largest age frequency in both the Vocational-Technical and Arts and Sciences is the 35-39 age group. The second largest representation in the Vocational-Technical faculty is the 40-44 age group and the second largest representation in the Arts and Sciences faculty is the 45-49 age group.

2.   The mean age of the Arts and Sciences faculty is 42.4 years, while the mean age of the Vocational-Technical

faculty is 43.2 years. The difference is not statistically significant.

3. Of the Arts and Sciences respondents, 110 (48.5 per cent) have the rank of instructor while of the Vocational-Technical respondents, 60 persons (49.2 per cent) hold that rank. The second largest representations are 35 (15.4 per cent) Arts and Sciences faculty full professors and 23 (18.8 per cent) Vocational-Technical faculty associate professors. None of the differences is statistically significant.

4. The overall mean years of service at the current institution is 7.8 years for Arts and Sciences respondents and 6.9 years for the Vocational-Technical respondents; this difference is significant at the .05 level.

5. The overall mean years of service in post-secondary education for the Arts and Sciences faculty is 9.1 years while the corresponding figure for the Vocational-Technical faculty is 7.9 years; this difference is significant at the .01 level.

6. The mean number of academic appointments (at different post-secondary institutions) is 1.9 for the Arts and Sciences faculty and 1.5 for the Vocational-Technical faculty; the difference is significant at the .01 level.

7. The highest educational levels for the Arts and Sciences group are 152 persons (67 per cent) with a Master's degree and 54 persons (23.8 per cent) with doctorates. The

highest educational levels for the Vocational-Technical group are 68 persons (55.8 per cent) with Master's degrees, 32 persons (26.2 per cent) with Bachelor's degrees, and 15 persons (12.3 per cent) with doctorates. None of these differences is statistically significant.

8. As to the group with which the respondents feel the strongest identity, 92 persons (40.5 per cent) of the Arts and Sciences group name their department or division, 68 persons (30 per cent) name their discipline, and 38 persons (14.5 per cent) name their students. In the Vocational-Technical group, 39 persons (32 per cent) name their department or division, 31 persons (25.4 per cent) identify mostly with their students, and 30 persons (24.6 per cent) name their discipline. None of these differences is statistically significant.

9. Considering the amount of assistance received by the respondents in twelve areas of professional development, the means vary for the Arts and Sciences faculty from 1.5 (very little to minor help) to 2.3 (minor help to moderate help). For the Vocational-Technical faculty, the means range from a low of 1.7 (very little to minor help) to 2.5 (minor help to moderate help). In every instance, the means follow the same pattern for both groups with the largest difference in means is only four-tenths of a point for any one item. The means for the Vocational-Technical responses are consistently slightly higher than the means for the Arts

and Sciences responses. The differences are significant as to whether faculty development helped in (1) improving as an advisor of students, (2) improving skills in the academic field, (3) improving skills as a committee member, (4) improving administrative knowledge and skills, (5) improving skills for consulting, writing, or other skills related to community service, and (6) improving research skills.

10. Concerning the extent of institutional support received, the means of the two groups are 2.4 (2.0 = a limited extent, 3.0 = a considerable extent) for Arts and Sciences respondents and 2.6 for Vocational-Technical respondents. The difference is not statistically significant.

11. The most frequently mentioned comments from both groups are in the category of inadequate and nonmonetary rewards for faculty development. The second most frequently mentioned comment from both groups is that programs offered do not meet the faculty members' needs. The third and fourth most frequently mentioned comments from both groups are that the topics are too general and thus a waste of time, and that faculty development should be based on individual needs.

12. Both groups of faculty respond that faculty development has not had many specific effects; in every one of twelve areas of professional development they have received only minor to moderate help. Both groups express a need for more emphasis on the skills of teaching and a need to organize faculty development by divisions or departments.

13. Both faculty groups give similar responses on the importance of achievements in decisions on tenure, promotion, and salary increases. The Arts and Sciences mean is significantly greater on publishing professional works. The Vocational-Technical mean is significantly greater on being a knowledgeable, sensitive advisor, and on participating as a consultant, scholar, and leader beyond the institution.

14. On the importance of staff development participation as an achievement for personal satisfaction and gratification, the Arts and Sciences mean is 2.2 (2.0 = somewhat important) and the Vocational-Technical mean is 2.4. In responding to the importance of achievements, both groups believe that teaching and advising students are their most important achievements. None of the differences is statistically significant.

15. The overall means of the Arts and Sciences and Vocational-Technical respondents on the extent of institutional change in the last five years are exactly the same at 3.8 (3.0 = about the same as most institutions; 4.0 = somewhat more than most institutions).

16. Of the two groups compared college by college on extent to which faculty development has encouraged institutional innovation (in every instance and for both groups), the means are considerably lower than on the extent of institutional change.

17. The Vocational-Technical means on four areas of institutional improvement occurring in the last five years are significantly greater than the Arts and Sciences means. The areas are preparing students for careers, developing students' intellectual skills, making governance and administration more effective, and providing students with a breadth of learning.

18. On two areas of institutional improvement that need to occur soon, the Arts and Sciences means are significantly greater than the Vocational-Technical means. These needs are on preparing students for careers and on developing students' intellectual skills.

19. The majority of faculty members in both groups indicate that the degree of institutional support is in the midrange between a limited extent and a considerable extent.

20. Both groups of faculty feel strongly about the need for improvement of faculty development programs in terms of rewards, topics, and recognition of the needs of individuals and groups.

21. Both groups expressed a need for more emphasis on the skills of teaching and a need to organize more faculty development activities by departments or divisions.

22. The responses from the two groups of faculty members show that they are convinced that the primary mission of the community college teacher is to teach; other achievements, including participation in faculty development, are important but not foremost.

23. The responses of the faculty members in this sample indicate that faculty members at community colleges throughout the state feel that participation in faculty development activities should result in more monetary or other tangible rewards, or that institutionally-organized faculty development programs should be curtailed in favor of other forms of professional development.

24. Both faculty groups from every community college represented feel that some innovative changes have occurred in the last five years, and that most of it is due to factors other than the existence of faculty development programs at their institutions.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings of this study:

1. The two groups of faculty members have the same impression of faculty development programs.

2. Both groups of faculty state unequivocally that they are getting, at best, only minor to somewhat-less-than moderate help from faculty development programs in all areas of professional development.

3. The faculty development programs, by virtue of their existence and the name, appear to have caused faculty members to consider their professional development as being more of an individual concern, yet they also consider this as an area for needed institutional support.

4. The faculty members respond as faculty in general and not just as Vocational-Technical faculty or Arts and Sciences faculty.

5. Faculty development at present is none too effective; at least this is the case in the institutions whose faculty members participated in this study.

General Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Faculty development programs should be strengthened to provide more help in professional development areas; these areas include more emphasis on the skills of teaching, and the organization of programs and activities by division or department.

2. Community colleges should seek to improve the extent of institutional support for all faculty members in the area of professional development.

3. Now is the time for community colleges to conduct a thorough reappraisal of faculty development in order that faculty development can be a force for fostering innovation at the community colleges. Every community college should review and possibly revise its philosophy and methods of faculty development. Reappraisals of community college faculty development should take place periodically.

4. Every community college should thoroughly examine its reward system as related to faculty development with an eye to (1) making faculty more aware of the relationship, and (2) strengthening the rewards associated with faculty development.

5. Future faculty development programs should be planned with more attention to individual development needs.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations for further study are suggested:

1. In-depth interviews should be conducted with faculty members at community colleges to provide more thorough data on their perceptions of faculty development.

2. Studies should be made of whether faculty members having different backgrounds (with and without doctorates, with few or many years of teaching experience, and so forth) respond in the same ways.

3. Studies should be made of differences in perceptions of urban and rural public community college faculty.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

A. BACKGROUND AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Please write the number of the most suitable option in the space beside the number of the question.

____ 1. What is your present age?
(1) under 25 (2) 25-29 (3) 30-34 (4) 35-39 (5) 40-44 (6) 45-49 (7) 50-54 (8) 55-59 (9) 60 or over

____ 2. What is your sex? (1) Male (2) Female

____ 3. What is your present rank? (1) Instructor (2) Assistant Professor (3) Associate Professor (4) Full Professor (5) Other

____ 4. For how many years have you held an academic appointment at this institution? (1) 1 or less (2) 2-3 (3) 4-6 (4) 7-9 (5) 10 or more

____ 5. For how many years in all have you held an academic appointment in post-secondary institutions including this one? (Do not count graduate and research assistantships.) (1) 1 or less (2) 2-3 (3) 4-6 (4) 7-9 (5) 10 or more

____ 6. At how many post-secondary institutions (including this one) have you held an academic appointment? (1) 1 (2) 2 (3) 3 (4) 4 (5) 5 or more

____ 7. What is the highest earned degree you hold? (1) Undergraduate Bachelor's or less (2) Master's (3) Ph.D. (4) Other

____ 8. With which of the following groups do you have the strongest identity or sense of belonging?

(1) My academic department or division
(2) My discipline generally (3) My institution
(4) My students (5) A special interest group across department lines
Please name:_____

B. REWARDS

For each of the following areas, how important do you feel
your achievements would be:

1. In decisions involving the award of tenure, promotion
    or salary increase at your institution? Use the fol-
    lowing scale:

> (1) Not important
> (2) Somewhat important
> (3) Quite important
> (4) Extremely important

____ a. Publishing professional works
____ b. Being a demanding and challenging teacher
____ c. Participating in departmental and insti-
         tution-wide governance affairs
____ d. Exercising innovativeness in teaching
____ e. Being a knowledgeable, conscientious and
         sensitive advisor
____ f. Participating as consultant, scholar, and
         leader beyond the institution
____ g. Participating in staff development activities

2. In providing you with a sense of personal satisfaction
    and gratification?

____ a. Publishing professional works
____ b. Being a demanding and challenging teacher
____ c. Participating in departmental and insti-
         tution-wide governance affairs
____ d. Exercising innovativeness in teaching
____ e. Being a knowledgeable, conscientious and
         sensitive advisor
____ f. Participating as consultant, scholar, and
         leader beyond the institution
____ g. Participating in staff development activities

C. INSTITUTIONAL INNOVATION

____ 1. To what extent do you feel your institution has
         been involved in innovative changes in curriculum,
         teaching or evaluation in the last five years?

> (1) Very little or not at all
> (2) Less than most institutions
> (3) About the same as most institutions
> (4) Somewhat more than most institutions
> (5) Considerably more than most institutions

___ 2. To what extent do you feel faculty/staff develop-
        ment has encouraged innovative changes in curri-
        culum, teaching or evaluation at your institution?

        (1) Very little or not at all
        (2) Less than most institutions
        (3) About the same as most institutions
        (4) Considerably more than most institutions
        (5) Considerably more than most institutions

   3.   Below are several areas of possible institutional
        concern. How much improvement has occurred and
        how much should occur in each of these at your
        institution? On the left, rate the degree to
        which improvement has been made over the last five
        years. On the right, indicate the degree of
        improvement that needs to occur in the near
        future. Use the following scale to rate the
        amount of improvement that has occurred or needs
        to occur.

        (1) None or little
        (2) A minor amount
        (3) A moderate amount
        (4) A major amount

Has occurred in   Needs to
last five years   occur soon

     ___ a. Preparing students for careers   ___
     ___ b. Advancing scholarship and research   ___
     ___ c. Developing students' intellectual
              skills   ___
     ___ d. Preparing students in academic
              concentrations   ___
     ___ e. Making governance and administration
              more effective and efficient   ___
     ___ f. Helping students clarify purposes,
              develop self-understanding and con-
              fidence and relate effectively to
              others
     ___ g. Serving local, regional or national   ___
              needs
     ___ h. Providing students breadth of learning ___
     ___ i. Establishing comprehensive faculty
              development   ___

D.   PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INTERESTS

Below is a list of ways you may have wished to improve your performance as a teacher, advisor, and professional contributor to your college and community. Please place next to each statement the number reflecting the amount of help your institution's faculty development program has provided in each area.

(4)   A great deal of help
(3)   Moderate help
(2)   Minor help
(1)   Very little or no help at this time

_____ a.   Refine and improve my current teaching style

_____ b.   Attempt to improve my ability as an advisor of students

_____ c.   Strengthen my knowledge, skill and productivity in my academic field

_____ d.   Introduce changes in course content and teaching approach to make the educational process more responsive to student learning needs and interests

_____ e.   Improve the standards and accuracy of my approach to evaluating students

_____ f.   Improve my skills as a committee member

_____ g.   Attempt to broaden my knowledge outside my discipline

_____ h.   Develop new courses and programs

_____ i.   Strengthen my consulting, writing or other skills related to community service

_____ j.   Seek to learn about and try teaching innovations

_____ k.   Improve my research skills

_____ l.   Improve my administrative knowledge and skills

E.   Overall, to what extent does this institution support your interests and help you realize your own career aspirations?

___ 1. Hardly at all
___ 2. To a limited extent
___ 3. To a considerable extent
___ 4. To a great extent

F.   Faculty members express a range of views about their work. At this stage of your career how do you feel about the following matters?

	Disagree Strongly 1	Disagree Somewhat 2	Agree Somewhat 3	Agree Strongly 4
1. My work generally is exciting and fulfilling	___	___	___	___
2. Knowledge in my field is expanding so fast that I have fallen seriously behind	___	___	___	___
3. Teaching is not as much fun as it once was	___	___	___	___
4. I can't seem to find time to do all the things that I want to do	___	___	___	___
5. There is nobody here with whom I can share my professional interests	___	___	___	___
6. My career to date has been successful	___	___	___	___
7. I consider myself an intellectual	___	___	___	___

G.   Please give any other comments about your perception of faculty development and the rewards from faculty development.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY BY COLLEGES

Vocational Technical

<u>College Number 1</u>

"Not enough reward given to encourage fac. dev. OR not enough penalty for not doing fac. dev. activities. We need to be serious about rewarding those who work and not rewarding those who do not. We should not compensate at across the board rate!"

"Pay a percentage of tuition of 'hourly' courses to increase participation & incentive."

"I think it could be more of a career development tool than it is. There is a temptation to take anything that is offered in order to play the game and increase your pay, whether or not the activities increase your knowledge in the specific areas of your career goals. This probably occurs because there are not enough people interested in the courses that would update your knowledge in your field to make up a class; so the courses offered have general appeal rather than specific information that you could use in teaching. The solution of course, is to take a college

151

course in your discipline; however, many people feel that the expense of tuition, and board if the course you need is out of town, will never be returned to you by the present staff development increments. So we take, and hate, general education courses offered on campus. If the reward system could be changed so that those who will sacrifice the time and effort to improve knowledge in their field could be reimbursed for a portion of their expense at the time, I think that the real goals of staff development would be achieved to a far greater extent."

"Good to have pay increase for completion of 72 points. Workshops should be repeated for convenience of attendees."

"It is essential for maintaining productivity and professionalism."

"I think this college has been outstanding in this area, and I am pleased with our SD program."

"Present faculty development program does not place enough importance on improving classroom teaching."

"This college is excellent in this area & gives members of the faculty a lot of encouragement."

"The staff development has not really been geared to the needs of the faculty--Each area has specific needs & these have not been considered."

"Basically, very good idea and certainly needed--however--it must be structured so that it may function fairly and according to the rules originally set."

"This college is good in this area--Faculty is motivated to attend."

"Need better speakers and more general topics."

"The present faculty development program does not place enough emphasis on improved classroom teaching."

"I find the current system satisfactory. I like the increase in pay when you complete the 72 staff development points. It would be helpful if the workshops were held 2 days so that more faculty could attend."

"Faculty development (staff development) needs to be more organized. A staff development plan encompassing one school year should be available to all participants at the beginning of each school year. There are many on-campus activities that are called staff development, but, which are really 'keeping current' and certainly not worth of SD points. I personnally[sic] feel that all professional meetings are also 'keeping current' and should not receive SD points."

"I have enjoyed faculty development seminars very much. I do think we could probably get some better speakers. Some have been good--others!!. Maybe get topics that would be of interest to all of us."

"It is not good when it applies force to anyone under any circumstance."

"Faculty development is essential for maintaining professional interest and productivity."

"Aside from academic degrees I would like to see staff development removed from salary scales. Instead I feel that it would be in the interest of faculty and college to develop a tuition or seminar reimbursement program. This would be a one time thing per course or seminar and should be used only for work directly related to a teaching field. I am not knowledgeable enough to make recommendations concerning staff. I would like to see more work in new and innovative approaches to teaching. Everyone should have the opportunity to try something 'new', but I also feel that some method of evaluation should be developed to assure these new techniques are valid and learning does occur. Some of the innovative techniques in teaching are not working in my opinion and should be evaluated and then modified. SOAPBOX----Although I understand that funding for this college is based on contact hours I feel that 'numbers' of students is over emphasized. Courses should be offered at different levels to meet different student's[sic] needs, but some people simply do not have the ability or apptitude[sic] to complete more difficult work. I think I am trying to say that standards are sometime lowered in order to assure that an adequate number of students can get through it. This is not fair to the student nor the college. Staff development is very important and should be rewarded. I feel that it is not fairly administered and alternate systems should be reviewed. Thank you for an opportunity to speak out on this matter."

College Number 2

"I have just completed a faculty survey of the technical division dealing with faculty development and our rewards i.e. salary promotions and rank promotions. Both promotion systems are based on college credit hours related to the field of teaching. 30% have no doctors nor masters that are directly or closely related to the courses in their program. 82% are impacted by equipment or technological changes that are gained from sources other than graduate work. 94% gain this development from sources other than graduate studies but these developments are not recognized in the rewards."

"Faculty development & rewards from such development come only in the form of feeling satisfied that I have actually helped someone through education to better themselves[sic]. Monetary rewards are virtually non-existant [sic]. From an economic standpoint, a teacher is penalized monetarily by taking time off from work to pursue higher academic degrees."

"A person gets promoted if he sticks around & does his job reasonably well. For the person who wants to excell [sic] in an area (or two) there is no significant reward or incentive beyond the intrinsic (and perhaps community recognition). Even when the graduates of a department get significantly higher salaries than those from other institutions,

there is very little recognition--let alone remuneration--
except from the hiring companies themselves."

"To my knowledge, our college does not have a formal
faculty development program. Most of my personal develop-
ment (completion of Ed.D., May '80) has been approved by
college but not encouraged. The department I am a member of
has recently addressed the problem of professional develop-
ment. I have developed a model for faculty development that
is under consideration by a committee in our department."

"There are in the Educational lexicon a Plethora of
Catch Phrases, none of which have[sic] a clear definition,
but all of which must be included in any educational
research paper: 'How do you feel about Omfoging. (It is
equivalent to goodness, light, and beauty)?' 'Oh, I'm in
favour.' 'How do you feel about Omfoging? (it is equiva-
lent to treachery, deception and guys with black hats)'
'Well, Then, I'm against IT.' As a result a large number of
survey studies are without validity. I have no comments
about faculty development & reward since my perception is
muddied by lack of understanding of the terminology."

"Teaching young students is a challenging job. The
faculty here has been most helpful in preparing me for this
profession. As a retired electronics engineer from the U.S.
Air Force, this change in occupation has been most exciting
and rewarding."

"There are financial rewards for faculty development but I feel somewhat restrained academically. I feel that some of the new knowledge there is needs to be used."

"The institution to which I belong has no faculty development program as such. Except for the new beginning teacher, who receives some minor development, none is programmed for other faculty members."

College Number 3

"Faculty development at this institution is a 'Hodge-Podge' situation; definitely not geared to meet the needs of the individual faculty member--Very little leadership shown on the part of the administrative personnel--at present the program is relagated[sic] to a 'Mickey Mouse' system of acquiring 'Points' which, at best, is a page out of a book entitled 'Playing the Paper Game'."

College Number 4

"Inadequate and not available"

"Education is at least 20 years behind the times. Let's wake up."

"Lectures are effective when handled by person with personal expertise and experience in a specific field. Classical management procedures and problems, as well as those of employees, handled in a positive cooperative rather then[sic] divisive manner would be more productive."

"Faculty development seems to be not as practical as it should be. I think measured results should be seen. The

development programs should be less in the realm of the abstract and more in the realm of determined position."

"Faculty (development) is to[sic] general and for the most part not for my needs."

"HEMI program at this institution has made significant 'apparent' change in some management styles and activities. More authority is being delegated. Whether or not this will continue remains to be seen. Major policy changes in requirements for faculty incentive (required to continue ed.) appear to benefit both the college and the individual faculty member. Other attempts at in-service type staff development programs and activities have not been successful."

"Faculty development should be a much broader subject. Too many times speaker of development workshops are hidden in their own discipline they have no desire or interest in areas (other than their own)."

College Number 5

"I feel that it is essential for the full development of the teacher; however, I'm often discouraged as I can't fit it into my schedule the majority of the time."

"This institution is mired in a system that rewards incompetence. Many of the administrators do not have the 'guts' to dismiss incompetent instructors or lower level administrators."

"The sessions that I have participated in on this campus, have been a waste of my time. Some that I signed up

for at times were cancelled. Fac. dev. sessions are sched-
uled at the wrong time in the course of a year. Usually at
the beginning of a semester, when an instructor is already
busy with advisement, registration, and new lesson plans,
etc."

College Number 6

"I feel it has given me a better insight into our
courses and programs as well as working with the individual
student."

"I have not received any awards as such, but the
rewards have been tremendous in the framework of successful
leadership & challenges in my career here. No bargains all
gains, these being, creative ideas that has[sic] helped me
to build & instruct fundamental teaching objectives, &
competency based training to students. The incentive is
often shared where the learner reaches his/her aim or goal
through projects, research, skits and activities in a
learning-performance assessment. Other rewards have been
when the student has completed the program & received his/
her award. Also, the outreach into our community shares &
harmonizes the opportunity to include all able human beings
(giving them) a chance to learn or develop a skill, & to
successfully lead an adaptable life. 'Children are our
nations[sic] resources in all endeavors.'"

"Some type of reward for faculty members are[sic] a
must. Rewards do tend to improve effective and innovative
instruction."

"Being in health careers it is difficult to adapt some of your questions. On a whole, the college has given us support on projects we think important, however we feel we sould be more informed on policies concerning our division before it becomes 'law'. Faculty or the nursing department are given maximum freedom to develop or change along the guide lines of State Board."

College Number 7

"The leader is trying. It's impossible to get released to travel. The development programs do not seem applicable to my area."

"Very little, if any, departmental and/or faculty development has been conducted or even attempted for the Continuing Education department of our college. There is a very much needed development for this area. Continuing Education is too often looked upon as a step-child or a second-rate department of most schools. Continuing education is a very much needed area of a college and often acts as a stepping stone for adults to move into college credit courses."

College Number 12

"Key is small groups working together over a period of time."

College Number 13

"A good faculty development program in my opinion provides a variety of opportunities for a faculty to meet needs

in Instructional concerns, Administrative concerns, and Professional and Personal concerns. Workshops, seminars, etc. should be held throughout the school year addressing these topics and faculty should be free to choose what they wish to participate in. I can tolerate a <u>large</u> <u>group</u> session for <u>Staff</u> <u>or</u> <u>Faculty</u> <u>Development</u> about <u>once</u> a school year. It's okay for providing background information, but to really learn and understand theory we need opportunities for small and individual sessions to put those theories into practice. <u>Themes</u> for faculty development are also okay--but again the faculty should have <u>optional</u> ways of achieving the overall goals of the theme for faculty development. We need more innovative staff development activities. Too many concentrate on evaluation and curriculum development."

<u>College Number 15</u>

"Most faculty development programs have been well presented but are, in general, a waste of time. Innovations on New Teaching Aids are always good but other areas, cognitive style learning, etc. are not. Teachers are Born, developed and mature through experience and help from an understanding supervisor, Not! developed through formal presentations on <u>how</u> to 'teach'. If you tell it like it is, how to succeed and/or fail in the Real World they (students) will follow you and <u>Never</u> miss class or drop out. Thanks for asking my opinion."

"Programs here are current, interesting, helpful, well planned, and well promoted. Response by the faculty to these programs seems to be growing rapidly. The use of input from non academic experts adds a great deal to the development programs."

College Number 16

"Could emphasize teaching skills and techniques more."

"The delegation of responsibility and authority below division chairmen is nebulous. Tenure, salary, and position is[sic] too generalized. After 13 years here, I am still an instructor, salary is adjusted only by years of being here and degrees. Today at best with highest degree in my field I can make half as much as my family needs to live."

Arts and Sciences

College Number 1

"If faculty development is staff development--then it is not too good at present. Nothing is offered to the staff so everyone picks a hodge-podge of "stuff"--usually courses here--& will take anything which somebody approves. The SD director should get more activities brought in & stop asking someone else to get up SD activities."

"Faculty development is important--This institution has not provided stimulus for staff development related to my field--however, has allowed me to attend & receive some credit for outside staff development. These are of more

value to me in my teaching than on-campus-or campus provided areas--Yet sometimes little or no credit is given for these. I have increased in current teaching style--etc., since employment through programs held outside of this campus--I would have attended these without the staff development program--But appreciate credit given for outside sources."

"I do believe in faculty development, but the monetary rewards hardly justify the effort."

"Faculty development is very important--this institution can help, but the responsibility and accountability belongs to the individual faculty member."

"The programs that are worthwhile for updating my knowledge are usually turned down under the guise of 'that's your professional responsibility', whereas programs that may be worthless to me as an individual &/or faculty member will be approved."

"I have no improvements to suggest unlss it would be some type of streamlining to facilitate participation in development. I don't know the answer, after all, we can't dismiss classes to attend activities, if we didn't have students we wouldn't need faculty development."

"Rewards seem to be mainly monetary, which I don't feel should be the primary concern of faculty. A conscientious, dedicated teacher will keep ahead of developments in his or her field without 'rewards'. Too many of the development programs seem to be 'Mickey Mouse', basket-weaving' type of

courses. Incompetent teachers will not be improved by development programs. I also believe that the points for development are awarded on an uneven basis. A committee on campus cannot know what course work a faculty member may need for his program. They should not have the right to reject a graduate level course if it is required by the institution awarding the degree. Too many points are given for workshops, etc. instead of course work."

"Bad teachers usually do not develop. Good teachers usually develop on their own. With teaching, grading, and studying who has much time for development meetings, etc.?"

"Institutionally directed faculty development has no place in a supposed 'institution of higher learning.' Individually directed faculty development assumes a greater importance. Individual faculty members should choose their own route without approval from above and 'Brownie' points should not even be necessary."

"Faculty development here is largely irrelevant to my discipline. The activities which have benefited me most are those sponsored by my discipline's local, state, and national organizations. Participation in these activities is severely limited by my two immediate supervisors."

"Greater stress should be made toward fulfilling the needs & interests of the individual. Thoe programs brought to this campus for group participation, though of general value, are less meaningful than are those of specific topics

available at senior institutions. Expensive to accomplish, but individual growth strengthen[sic] this institution."

"It is very difficult to apply an even-handed evaluation of credit and rewards to all faculty members. Therefore, inequities are inherent in a staff development program."

"It has helped me recognize that inovation[sic] and change are occurring, some beneficial, some not. I don't feel that I need to jump in on every new modification that comes along' I don't believe in the 'Peabody Principle' of change for the sake of change. I figure if it works and has proven effective, don't dump it, but I'm no politician."

"Professional and personal commitment dictate the importance one places on faculty development. No institution should have to legislate that. Most growth has its own rewards ultimately. It can become all too easy in a faculty development program to equate 'effectiveness' with how many points one accumulates rather than how well one has reached, taught and helped each of his/her students and/or advisees."

"Both the college and the individual can gain much from faculty development if it is properly supported. This college has not fully supported faculty development. There should be more coordinated effort, better organized; more consistently administered--we need a coordinator dedicated to the development of programs with faculty input."

"Faculty development should be encouraged, of course, and it should seek to allow the faculty member to be rewarded for <u>any</u> activity which makes him a better teacher in the classroom."

"Faculty development is fine, but too little return in pay."

"Much so-called faculty development has been superficial, and the rewards have been undeserved."

"The concept as practiced is a fraud perpetrated against the faculty. It is merely a device to reduce incremental pay by devoting resources to 'faculty development' rather than payroll."

"Because I am in the music field--the staff courses do not relate to me as much. I teach mostly on a one to one basis; therefore it is difficult to relate this. I will say, however, that the one or two sessions I have participated in have been boring! The main complaint is that if you want to go to most of these sessions one or I have to cut classes or private lessons to go, and I, nor my students, can afford to miss even 1 lesson a semester much less three or four!"

"This questionnaire was too long. I doubt that many will endure through it. Why did I??"

"My experience and impressions of staff development are that there is a lot of 'interpretation' of what it says about how it is to work and how it is applied. There is too

much paperwork and too little reward. There is no encouragement to improve oneself professionally. Instead there is encouragement to take coursework that is favored by the powers that be and there is little course content or worth in the ones that I have taken or heard about. The system is used as punishment and reward, according to who is involved. The central committee who twice voted in favor of an appeal was overrode[sic] by the interim president."

College Number 2

"I do not hold my institution responsible for my development. All I want is to be allowed to improve and I feel totally satisfied that I am given that opportunity in my present situation. The only complaint I would register is that promotions and raises in salary are locked into 'hours of credit' in graduate work. I think that is a narrow and restrictive criterion. Other achievements should be given stronger consideration. That complaint pertains to my school. In education in general, I feel that good teaching does not receive due credit. That is the most important concern for any teacher or school, but it is so often overlooked, unnoticed, given less attention than other activities. Too bad."

"Faculty development should be broad enough to permit a personal/professional growth. By this I mean growth in: 1. Subject matter comprehension, refinement, etc. 2. Effective teaching methods. 3. Personal areas, for example,

learning new skills, new behaviors for relating to and understanding people, etc."

"In order for any faculty to develop, it must have inner motivation. This must be <u>encouraged</u> by the administration & unforced. Without this, the fire inside will die and a stagnating situation will be reached."

"My impression is that 'faculty development' programs are largely the perfunctory duties of 'educationists.' I feel little in common with educationists and their obsession with method at the expense of content."

"Having no definition of 'faculty development' in mind except my own concept has made it difficult to answer this questionnaire. Our college makes courses available for us to take, and shares the cost, for the purpose of our attaining certain status for promotion purposes. I do not, however, see the courses' purpose (from the college's standpoint) as being primarily 'faculty development'. Faculty development is encouraged and supported, certainly, but it is the individual faculty member who provides, or fails to do so, his own development in whatever way he can. This probably is the way it should be. Any real professional is aware of what development he needs and takes steps to provide it. Encouragement and support from the institution should be adequate, without any formal faculty development program. Once again, however, lack of a clear definition of that term may invalidate this whole paragraph."

"The courses offered for the most part are education & psychology courses. All a load of baloney as far as I am concerned."

"At this stage of my career, I will continue to develop nicely if I am just left to my own methods."

"I believe in continuing education. Faculty development should cover, as nearly as possible, all disciplines rather than, say, just one or two...ie Education."

"I feel this department is falling short of faculty development. There is never any Inservice of any kind although we have a faculty development committee. I feel this would bring the faculty up to date on many aspects and in this department it is really needed."

"Faculty is strongly discouraged from research and writing. Only a few members of the faculty show slightest interest in current developments in this discipline. In fact, many are bored with their own routine lectures. A strong need to broaden variety of courses in order to re-awaken interest."

"Little emphasis on professional development, little recognition of prof. dev. on teaching performance. Little institutional emphasis on community cultural development. This institution maintains within the community a low profile approach. *My perspective is unique within the art department. Some questions on the questionnaire don't directly apply. I answered as much as they did apply."

College Number 3

"I spend more time proving my existance[sic] than I do existing. Daily logs, work schedules, paper work, etc. Faculty development and rewards depend on political and social connections rather than educational profiencies [sic]."

"You can led a horse to water, but you can't make her/him drink. If you do manage to get her/him to drink, you still cannot make her/him enjoy."

"I feel that we have a good faculty development program. It is mainly developed by the faculty member with advise[sic] of his/her supervisor. There are standard projects to do, but there are others that the individual faculty member can do to enhance his/her professionalism. One thing that needs improvement is salary increases especially beyond the 36 hrs according to the increment program there are no salary increases beyond the 36 hrs unless you receive a Phd."

"I need things that relate to my subject matter, not on determining test effectiveness, psychology of the students behavior, etc....."

"I am working on a doctoral program and have gotten 6 hours each academic year and completed two comprehensives. Our professional development plan is a point plan that includes a variety of junk that I am not interested in at this time and which I do not feel helps me at this time, and

in fact which impedes my efforts to become more professionally competent. Plans should be designed to meet special circumstances such as special study, sabbaticals, research projects, or other things if definitely related to teaching areas. Quite frankly, rewards of faculty development are internal since the salary gain is the only other recognition and it is slight. The internal reward is what makes it worth the trouble."

"I think faculty development should be practical and one year in length for a new faculty member. For experienced faculty on-going and according to faculty member's interests. TIME should be set aside for the program. Thanks for asking me what I think."

College Number 4

"Staff development has been used primarily to serve the interests of the president of th college and/or those who are personally liked by the president of the college. It is essentially a farce, since it is mostly for show and the findings are seldom put into effect, especially if it relates to faculty participation in college governance."

"Having come out of retirement from public school, I am in a unique position here. I thoroughly enjoy teaching; I love young people and enjoy an excitement when their minds begin to really click--not only with answers, but with questions. My coworkers are a delight and the administration 'lets me teach'. I want to do my best, but I have no

ambition, but to be what I am. I would like to improve my knowledge and ability, but not my position."

"Our faculty development has always been for the entire faculty. In reality it should be for departments and not for the masses, because each department is specialized with completely different needs and interests. Specialized or department development is badly needed."

"Development has been made available for Campus-wide faculty. However, as a part of the nursing faculty our needs are unique. We are attempting as a department to get changes made in this area."

"I do not really expect the institution to foster and promote my intellectual development as a professor. I see that development primarily as an individual responsibility."

"Some administrators at all institutions that I have been in (other than this one as a student only) seem to be beyond the perspective of most teachers. Perhaps the best way to improve faculty development would be for all administrators to teach _full_ _time_ in classroom situations for two years at seven year intervals. Faculty development would best be handled by related divisions, not institution-wide. Another important element is recognition for achievement. Too many institutions award negatively for isolated poor performance but not positively for generally good, high-grade, and the mostly continuing of such performance."

"Faculty development planned by administration is a waste of time at this institution. The same program for staff development is not appropriate for both academic and occupational faculty. The time could be spent in the specific department for faculty development in areas that are needed."

"Our faculty development program is almost non-existant[sic]--consisting of a mass meeting devoted to busy work which everyone dreads to attend. A complete and utter waste of time."

"Can only be successful when dissociated from outside consultants and educational jargon. Should be done departmentally by the department."

College Number 5

"I wish for time--a sabbatical, a released class, etc. to pursue higher education or for more liaisons with other institutions to provde one course exchange programs. Our educational program is responsive to our needs concerning teaching methodology, etc., and will pay for consultants in our field as an occasional conference. It is hard though to find time to be a good teacher and curriculum innovator and at the same time take formal courses without any institutional help."

"Well organized, well meaning, good thing to have, somewhat limited as effective faculty enrichment."

"The greatest problems facing our faculty development program currently are: 1) establishment of some reward system for 'work well done.' 2) revitalization of teaching as a career. 3) change in top administration for better leadership in our College. (This year over 70% of the college's employees voted 'no confidence' in the President's and Presidential assistant's ability to lead the institution.)"

"I have asked for and received much more than the average faculty member, and I appreciate it. Two disadvantages are the great amount of extra work it entails and the threats to my job security. Also, when I earn my Ph.D. I shall become a more expensive employee."

College Number 6

"Faculty development will work better in this institution if financially supported on a Division basis. Assign development personnel to a Division for a span of time, and then move to the next."

"Faculty development at this institution suffers from a lack of cohesive administrative policy."

"There are too many questionnaires like this one to fill out."

"Viewpoint is limited due to assignment. Removed from campus--little communication--except very essential--from department's office."

"Needs to be more comprehensive and professional. There are no institutional rewards from faculty development--only personal rewards from some of the f.d. effort."

"Many of the faculty really are competent. But, often they remind me of Socrates' description of the wise man: they know one thing and this means they know everything. Dismantling their competencies for analysis seems to take away their Linus blanket. It is possible to look at skills and competencies, but diplomacy, tact, and caution are the by-words."

"Faculty development programs that I have been exposed to in the past are too 'theoretical' (for want of a better word), and thus--generally useless and a waste of time! If programs could be developed within specific disciplines-- i.e. demonstrating innovative teaching techniques in specific applications--they could be of tremendous practical value."

"The curriculum development at this college has been a very strong point for the school."

College Number 7

"We have a fairly responsive and effective faculty development, however time schedules (teaching responsibilities) do not always lend themselves to the schedule of activities presented for faculty development. We need to arrive at a more uniform manner of sharing information college-wide with those who are interested in programs

presented, yet are unable to attend due to class commitments."

"I think most of our staff feel grateful to be a part of the college."

"Although this college has taken steps to tie faculty evaluation and development to contracts (particularly multi-year contracts), it has not been implemented. The evaluation system is working and faculty development is improving, but no multi-year contracts. (The faculty has consistently voted against rank and there has been a strong move for tenure.)"

"The program of faculty development at this college is very motivating and varied. It has introduced new methods and enthusiasm as well as allowed me to become acquainted with professionals in my occupational area from other parts of the state."

"So far, my perception of faculty development at this institution is that it has just begun to be considered an important function of the college and has a long way to go to become effective. However, I have seen a lot of improvement in the last year and expect to be involved in some beneficial activities in the near future."

College Number 8

"All faculty development is something done within. Very little can be done by the institution except provide

funds for individual study and very few institutions want to do this. Most administrators are only interested in saving tax dollars to make themselves look good."

College Number 10

"At our institution faculty development concentrates on 'how to make a profit' which is defined by the institution as having sufficient contact hours to pay my salary plus 40% for administrative costs, plus 20% for student services plus an overage."

College Number 11

"Faculty development has been better here than anywhere else I've been in Texas but does not compare with New York State where much more money is spent on all phases of education at every level, including facilities and instructors desires and needs. The rewards from real development are increased interests and enthusiasm but Texas is stingy."

College Number 12

"Staff development generally concentrates on what the institution and administration wish to emphasize--the needs and interests of the individual teaching instructor are secondary. Rewards are limited."

"More focus should be put on students and on innovative and challenging teaching techniques, less on community involvement."

College Number 13

"I feel my directions of _future_ growth must go _beyond_

this campus (to study, write, speak, seek outside recognition, etc.). But extra-campus development is discouraged in favor of putting all efforts into classroom."

"This school was begun with the stated philosophy that faculty were to be judged virtually entirely on teaching prowess. 'Publish and perish' was to be closer to the truth. This has moderated somewhat--outside research, or other interests, of worth to the community at large are thought desirable. But classroom effectiveness is still the prime criteria. There is no other rank than 'instructor' here, and salary is determined by length of service and degrees accrued. At this point, because of enrollment problems 'rewards' are seen simply as the offer of another year's contract."

College Number 14

"Little or no consideration given here to faculty time--available for fac. deve. projects. Too often, high-interest workshops, guest lecturers, etc. set at a time when too many of us are still in class (i.e. 1 p.m.--1:30 p.m. ---etc.) cannot remember ever being surveyed as to a time preference for such things."

"Faculty development as practiced on this campus is a general waste of precious time. When I need help in improving my own teaching I go directly to the professionals that can help. Mass meetings and other similar attempts to 'develop faculty' are generally boreing[sic] and seldom

speak to specific areas where individual instructors could use help. As a well developed professional with nearly 20 years teaching experience very little additional 'committee' development is needed or desired."

"I've been very pleased with the one out-of-district guest speaker invited each semester by the College. I can remember each one of them vividly, partly because each spoke to an issue just beginning to surface in educational waters. They have been as good as anyone I've ever heard at any convention."

"The attempts made here at faculty development are largely a waste of time and money. Recently a university education professor was brought in to teach us 'how to teach.' This turned out to be the worst development program yet given. In one hour he attempted to tell a seasoned group of professionals how to teach in a way that would have insulted graduate assistants. In short, there have been few rewards from institutionally sponsored faculty development."

<u>College Number 16</u>

"Faculty development needs to be highly individualized and more centered on academic fields."

"It is frustrating to feel that regardless of how well I perform my duties my financial and promotional rewards are no different from those of other instructors. All positive motivation must come from within myself; from my own assessment of my development and value as an educator."

"Faculty development as perceived by most schools is

too broad in scope to really help. Our department meetings and the one faculty day we've had were much more productive than anything else I have attended."

"Generally a waste of my time."

"I've yet to see an organized program that really works. I think needs are too individual."

"This college did generously give me a semester off at full pay so that I could work on a Ph.D. and I am extremely grateful for the gift. It is true, however, that the college, by its very nature, cares very little about such subjects as literature, foreign languages, and philosophy. It is much more at ease with subjects that lead directly to jobs: computer programming, data processing, food service, quality control of building materials, accounting, automobile repair. This is a business town, and it is inevitable and probably right that community colleges, supported in part by local money, should offer what the community as a whole and the individual students value most."

"Should be totally voluntary--not demanded by administration--It's difficult to offer programs which are of interest to diverse disciplines--It would be of more use to spend 'speaker monies' on travel for faculty to attend conferences in their own fields!"

"There are already too many exercises for us to go through. How about student development and student responsibilities!"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bergquist, W. H., S. R. Phillips, and G. Quehl, A Handbook for Faculty Development 1, Washington, Council for Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

_____, A Handbook for Faculty Development 2, Berkeley, Pacific Soundings Press, 1977.

Freedman, Mervin, editor, Facilitating Faculty Development San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1973.

Gaff, Jerry, Toward Faculty Renewal, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1975.

Garrett, Henry Edward, Statistics in Psychology and Education, 6th ed., New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1966.

Good, Carter V., editor, Dictionary of Education, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Hillway, Tyrus, The American Two-Year College, New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958.

Medsker, Leland R., The Junior College: Progress and Prospect, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

Monroe, Charles R., Profile of the Community College, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972.

O'Banion, Terry, Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior Colleges, Tucson, The University of Arizona Press, 1974.

Thornton, James W., Jr., The Community Junior College, 2nd ed., New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Articles

Alvarado, Andrew, and Elizabeth Rinnander, "Sources and Information: Developing Staff Potential," New Directions for Community Colleges, 5 (Autumn 1977), 103-110.

Atwell, Charles A. and Robert W. Sullivan, "Cooperative Faculty Development," Community and Junior College Journal, 44 (November 1973), 32-33.

Beaudoin, Adrien P., "A State Plan for Staff Development," Community College Frontiers, 2, 2. (Winter 1974), 28-30.

Bergquist, William H., and Steven R. Phillips, "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program," Journal of Higher Education, 46, No.2 (March-April, 1975), 177-211.

Birnbaum, Robert, "Using the Calendar for Faculty Development," Educational Record, edited by Clifford B. Fair, 56, No. 4 (Fall 1975), 226-230.

Bogart, Quentin J. and Ellen A. Elson, "Role of the University in Community College In-Service Education," Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 1, 3, (April-June 1977), 219-230.

Chan, Betty, "Branching Out: The Staff Development Program at Parkland College," Community College Frontiers, 2, No. 2, (Winter 1974), 21-5.

Claxton, Charles, "Comprehensive Staff Development in the Community College: Implications for the Office of Institutional Research and Planning," Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 1 (July-September 1977), 397-408.

Clements, Clyde C., Jr., "Staff Development for Community Education Teachers," Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper, 5, No. 2 (Summer 1979), 10-13.

Cohen, Arthur M., "Towards A Professional Faculty," New Directions for Community Colleges, 1, (Spring 1973), 101-117.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brewer, "Evaluating Faculty," Community Colleges, 4, 7, (September 1972), 33a-33d.

Cox, David W., "Creating a Caring Community," New Directions for Community Colleges, 5, No. 5, (Autumn 1977), 47-59.

Croy, John E., "How Do You Feel About In-Service Programs?", Community and Junior College Journal, 44 (November, 1973), 28-29.

Dean, Kenny S., "In-Service Workshops for Community College Teachers," Community College Frontiers, 2, No. 2, (Winter, 1974), 26-7.

Doty, Charles R., "Major Characteristics in the Development and Implementation of a Professional Staff Development Program for Technical Teachers," Canadian Vocational Journal, 13, No. 1, (May 1977), 5-11.

Edefelt, Roy A., "In-Service Education of Teachers: Priority for the Next Decade," Journal of Teacher Education, 25 (Summer, 1974), 250-252.

Fordyce, Joseph W., "Faculty Development in American Community Junior Colleges," Peabody Journal of Education, 48 (January, 1971), 270-275.

Furniss, W. T., "Faculty Development and the Department," ADE Bulletin, (Association of Departments of English), 47, (November, 1975), 30-35.

Gaff, Jerry G., "Current Issues in Faculty Development and Evaluation," Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper, edited by Dr. Albert B. Smith, Gainesville, 3, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 2-4.

Garrison, Roger H., "A Mini-Manual on In-Service," Community and Junior College Journal, 45, No. 9, (June-July, 1975), 18-20.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr., "Beyond the Open Door: The Open College," Community and Junior College Journal, 45 (August-September, 1974), 16, 17, 28, 29.

_____, "Faculty Development Project," Junior College Journal, 38 (April, 1968), 7.

_____, "What Now for the Community Colleges?" Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (December/January, 1973), 9-13.

Gross, Richard, "Faculty Growth Contracts," Educational Horizons, 55, No.2 (Winter, 1976-77), 74-79.

Hammons, James O., "Suggestions Concerning Institutional Training of New Faculty," Community College Review, 1, No. 2 (July-August, 1973), 49-60.

Hammons, James O., and Terry H. Smith Wallace, "Planning for Staff Development," Community College Frontiers, 3, No. 1, (Fall, 1974), 36-43.

_____, "Staff Development Needs of Public Community College Department/ Division Chairpersons," Community/ Junior College Research Quarterly, 2, No. 1 (October-December 1977), 55-76.

Hipps, G. Melvin and Philip C. Winstead, "Faculty Development: A Planned Approach at Furman University," Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper, edited by Albert B. Smith, 5, No.1, (Spring, 1979), 1-7.

Jabker, E. H., "Initiating Faculty Development Programs: Some Observations," Planning and Changing, 8 (March, 1977), 171-184.

Jabker, Eugene H. and Ronald S. Halinski, "Instructional Development and Faculty Reward in Higher Education," Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper, 3, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 15-17.

Johnson, Glenn R., "Delphi-Process Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Selected In-Service Training Techniques to Improve Community/Junior College Instruction," Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 1, No. 1, (October-December, 1976), 51-57.

Johnson, Rita B., and Stuart R. Johnson, "A Strategy for Inservice Instructional Development," New Directions for Community Colleges, 5, No. 3 (Autumn, 1977), 83-9.

Marsh, Stewart, "Helping the New Community College Instructor," College Management, 7, No. 8 (August, 1972), 26-27.

Martin, W. B., "Faculty Development as Human Development," Liberal Education, 61 (May, 1975), Washington, Association of American Colleges, 187-96.

Mastellar, Charlotte, "Community College Business Teacher Perceptions of Professional Growth and Development Programs," Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 20, No. 3, (July, 1978), 25-9.

Mongano, Ronald M., "Faculty Attitudes and Teaching Improvement," _Improving College and University Teaching,_ 21 (Summer, 1973), 208-210.

Nelson, James H., "Collective Bargaining: An Instrument for Staff Development," _Community and Junior College Journal,_ 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), 27.

Noonan, John F., "Faculty Development Through Experimentation and Interinstitutional Cooperation," _Facilitating Faculty Development,_ edited by M. Mervin Freedman, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1973, pp. 93-103.

Novak, Charles R., and Barbara K. Barnes, "Florida and Illinois: Views on Staff Development," _New Directions for Community Colleges,_ 5, No. 3 (Autumn, 1977), 11-8.

O'Banion, Terry, "A Catalyst for Staff Development," _Community and Junior College Journal,_ 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), 12-13.

_____, "Patterns of Staff Development. Toward Professional Faculty Patterns," _New Directions for Community Colleges,_ edited by Arthur Cohen, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, Spring, 1973, pp. 9-29.

_____, "Staff Development: A New Priority for the Seventies," _The College Board Review,_ 99 (Spring, 1976), 26-33.

_____, "Staff Development: Priorities for the Seventies," _Community and Junior College Journal,_ 43, No. 2 (October, 1972), 10-11.

_____, "Staff Development for Student Development," _Community College Frontiers,_ 2, No. 2, (Winter, 1974), 12-20.

_____, "Teachers for Tomorrow: One Year Later," _Community and Junior College Journal_ 44 (November, 1973), 10-13.

Phillips, S. R., "What, Then, Is Faculty Development?", _ADE Bulletin_ (Association of Departments of English), No. 49 (May, 1976), 11-17.

Rabb, Theodore K., and Anita E. Levine, "Princeton Graduate Interns: A Staff Development Program for Community Colleges," Community and Junior College Journal, 46 (March, 1976), 33-35.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr., "Staff Development: A Conceptual Framework," Journal of Higher Education, 46, No. 1 (1975), 303-311.

Schultz, Raymond E., "Low Turnover Creates Staff Development Problems," Community College Review, 1, No. 1 (April, 1973), 22-8.

Scigliano, John A., and Eugene E. DuBois, "Staff Development: Nova Style," Community and Junior College Journal, 55, No. 2 (October, 1976), 38-39, 41.

"Some Perspectives on Staff Development," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (October, 1972), 14-19.

Stice, James E., "A Bargain at Any Price; A Steal at $1.24," Educational Horizons, 55, No. 2 (Winter, 1976/77), 80-85.

Taylor, William R., "A Consortium Approach to Faculty Renewal," New Directions for Community Colleges, 1, No. 2, (Winter, 1975), 17-22.

Thomas, Wanda E., "The Chairperson's Role In Promoting Better Teaching," New Directions for Community Colleges, 5, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 13-18.

Van Ast, John, "Guidelines for a Personnel Development System," Journal of Epsilon Pi Tau, (Spring, 1978), 34-40.

Vincent, William E., "Locked In and Locked Out," Community and Junior College Journal, 50, No. 5 (February, 1980), 54-55.

Wallace, Terry H. Smith, "Provision for Community College Faculty Development in Collective Bargaining Agreements," Research in Higher Education, 4, No. 4, 1976, 381-92.

_____, "The Staff Development Committee: A Model for Instructional Change," New Directions for Community Colleges, 5, No. 1 (Spring, 1977), 65-74.

Wattenbarger, James L., and Robert S. Carpenter, "Faculty Development: Let Teachers Take the Initiative," Community College Review, 3, No. 1 (June, 1975), 25-30.

Wetzler, Wilson F., "A Breakthrough for Faculty and Program Development," Junior College Journal, 40, No. 9 (June-July, 1970), 13-15.

Wick, Daniel L., "Towards a Phenomenological Approach to Faculty Development," Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper, edited by Albert B. Smith, 5, No. 2 (Summer, 1979), 8-10.

Wilson, Richard E., "Staff Development an Urgent Priority," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (June-July, 1973), 68-69.

Zion, Carol, and Connie Sutton, "Integrated In-Service Development, Towards a Professional Faculty," 1, New Directions for Community Colleges, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1973, 41-51.

Reports

Cooper, John D., "Professional Development Plan, Lansing Community College, 1976-77," Lansing, Michigan, ED 140 923, September 1976.

Cooper, John, and others, "Professional Development Plan, Lansing Community College, Lansing, Michigan, ED 162 688, September, 1978.

Coward, Tamara B., "Professional Development in Higher Education," Advanced Institutional Development Program Two-Year College Consortium: Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, Illinois, 1978.

Garrison, Roger H., "Report of the 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges," New Staff for New Students, Washington, 1974, pp. 138-150.

Nelson, Hilding E., Competency Based Teacher Education for Community College Instructors: A Partly Self-Instructional Staff Development Program, ED 158 829, Mount San Jacinto College, San Jacinto, California, April, 1978.

Publications of Learned Organizations

Bender, Louis W., "Government Actions Affecting Staff Development," New Staff for New Students, Washington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974, pp. 41-54.

Centra, John A., Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities, Princeton, Educational Testing Service, 1976.

_____, Strategies for Improving College Teaching, Washington, American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Claxton, Charles S., Community College Staff Development: Basic Issues in Planning, Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1976.

Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment, New Rochelle, The Group for Human Development in Higher Education, 1974.

Gaff, Jerry, "Faculty Evaluation," Resource Notebook IX-1 to IX-5, Project on Institutional Renewal through the Improvement of Teaching, Washington, June, 1976.

Gaff, Sally Shake, "Faculty Development," Resource Notebook, VII-1 to VII-14, Washington, Project on Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching, June, 1976, VII-1 to VII-14.

Garrison, Roger H., Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, Washington, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr., Responding to the New Spirit of Learning, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, 1976.

Gray, H. L., Staff Development, North East London Polytechnic (England), Division of Staff and Educational Development, January, 1978.

Hammons, James O., and Terry H. Smith Wallace, An Assessment of Staff Development Needs in the Northeastern United States, University Park, The Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 1976.

Hammons, Jim, Terry H. Smith Wallace, and Gordon Watts, "Staff Development in the Community College: A Handbook," California University, Los Angeles, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, June, 1978.

McClelland, William A., and David S. Bushnell, "A Futuristic Look at Training," New Staff for New Students, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, 1974, pp. 10-22.

National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, Directory of Human Resources, 1978.

O'Banion, Terry, Organizating Staff Development Programs that Work, Washington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978.

O'Banion, Terry, "Staff Development: A Priority on Persons," New Staff for New Students, Washington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

O'Connell, William R. and Steven H. Smartt, Improving Faculty Evaluation: A Trial in Strategy, Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1979.

Peterson, Gary T., editor ,Staff Development: Mini Models for College Implementation, proceedings of a conference, Squaw Valley, California, June 24-26, 1975.

Yarrington, Roger, editor, "Introduction," New Staff for New Students, Washington, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

Public Documents

Doty, Charles R., and Ronald Gepner, editors, Post-Secondary Personnel Development, vol. 2, Mercer County Community College, Trenton, New Jersey, Department of Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, 1976.

Faculty and Staff Development Manual for South Carolina Technical Education System. Columbia, South Carolina State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, July, 1975.

Martorana, S.V., William Toombs and David W. Breneman, eds., Graduate Education and Community College Cooperative Approaches to Community College Staff Development, Technical Report No. 5, ED 111 479, Washington, National Board on Graduate Education, August, 1975.

Opportunity/Incentive Grant. Fort Morgan, Morgan Community
    College, 1976.

People for the People's Colleges: Community-Junior College
    Staff. Washington, D.C.: Priorities National Advisory
    Council on Education Professions Development, ED
    061 942, 1973.

Staff Development: A Profile of Local Institutional Effort.
    Raleigh, North Carolina State Department of Community
    Colleges, ED 139 465, December, 1975.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
    Office of Education, Annual Report of the Commissioner
    of Eduction for the Fiscal Year 1974, No. 76-003,
    Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Williams, Harrison, "Introduction of Comprehensive Community
    College Act of 1969, S. 1033," Congressional Record:
    Senate, February 17, 1969, 3,435.

Unpublished Materials

Beaudoin, Adrien P., "A State Plan for Staff Development,"
    Community College Frontiers, 2, 2. (Winter 1974),
    28-30.

Birkholz, John R., A Faculty Internship Program for William
    Rainey Harper College, Bethesda, ERIC Document Repro-
    duction Service, ED 035 407, 1969.

Buchan, Robin G., "Community College Staff Development:
    The Teachers' Perspective," unpublished paper presented
    at the Community College Social Science Association
    Conference, San Diego, March, 1979.

Carpenter, Robert Scott, "Instructional Competencies and
    Implementation Methods for Community College Faculty
    Service Programs," unpublished doctoral dissertation,
    Gainesville, The University of Florida, 1974.

Collin, W. J., "Staff Development: An Organizational Skill
    for Survival," paper presented at the International
    Institute on the Community College, Sarnia, Ontario,
    June 12-15, 1978.

Collins, Charles, "The Induction of Community College
    Instructors: An Internship Model," Bethesda, ERIC
    Document Reproduction Service, ED 056 684, 1971.

Collins, Charles C. and Chester H. Case, "The On-Site, Programmatic Approach to Staff Development," paper presented at the Conference on Graduate Education and the Community College, ED 101 780, Warrenton, Virginia, November, 1974.

Colman, Clyde H., "Organization and Administration of In-Service Programs for Public Junior College Teachers," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lincoln, University of Nebraska, 1968.

Garlock, Victor P., Faculty Development at the Community College: Who Participates, unpublished paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, ED 168 621, April, 1979.

Geis, George L., and Ron Smith, "Professors' Perceptions of Teaching and Learning: Implications for Faculty Development," unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1979.

Glucksman, Marc, "Flexible Calendar and Staff Development 1977-1978," Maryland, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 156 227, March, 1978.

Hammons, James O., "Faculty Development in the Community College: A Discussion Paper," at St. Louis, Missouri, National Conference on Faculty Development in Two-Year Postsecondary Institutions, January, 1976.

Harris, Howard L., "Intersession '78: A Report for the Flexible Calendar Project," Bethesda, Maryland, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 154 862, 1978.

Jenkins, Sebetha Lee, "The Perceptions of Selected Administrators and Faculty Toward Faculty Inservice Training Programs in Junior Colleges of Mississippi," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Mississippi State, Mississippi State University, 1978.

Jones, Vauncille Braddy, "Administrative and Faculty Perceptions of Staff Development Needs in the Los Angeles Community College District," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Los Angeles, University of Southern California, 1978.

Joyce, Bruce R. and Marsha Weil, "Concepts of Teacher Centers," Bethesda, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 075 375, 1973.

Kilpatrick, Gordon, "In-Service Education with Recommendations Concerning Its Implementation in American Junior Colleges," Bethesda, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 020 721, 1967.

Mayo, C. Douglas, and Charles S. Claxton, Conference Report: Improving College Teaching, ED 157 494, Memphis, Tennessee: Memphis State University, 1978.

McCormick, George Robert, "The Perceptions of Selected Groups Concerning the Role of the University in Community College Staff Development," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Auburn University, 1975.

McMullen, Harold G., "The Instructional Clinic and Staff Development: When Faculty Come From Behind the Classroom Door," paper presented at the 57th Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, ED 144 630, Denver, Colorado, April, 1977.

McQuay, Paul L., "Vocational and Staff Development in the Community College," unpublished paper presented at the Pennsylvania Vocational Education Conference, ED 148 449, Seven Springs, Pennsylvania, June, 1976.

Mills, Richard Ottis, "An Assessment of Selected Community College Teacher Preparation Programs as Perceived by Program Directors and the Dean of Instruction of the Community or Junior College They Serve," unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, College of Education, Commerce, 1973.

Novak, Charles Richard, "The Perceptions of Selected Community College Staff towards Inservice Staff Development Programs in Illinois Community Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, 1974.

Parker, Paul W. and Patrick W. Parker, Kansas Community Colleges: Assessing Staff Development Needs, Kansas State College of Pittsburgh, 1978.

Parsons, Michael H., "Targets of Opportunity: Strategies for Managing a Staff Development Consortium," paper presented at the Northeast Regional Conference of the National Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development, ED 161 485, Mt. Laurel, November 1978, ED 161 485.

Preus, Paul K., and Douglas F. Williams, "Statewide Community College Faculty Development: A Personalized Approach," unpublished paper, ED 118 168, November, 1975.

Samlin, J. R., "Inservice Education in American Public Junior Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Normal, Illinois State University, 1967.

Stec, Philip Joseph, "Staff Development: Approaches in Theory and Practice," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Amherst, University of Massachusetts, 1978.

Sutton, Connie, and George W. Armfield, "Staff Development for Small/Rural Community Colleges: Effective Renewal with Less Resources," paper presented at the First National Conference on Small/Rural Colleges, Blacksburg, Virginia, August, 1978.

White, Marvin, "A Study of the Relationship of Selected Faculty Characteristics and Faculty Development Needs as Perceived by Faculty Members in Mississippi Public Junior Colleges," unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Hattiesburg, University of Southern Mississippi, 1977.

Wilson, Leon L., James H. Fain, and Otis M. Preslar, "A Guide for Conducting a Teacher Self-Improvement Program," Bethesda, Maryland, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 079 259, 1972.

Wilson, Reginald, "Humanizing Community-Junior College Environment: Toward Change--Staff Development," paper presented at American Association of Community and Junior Colleges National Convention, ED 088 555 (February, 1974).

Zickel, Jael Noam, "A Consortium Approach to Faculty Development: Use of Faculty Facilitators to Enhance Teaching Performance," paper presented at the Fourth International Conference for Improving University Teaching, Aachen, Germany, July, 1978.

Zion, Carol, and Connie Sutton, "Integrated In-Service Development, Towards a Professional Faculty," 1, New Directions for Community Colleges, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1973, 41-51.