Credibility and Effectiveness in Context: An Exploration of the Importance of Faculty Status for Faculty Developers

Bonnie Mullinix
Furman University

This study documents an emerging profile of the faculty status of faculty developers as solicited, compiled, and interactively interpreted with faculty developer practitioners. It used integrated (mixed) methodology and participatory research strategies to gather data and it shares descriptive statistical information on the various positions held by faculty developer respondents; qualitatively analyzed impressions of the importance of faculty status to their credibility and effectiveness as faculty developers; and information regarding respondents' institutional contexts. Findings are further disaggregated across institutional contexts and sex to explore trends, differential perceptions, and other emergent issues as identified by participant researchers.

Centers for teaching and learning (CTLs) represent a wide variety of contexts and historical origins reflected in a significant range of structural identities. These origins influence the degree to which directors and other faculty developers are directly involved in teaching within the institution. Even greater are differences of faculty status associated with positions and faculty developers' perceptions of how this status impacts their effectiveness in working with faculty. Building from Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach's (2006) recent work on mapping the profession and Graf and Wheeler's (1996) findings regarding sex differences in faculty developer status within institutions (75% male/25% female with faculty status [Chism & Mintz, 1998]), this study took

an active, constructivist approach to furthering exploration of faculty development as a profession embedded in the higher education context. A participatory research approach allowed for collaborative inquiry, constructing trends from data, adding to it, and interpreting findings together.

The data has its origins in an initial survey of faculty developers invited to participate through the listserv of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD). In a five-day period in late December 2004, 31 faculty developers responded to a 16-question online survey; subsequently, this number grew to 35 respondents. Building on the initial analysis of online survey data, this chapter expands the analysis by adding the results collected through two interactive sessions at the POD Network Conference in October 2005. Additional responses solicited in a poster session and follow-on concurrent session are incorporated, along with the analysis and interpretation of the data by faculty developers participating in the sessions.

In its essential form, this chapter documents an emerging profile of the faculty status of faculty developers as solicited, compiled, and interactively interpreted with faculty developer practitioners. It shares:

- Descriptive statistical information on the various positions held by faculty developer respondents
- Impressions of the importance of faculty status to their effectiveness as faculty developers (as captured in a qualitative summary of illustrative themes)
- Information regarding respondents' institutional contexts
- Initial findings disaggregated across institutional contexts and gender disparities to explore trends and differential perceptions (e.g., profiles of small baccalaureate colleges, medium-size master's teaching universities, and larger doctoral/research universities)
- Other emergent issues as identified by survey participants

Methodological Orientation, Data Collection, and Analysis

This study represents an integrated research (also called "mixed methods") approach that strategically incorporates quantitative and qualitative methods. As noted, its origins in a POD listserv query solicited information via an online survey and initial findings were subsequently shared with, added to, and collectively interpreted by practicing faculty developers. Using participatory research strategies, POD conference participants enhanced the research by

validating, adding to, and interpreting the quantitative and qualitative data collected around the central question of *the importance of faculty status for faculty developers*.

Data Collection and Sources

The study draws its data from multiple sources. The data collection techniques implemented included online surveys, an interactive poster session, and participatory data analysis and interpretation with participating practitioners. The online survey formed the referential foundation of the study and solicited the following information:

- Position and roles
- How participants came to the position: entry point, history at current institution
- Engagement in teaching: position/appointment and teaching responsibilities, degree/amount of teaching, level of teaching
- Impressions regarding the importance of faculty status to the role of faculty developer
- Description of institutional contexts: types, focus, size, and other defining features
- Respondent gender and geographic distribution

A full version of the survey follows this discussion (see Appendix 12.1). In a five-day period in late December 2004, 31 faculty developers responded to this 16-question online survey as solicited through the POD listserv, the primary professional association for faculty developers (final initial response rate to the survey was 35 respondents by March 2005). In a three-hour interactive poster session at the October 2005 POD conference, the response rate rose to 110 participants who completed the survey and “grew” the visual response graphs by adding their data to the poster presentation of data (incomplete responses dropped the final number of respondents to a remarkably convenient 100). With the assistance of Nancy Chism, this information was compiled as participants completed their surveys and formed the core of the data handouts structured for practical analysis and interpretation by participant researchers in a concurrent session the following day.

Data Analysis

Participatory research principles (Cornwall and Jewkes, 1995; Maguire, 1987; Mullinix & Akatsa-Bukachi, 1998) and grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) informed the analysis as researchers and practitioner colleagues identified emergent themes and allowed for their growth and extended validation. Quantitative and qualitative data analysis was further enhanced through the use of Excel and NVivo qualitative software, respectively. Periodic informal and formal discussions among author-researchers and practitioner participant-researchers served as an inductive base to identify themes of topic impact that were further expanded and identified through text analysis. Recoding strategies were utilized to increase validity by generating initial free nodes and subsequently exploring relationships by establishing tree-noded categories, supporting each with quotations and emergent analysis (Richards, 1999). “Live” collaborative data interpretation was undertaken on the expanded dataset collected during the POD conference poster session by faculty developers participating in a concurrent working session, producing patterns of findings and directions for additional research.

Findings and Considerations

As noted, the first-level response to the online survey was 31 participants (71% female, 23% male). This grew to 110 participants in the second round, culled to a straight 100 completing all questions posed (59% female, 34% male, 7% unidentified). This updated gender distribution moves substantially closer to the 54%/44% female/male response distribution recorded in the only known survey of POD membership that asked about gender (Graf & Wheeler, 1996). Hailing from 39 states and from Canada, Japan, and Korea and covering most institutional types, most respondents were from doctoral/research universities (47%) or master’s colleges/universities (26%), with the remaining identifying themselves with baccalaureate colleges (11%) and associate degree-granting institutions/community colleges (5%). This institutional breakdown is reasonably close to that reported by Sorcinelli et al. (2006), whose institutional breakdown of respondents included 44% from research and doctoral institutions, 23% from comprehensive I and II, 11% from liberal arts I and II, 9% from community colleges, 5% other, and 8% from Canadian institutions. The majority described themselves as mid-size (10,000–20,000, 38%), with the remainder comparably split between smaller (33%) and larger (28%) institutions.

The exhibits on the following pages provide an emerging profile of faculty developers and the key characteristics that define their roles: their faculty development responsibilities and how they came to faculty development (Exhibits 12.1, 12.2, and 12.3), and their teaching responsibilities and faculty status within their institutions (Exhibits 12.4, 12.5, and 12.6). Out of respect for the contextual variabilities and range of responses, the data are provided without summary descriptive narrative (which tends to relate patterns that may not yet exist). Rather, they are offered in their pure form to encourage continued reflection and allow faculty development colleagues to situate themselves within this data.

EXHIBIT 12.1
Positions and/or Roles*

a) Director of CTL	50	37%
b) Consultative Support	28	21%
c) Training Support	20	15%
d) Technical Support	9	7%
e) Faculty Peer Mentor/Consultant	11	8%
f) Other	16	12%

*Note. Multiple responses.

Positions/Roles

EXHIBIT 12.2

Entry into Faculty Development (Q 2A)

Entry Point

a) From a tenure-track faculty appointment within the institution	36%
b) From a nontenure-track faculty appointment within the institution	7%
c) From an administrative appointment within the institution	10%
d) Hired from the outside with professional faculty development experience	26%
e) Hired from the outside with no faculty development experience, but with higher education faculty/teaching experience elsewhere	6%
f) Hired from the outside with no faculty development or higher education faculty experience, just related/relevant skills	7%
g) Other (indicate in narrative)	8%
Total	100%

Note. Goodness of fit test indicates entry points are unequally distributed, $\chi^2 (6, N = 100) = 58.9, p < .001$.

Entry Point

- a) From a tenure-track faculty appointment within the institution
- b) From a nontenure-track faculty appointment within the institution
- c) From an administrative appointment within the institution
- d) Hired from the outside with professional faculty development experience
- e) Hired from the outside with no faculty development experience, but with higher education faculty/teaching experience elsewhere
- f) Hired from the outside with no faculty development or higher education faculty experience, just related/relevant skills
- g) Other (indicate in narrative)

EXHIBIT 12.3
History at Current Institution (Q 2B)

Time	%
a) Less than a year	8%
b) 1–3 years	15%
c) 3–6 years	16%
d) 6–10 years	21%
e) More than 10 years	39%
<i>No response</i>	1%
<i>Multiple responses</i>	2%
<i>Note.</i> Approximate weighted average equals 8.59 years.

Engagement in Teaching

Faculty developers report generally being involved with teaching in a variety of contexts from a variety of positions, distributed unequally across categories ($\chi^2 (5, N = 100) = 22.29, p < .001$). Forty-eight percent of those responding to questions about teaching engagement listed multiple levels of engagement (with 38% including “teaching” faculty as part of their work). Likewise, those who do teach are split between those teaching from tenured or tenure-track positions (34%), special faculty appointments (6%), and those teaching as adjuncts (31%, as part of position or for pay).

EXHIBIT 12.4
Teaching Engagement and Position* (Q 3A)

a) Conduct workshops/training/sessions for faculty only	13%
b) Teach courses as part-time/adjunct faculty (outside of normal working hours for pay)	19%
c) Teach courses as part-time/adjunct faculty (as part of position/appointment responsibilities)	12%
d) Hold nontenure-track/faculty appointment as part of position (specialist faculty, etc.) and teach	6%
e) Hold a tenure-track position at the assistant/associate level	7%
f) Am tenured faculty	27%

**Note.* Forty-eight percent of respondents offered multiple responses, which are only partially reflected in the selection above. For example, 38% of respondents conduct workshops/sessions for faculty as part of their varied teaching responsibilities.

Teaching Engagement and Position

EXHIBIT 12.5
Degree/Amount of Teaching (Q 3B)

a) Conduct workshops/training/ sessions for faculty only	31%
b) 1 course a year	23%
c) 1 course a semester	12%
d) 2 courses a semester	10%
e) More than 2 courses a semester	5%
f) Guest lecture/present/facilitate sessions upon request	2%
g) Other (indicate in narrative)	14%
<i>No response</i>	3%
<i>Multiple responses</i>	25%

EXHIBIT 12.6
Level of Teaching (Q 3C)

a) Introductory/foundational undergraduate courses (lower level courses)	35%
b) Advanced undergraduate courses (upper level courses)	17%
c) Master's-level courses	16%
d) Doctoral-level courses	10%
e) Advising	1%
f) Other (indicate in narrative)	9%
<i>No response</i>	12%
<i>Multiple responses</i>	28%

The Central Question

A total of 15 thematic responses were revealed through a preliminary analysis of the narrative responses to the central survey question: What are your impressions regarding the importance of holding faculty status as it contributes to your credibility and ability to effectively support faculty within your institution? Exhibit 12.7 provides a basic overview of these emergent themes.

EXHIBIT 12.7
Importance of Faculty Status

	Percentage/Total Responses, N = 100 (% non-conflicting responses)
Faculty Status Is Important	79 (69)
Critical—very important	48
Adds to credibility	54
Impacts effectiveness	28
Supports personal professional development	12
Tenure is a consideration—titled membership (6), access (4), security (5)	17
Releases tension between faculty and community college	1
Faculty Status May (May Not) Be Important	25
Challenging to balance roles	4
Mixed—hard to judge—context dependent	8
Differing perspectives (to faculty, yes; director, unsure)	3
Is theoretically important	4
Faculty Status Is Not Important/of Limited Importance	30 (9)
Teaching experience most/more important	12
Faculty status not important	6
Reputation as an outstanding instructor most important	7
Engage in scholarly activities	2
Teaching not important	3
Totals (average of 2.1 impressions per respondent)	209
<i>Note.</i> $\chi^2 (2, N = 100) = 56.23, p < .001$.	

Examples of illustrative quotes identified through qualitative analysis help to bring these themes to life. Respondents who identified faculty status as important (79%) noted it as critical to very important (48%), impacting their credibility (how they were perceived by colleagues, 54%) and/or effectiveness (their ability to do their work, 28%). They clarified the importance of faculty status as follows:

CRITICAL!!! I have no credibility without it. I can negotiate credibility with admin and staff due to my background.

I could not do the work that I have done without being a tenured faculty member; I couldn't do it if I didn't teach. I am a faculty member. I research. I publish. I write curriculum. I present at conferences. I serve on committees. I do all a "regular" faculty member does. . . . This position is also very vital for assuring credibility for the new faculty; they see me as one of them and come out to my workshops.

It's vital. The faculty/administration divide at our institution involves a lot of mutual hostility and suspicion. The fact that I'm faculty, and have faculty interests and experience, makes it much easier for me to do the job.

I have never had faculty status, but I believe it would be VERY helpful in my work with faculty. I have been told (sometimes very directly) that my lack of faculty status makes me less qualified to help certain faculty members (despite my credentials (PhD) and teaching experiences)

I believe that I must remain actively teaching for more credibility. I also believe that I hold more credibility as a faculty member (as opposed to administrator). My position is assistant professor, and I feel this is extremely significant, both for drawing academics into academic development, and for my credibility with clients.

Faculty status and active teaching, at any level, directly impacts effectiveness and credibility. I cannot effectively support faculty if I am not engaged in their challenges and won't know the right questions.

I believe I am MUCH more credible when I can share experiences from my own teaching situations on this campus. The anecdotes and specific examples I can provide are invaluable. It also gives me more confidence in making suggestions to faculty.

In some ways, not being a faculty has caused big [road] blocks, e.g., mailing lists/communication loops, inclusion in faculty meetings/decisions.

Extremely important—librarians have tenure track faculty status and it facilitates conversations about teaching/curricular issues. . . . I believe that heads of teaching and learning centers must have faculty status (as opposed to other kinds of academic appointments) to be

perceived by faculty as equals . . . and be at appropriate tables for conversations.

I think that full faculty status on the tenure track would increase my effectiveness on campus and my ability to intervene in important issues regarding student learning.

I believe that being a faculty colleague provides instant rapport and respect with other faculty. I can speak about promotion, tenure, classroom management, online teaching, electronic portfolios from personal experience rather than theory alone.

I cannot imagine being nearly as effective without faculty status.

Those who identified faculty status as not important or of limited importance offered fewer comments or examples. When they did, these occasionally conflicted (21%): "Faculty status would be nice, but experience in the field trumps."

Others offered additional criteria for credibility and effectiveness, such as reputation, experience, or established structures:

I think that my reputation on campus was important. For a long time (10 years) I was administrative faculty. I thought this would be a problem with tenure-track folks, but it really wasn't. 2 years ago, my status was changed to research faculty.

Middle level administrators do not have faculty status, but may teach and advise students. This is a regularized approach at the University and poses no problems to credibility as long as we have teaching experience.

The Context

Descriptive background on the respondents (position, engagement in teaching, sex, and geographic distributions) and their institutional context (type, focus, size, and other defining features, some noted next), help to provide the ability to compile distributed profiles (see Exhibits 12.8 and 12.9).

Initial analysis by institutional context and respondent status/perspective revealed added insights (i.e., smaller teaching colleges/universities find faculty status to be critical, while the highest responses citing faculty status as less/not important were among research universities).

EXHIBIT 12.8
Institutional Type

EXHIBIT 12.9
Institutional Size

Significant Patterns: Participatory Interpretation of Findings

Bringing voice to faculty developers' insights into their own work is an important part of this study. Built into the data collection strategies have been opportunities for interpretive analysis by faculty developers. Having worked with cross-coded responses to the central questions, 10 faculty developers assisted the researchers by sorting, compiling, and interpreting the findings as captured in Exhibit 12.10.

EXHIBIT 12.10
Patterning Responses Regarding Importance of Faculty Status

Faculty Status:	Is important: 63%	May or may not be: 24%	Is not important: 13%
Key Characteristics	Percentage of Category Respondents		
2A Entry point	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 20% hired from outside with faculty development experience• ~ 50% tenure track	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 50% from faculty positions outside• 50% from all other categories	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 20% faculty• 30% hired from outside
5A Institutional type	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 52% from research institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reported as “mostly” doctoral/research institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 50% doctoral• 20% master’s
5C Institutional size	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 40% small colleges• 38% mid-size• 26% larger	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 11% small• 47% mid-size• 32% larger	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 50% small colleges• 20% mid-size• 30% larger
Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 60% female• 40% male	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 57% female• 26% male• (17% unidentified)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 50% female• 30% male• (20% unidentified)

Participant analysis of collected data revealed the following interpretations and responses to the key prompts:

- *What do you see in the data?* People seem to report their perceptions based on their own experience. If they come in with faculty status, they believe it’s important. If hired as an expert, they may not need it to be effective. In general, a reputation as an excellent teacher may be the most important criterion of all.
- *What does it mean to you?* To support faculty successfully through a promotion and tenure process may require experiential knowledge of the process to support faculty. However, when technical support is the primary focus this may require technical expertise but not necessarily faculty status.

Gender Disparities

Gender disparities may have weakened slightly, but they still persist (see Exhibit 12.11). Among the 59% of female respondents, approximately 46% held faculty status while 54% did not. For the 34% of male respondents, the figures were split evenly between those who held faculty status and those who did not. Among the males who held faculty status, 69% were tenured or tenure track. While proportionally smaller in overall percentage, the women faculty developers who did hold faculty status reported themselves as tenurable/tenured at a rate of 95%. Arguably, this survey data is based on a limited response rate and should be compared against additional data collected on the current state of the field for faculty developers. Meanwhile, however, it is safe to state that the status of faculty developers vis-à-vis faculty roles in the academy has become more dynamic and variable since Graf and Wheeler's 1996 findings, where only 25% of female faculty developers held faculty status. Whether a function of broader definition of faculty developers or increasing range of structural options emerging, it is safe to say that gender disparities in the field are in flux.

EXHIBIT 12.11
Gender Distribution

Additional Pathways and Perspectives: A Case in Point

Participant researchers recommended that future analysis consider institutional size as a key reference variable and that follow-on research might also include asking faculty to indicate their perceptions of the importance of faculty status for faculty developers. Long attuned to this interest, I have had

the opportunity to explore this perspective, most specifically as a natural part of building a CTL. The design for Furman University's Center for Teaching and Engaged Learning (CTEL) has included the identification of four instructional development consultants (IDCs), experienced teaching and learning specialists associated with each of four academic divisions. A smaller liberal arts university with a focus on teaching and engaged learning for undergraduate students, Furman has approximately 2,600 students and 250 full-time faculty. Poised for major curricular and schedule changes and the institution of a two-course, interdisciplinary first-year seminar sequence, Furman conceptualized CTETL as a vehicle to support faculty and students through this shift. While student support was handled by well-established branches of CTETL (Collaboratory for Creative Learning and Communication and Undergraduate Research and Internships), the faculty development components were the focus of development. IDCs were to be the driving force in faculty support for teaching and learning. As such, significant faculty input into the development and staffing of these positions was critical, as were views on how to create positions that would be most effective within this context.

Explicit conversations with separate faculty focus groups drawn from fine arts, humanities, sciences, mathematics, and social sciences revealed remarkably diverse impressions of the importance of teaching and faculty status to credibility that these faculty developers might hold with faculty. Humanities faculty expressed the importance of having direct experience teaching Furman students (in addition to higher education teaching experience), a Ph.D., and continuing disciplinary scholarly excellence as critical factors in effectively connecting and supporting them and were most vocal regarding faculty status as important. Sciences and mathematics faculty shared concerns about too narrow and deep a disciplinary focus influencing IDC's ability to connect with faculty across departments and described individuals with multiple degrees in different disciplines and perhaps a terminal degree related to instructional design or adult learning that would enable team teaching, guest teaching, and other modeling opportunities. Social sciences faculty were more interested in current technical expertise supporting research, citing past teaching experience as sufficient for connection and credibility. Fine arts faculty were most concerned with candidates having experience as an artist in addition to technological expertise that would support fine and performing arts. In addition, while faculty tended to recognize teaching, team teaching, and faculty status as important to faculty developers, conversations with administrators and technical support staff found this less compelling. While earlier decisions predicated

on contextual challenges limited the possibility of advertising positions as faculty positions, latitude was provided to advertise broadly and differentiate each IDC position to reflect the input collected from faculty and capture divergent divisional desires. In this case, prior to and since the arrival of IDCs, departments and new initiatives (first-year seminars) have invited IDCs to teach.

Faculty Status and Faculty Developers

Identification of the natural overlay between faculty developer professional responsibilities and traditional faculty responsibilities serves to facilitate discussions of how faculty developers can be accommodated as faculty, especially within structures to clarify the overlaps with existing tenure and promotion evaluation.

Teaching “Teaching” faculty + teaching students

Research Scholarship of teaching and learning, programmatic evaluation and research

Service Committee service, support of curricular initiatives

During the interpretive analysis session and based on discussion of the data, participant researchers proposed the idea that somewhere within a CTL, someone should have faculty status and that should include a clearly articulated balance of time and responsibilities distributed between faculty and administrative status. This was thought to make for the most effective combination as it seemed to both differentiate between contexts and accommodate varying numbers of positions within given CTLs. It also addressed the interpretive impression gleaned from textual responses; that smaller institutions with greater teaching focus had fewer CTL staff, and faculty expected closer working relationships with faculty colleagues who maintained a direct connection with teaching. At larger research-oriented institutions, faculty might expect to work with professional staff more regularly than faculty colleagues.

Conclusion

Credibility, trust, and appreciation for the teaching abilities and instructional design skills of faculty developers have the potential to impact their effectiveness. This incremental study continues to document faculty developer

impressions of the importance of faculty status to their ability to effectively function within their particular institutional contexts. While such profiles of faculty developers are not intended as prescriptive recommendations, they do offer important illustrative insights into current trends and practices across the higher education landscape of faculty development. Even though context continues to be the primary determinant of whether faculty developers actually have faculty status associated with their positions, it is clear that a significant majority of these experienced professionals perceive faculty status to be an important contributor to their credibility, effectiveness, and interactions with faculty colleagues.

Appendix 12.1

Survey on the Faculty Status of Faculty Developers

Instructions

There are five multi-part questions below. Where projected options/responses are proposed as prompts, select as many as are relevant to your situation, adding more whenever necessary. You may circle relevant letters, supply simple lists of letter-coded responses, and/or develop a descriptive narrative that captures your information.

Estimated Response Times

Short version via coded responses, approximately two to five minutes.

Longer descriptive/narrative responses, approximately five to ten minutes.

Thanks in advance for your contribution,

Bonnie Mullinix & Nancy Chism

1. What position do you hold and/or role do you play in supporting faculty on your campus?

1A. Positions/Roles

- a) Director of CTL
- b) Consultative Support
- c) Training Support
- d) Technical Support
- e) Faculty Peer Mentor/Consultant
- f) Other (indicate in narrative): _____

2. How did you come to this position at your current institution?

2A. Entry Point

- a) From a tenure-track faculty appointment within the institution
- b) From a nontenure-track faculty appointment within the institution
- c) From an administrative appointment within the institution
- d) Hired from the outside with professional faculty development experience
- e) Hired from the outside with no faculty development experience, but with higher education faculty/teaching experience elsewhere
- f) Hired from the outside with no faculty development or higher education faculty experience, just related/relevant skills
- g) Other (indicate in narrative): _____

2B. History at Current Institution

- a) Less than a year
- b) 1–3 years
- c) 3–6 years
- d) 6–10 years
- e) More than 10 years

3. What is your engagement in teaching within your college/university?

3A. Position/Appointment and Teaching Engagement

Teaching Engagement and Position

- a) Conduct workshops/training/sessions for faculty only
- b) Teach courses as part-time/adjunct faculty (outside of normal working hours for pay)
- c) Teach courses as part-time/adjunct faculty (as part of position/appointment responsibilities)
- d) Hold nontenure-track/faculty appointment as part of position (specialist faculty, etc.) and teach
- e) Hold a tenure-track position at the assistant/associate level
- f) Am tenured faculty

Departmental/School Affiliation

- g) Am affiliated with a particular department
- h) Am affiliated with a particular school
- i) Teach courses across departments/schools
- j) Am an active, contributing member of a particular department/school
- k) Other (indicate further in narrative for 3): _____

3B. Degree/Level of Teaching

- a) Conduct workshops/training/sessions for faculty only
- b) 1 course a year
- c) 1 course a semester
- d) 2 courses a semester
- e) More than 2 courses a semester
- f) Guest lecture/present/facilitate sessions upon request
- g) Other (indicate in narrative): _____

3C. Level of Teaching

- a) Introductory/foundational undergraduate courses (lower level courses)
- b) Advanced undergraduate courses (upper level courses)
- c) Master's-level courses
- d) Doctoral-level courses
- e) Advising
- f) Other (indicate in narrative): _____

4. What are your impressions regarding the importance of holding faculty status as it contributes to your credibility and ability to effectively support faculty within your institution?

4A. Faculty Status Is Important

- A1) Critical—very important
- A2) Adds to credibility
- A3) Impacts effectiveness
- A4) Tenure—contributes to job security
- A5) Supports personal professional development
- A6)
- A7)
- A8)

4B. Faculty Status May (May Not) Be Important

- B1) Differing perspectives (to faculty, yes; faculty development, unsure)
- B2) Challenging to balance roles
- B3) Mixed—hard to judge—context dependant
- B4) Is theoretically important
- B5)
- B6)
- B7)
- B8)

4C. Faculty Status Is Not Important/of Limited Importance

- C1) Teaching experience most/more important
- C2) Faculty status is not important
- C3) Reputation as an outstanding instructor most important
- C4) Engage in scholarly activities
- C5) Teaching not important
- C6)
- C7)
- C8)

5. How would you describe your institution?

(Codes or description pulling from categories/descriptors below are welcome.)

5A. Type

- a) Doctoral/research university
- b) Master's college/university
- c) Baccalaureate college
- d) Associate's college
- e) Specialized institution
- f) Tribal college and university
- g) Other (indicate in narrative):

5B. Focus

- a) Teaching university
- b) Liberal arts/comprehensive
- c) Research
- d) Professional
- e) Other (indicate in narrative):

5C. Size

- a) Smaller (less than 10,000)
- b) Mid-size (10,000–20,000)
- c) Larger (above 20,000)
- d) Other (indicate in narrative):

5D. Other Defining Features

- a) Public
- b) Private/independent
- c) Multicampus institution
- d) Faculty union
- e) Other (indicate in narrative):

6. Your information: Name, email, and address

(Optional: If you would like copies of the results.)

Or please share:

- Gender
 - a) Female
 - b) Male
- Geographical location (state/country):
- Institution (optional):

Return Surveys (and/or direct questions regarding this study) to:

Dr. Bonnie B. Mullinix
Assistant Academic Dean
Center for Teaching and Engaged Learning
Furman University
3300 Poinsett Hwy
Greenville, SC 29613
Email: bonnie.mullinix@furman.edu

References

- Chism, N., & Mintz, J. (1998). *Who's developing the developers? A survey of job satisfaction, challenges, and disappointments of North American educational developers*. Paper presented at the International Consortium of Educational Developers, Austin, TX.
- Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R. (1995, December). What is participatory research? *Social Science and Medicine*, 41(12), 1667–1676.
- Graf, D., & Wheeler, D. (1996). *Defining the field: A survey of the membership of the Professional and Organizational Development Network*. Colorado Springs, CO: Professional and Organizational Development Network.
- Maguire, P. (1987). *Doing participatory research: A feminist approach*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, Center for International Education.
- Mullinix, B. B., & Akatsa-Bukachi, M. (1998). Participatory evaluation: Offering Kenyan women power and voice. In E. T. Jackson & Y. Kassam (Eds.), *Knowledge shared: Participatory evaluation in development cooperation* (pp. 167–176). West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Mullinix, B. B., & Chism, N. V. N. (2005, October). *The faculty status of faculty developers: A collaborative construction and collective explorations*. Paper presented at the 30th annual meeting of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, Milwaukee, WI.
- Richards, L. (1999). *Using NVivo in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sorcinielli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.