University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

To Improve the Academy

Professional and Organizational Development
Network in Higher Education

1984

Starting a Faculty Development Program: Strategies and Approaches

LuAnn Wilkerson

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad>

Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Wilkerson, LuAnn, "Starting a Faculty Development Program: Strategies and Approaches" (1984). *To Improve the Academy*. 72.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad/72>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in To Improve the Academy by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Starting a Faculty Development Program: Strategies and Approaches

LuAnn Wilkerson

Michael Reese Hospital and Medical Center

In *Pursuit of Loneliness*, author Philip Slater (1976) describes the typical fashion in which Americans have gone about confronting and responding to change on an individual basis without reference to the experience of others, without awareness of the past or insight into long-range implications. Unfortunately, faculty development practitioners have been accused of this same failure to study and develop a theoretical basis for action. A new idea for improving college or university teaching is sparked. The idea materializes into an event and two years later, no one has ever heard of it. The idea re-emerges, is tried again, and vanishes into the dark. This paper is an attempt to capture some of those ideas that have been tried in a variety of institutional settings as well as some of the principles that have guided practitioners in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of faculty development programs.

Lindquist (1978), in a collection of essays by faculty development leaders, delineates those areas to which consideration must be given in program planning and implementation: purpose, structure, staffing, activities, financing and evaluation. Jaggard (1977) (see Appendix A) provides a somewhat more expansive list of areas for consideration in her simulation of the planning procedure. Taken together, these two sources suggest a clear road map to be followed in the initial planning

stages for the new staff development program. In this paper, I will briefly present the crucial questions that planners need to consider, suggest a few principles to guide planning decisions, and comment on my own experiences as related to these issues. The end product of this planning process will be a program characterized by what Nelsen (1983) describes as the ingredients of better programs—quality, social and intellectual community among faculty, cooperation, institutional loyalty, and intellectual and moral leadership.

Who Should be Involved in Program Planning? Somewhere the idea of faculty development activity arises. The president hears about it at a conference and urges its adoption. The Faculty Senate asks for it to offset mandatory evaluation procedures. Deans seize upon it as a way to improve programs within their various areas. Whatever the source of the idea, an initial question is who should be involved in planning and initiating activities? It would seem that those populations to be served should carry central responsibility in this area. Toomus (1983) claims that many faculty development programs have failed because they were initiated by administration rather than in response to faculty needs. Two personal experiences serve to underline this position. In 1972, a dean at the University of Massachusetts procured a large grant to begin faculty development activities for the university. Although the particular model he created was a strong, viable, and pervasive one, his program was never widely accepted among faculty members and has long since vanished. At Murray State University, planning for faculty development was handled by a ten-member committee appointed by the deans at the request of the president. In the first year and a half of operations over 20 percent of the university faculty took advantage of program services and five years later a Teaching and Learning Center continues to thrive in the midst of substantial budget cuts. The difference may be due—at least in part—to the composition of the planning body. Seldin (1980) reminds planners that faculty involvement and the support of campus influentials are essential to the acceptance of evaluation and improvement systems.

What is the Purpose of the Proposed Program? Once the planning body is composed, the initial question becomes one of purpose. What should be the guiding purpose of the faculty development

program? This question can be answered through visitations to existing programs on other campuses, interviews with faculty colleagues, and an examination of institutional mission. The purpose must be clearly communicated to faculty and administration. Distinctions will need to be drawn between improvement and personnel evaluation in such a way as to allow no hidden agendas.

How Will the Proposed Program Affect Desired Changes? According to Lance Buhl (Lindquist, 1978) the next concern of the planning group should be the process of change. By formulating a clear model of the change process, program leaders may later demonstrate intentionality of the changes produced. Buhl suggests that three questions need to be answered:

1. What conditions will this program seek to produce?
2. What do you believe about the ways in which such changes can be brought about?
3. What assumptions underlie the purposes of your program?

In order to initiate thinking about this complex but crucial issue, a consensus activity was developed concerning those assumptions that can be made about instructional or faculty development (see Appendix B). The planning group, upon completion of this exercise, can identify a number of important steps in the change process similar to those described by Havelock (1972): The identification of a felt need by faculty members, the diagnosis of the problem through data collections, the exploration of possible solutions, the selection and implementation of the desired solution, and the evaluation of success. Program activities that furthered the various stages of this cycle were seen as primary ingredients for the faculty development program. Lindquist, however, offers one word of caution at this stage. "It is wise to remain flexible and get underway even as you work to clarify a model (p. 272)"

Who Should Participate? The next step in the planning process is a consideration of who is the intended audience for the program. Chet Case offers a suggestion that has proved useful in my work: "Think big but start small" (Lindquist, 1978, p. 154). There is a need to confront reality: chances for effecting wide-spread change are slim

given the constraints under which college faculty work—limited time, unlimited demands, cultural norms, weak evaluation systems. Whatever population is served, participation should remain voluntary and confidential as long as improvement—rather than personnel decision-making—is the program purpose.

At the same time that participants are encouraged from among the key population to be served, one should be giving some attention to related populations. Administrators need to be informed, surveyed, and encouraged to participate. Student leaders need to be contacted and students involved in supporting change efforts. Participation may increase as larger units within the institution come to recognize the need for and efforts of the faculty development program.

How do We Determine the Needs of Our Constituency? Prior to selecting program activities, planners should conduct some form of needs assessment. At one level, planners may wish to assess the readiness of the institution and the faculty for faculty development activities through a series of action research questions such as the following suggested by Case, Buhl, and Lindquist (Lindquist, 1978):

1. Who has authority? Will authority champion a faculty development program?
2. Who holds the purse strings?
3. Who could influence the level of acceptance of faculty development?
4. What resources related to faculty development are currently available?
5. What, if anything, has already taken place on this campus related to faculty development? What is the “aftertaste” of that activity?
6. At what stage is the institution in its development?
7. Are institutional goals well-known? acted upon? Shared by all elements?
8. What norms exist that might influence faculty participation?

Second, faculty interests and needs should be considered to derive useful objectives and program activities. Three approaches to needs assessment are worth considering. In the “naturalistic” process, we

assume that individuals know what they need and are ready to ask for it. A call for self-designed projects or growth plans might indicate key areas of need. A more widely used approach is that of the survey in which respondents are asked to indicate preferred activities. The problem with this approach is that preference does not indicate willingness to participate! A third approach, the "deductive" process, involves a comparison of the ideal of the institution to the real, of what should be to what is. Needs are revealed as discrepancies between the two (Bland and Froberg, 1982). Further deductions may be made from theories concerning the developmental patterns of adults or organizational functioning. Toombs (1983) again cites the failure of faculty development programs to assist faculty where they really needed help as an obstacle to the institutionalization of such programs.

What Goals and Objectives Should We Pursue? Once the data are in, the planning group is ready to formulate those goals and objectives that will guide the choice of actual program content. Goal statements should reflect institutional, departmental, and individual concerns. Finally, objectives should indicate the criteria to be used in determining success or failure of the program. Goal statements might also be derived from a consideration of literature in the field and attendance at national conferences on the topic. At Murray State University, the planning group worked directly from the consensus exercise mentioned earlier and results of a need survey and interviews with faculty.

What Institutional Structure Will Best Encourage Success? At the same time at which several of the preceding questions are being discussed, the location of the faculty development program within the structure of the institution should be considered. Several principles seem important in this phase of the design process. These principles apply whether the program is campus wide or limited to one unit on campus. First, the more ownership perceived by the audience for the program services, the greater the chance of success. Second, formal program status is essential if the activities undertaken are to be fully coordinated, sequenced, and followed through. A director of programming is needed, although this position can be part time. Third, the program should be located in a staff, not a line position. The confidentiality of services offered and the necessity for building trust among

clientele demands that the faculty development function rests outside of the decision making channel. Finally, the program should be located high enough in the administrative structure of the unit to be seen as supported by influential administration and legitimate in terms of goals of the institution or unit.

Several examples from my own experience may serve to point out the pitfalls in alternate structures. At one university, the faculty development program grew out of a grant in the School of Education. When moved into the campus structure, the "educationese" image remained with it. In addition, the location of the center under the assistant provost was not sufficiently high in the administrative structure for the center to survive the attacks of the deans in times of tight money. The battle cry—"if you really want to improve teaching, give faculty members more money"—knelt the death of a special program without a strong defender. At another university, the faculty development program reports directly to the academic vice-president as do library services, the academic advising center, and the deans of the various colleges. During initial planning and implementation stages, the center reported directly to the President of the university under the jurisdiction of a faculty board. Once fully underway, the board shifted to an advisory function and the Center was relocated under the office of the academic vice-president. At a third institution, an associate dean was hired to lead the instructional development efforts. He set himself apart from faculty, us and them. Programmatic efforts were blocked by faculty and chairmen, the associate dean was fired and the office was closed. Balancing faculty ownership with administrative support is crucial in locating the program within the institution.

What Activities Shall the Program Provide? Plans have been carefully laid for the initiation and nurturing of the new staff development program. Now the decisions with which most of us wanted to begin—program activities. What will the program do? Previous decisions provide the groundwork for program plans; however, several other principles may assist staff members and planners in selecting from among available options. A small well-planned set of initial services built directly from goals and needs will provide a strong beginning for later expansion. Balance breadth and depth, balance

low-key service with critical, visible events. Be various but persistent. Above all, recognize the strengths and weaknesses of any program offering and continuously assess effectiveness and need.

Program activities can be categorized in many ways. Appendix C lists program types with purposes, advantages, disadvantages, and sample institutions for each type.

How Should we Finance These Lofty Schemes? Centra (1976) found that on the average, 70 percent of the total budget for staff development came from institutional general funds with an average of 20 percent coming from federal or foundation sources. Another seven percent of program funding came from state funds. Where university money has not been contributed, program lives have often been extinguished with the end of the outside funding period. Legislators in Washington and Florida have actually earmarked a piece of the annual budget for faculty development activities. In addition, faculty growth funds have been available on campuses for a long time: sabbaticals, leaves, travel. Whatever the particular arrangement, some commitment by the home institution is crucial. Essential budget lines include salaries, travel, supplies, equipment, and external consultants.

What Type of Staff Does the Program Require? Closely related to financing is the issue of staffing. Table One indicates those characteristics reported by Lindquist (1978) as essential characteristics of a staff development person. The surprising aspect of these lists is the omission of a particular area of content expertise. Interpersonal communication skills and flexibility are more essential than expertise in testing or measurement, years of teaching experience, or a degree in educational psychology. The faculty development staff person needs to be a generalist, even a dilettante, interested in a wide variety of issues, topics, and ideas. The ability to listen closely, to plan collaboratively, and to seek creative solutions complements almost any discipline preparation. However, the majority of staff at present seems to come from English, education, psychology, and speech communication. Very few doctoral programs specialize in the teaching of professionals in staff development, although in-service training events are available each year through the Professional and Organization Development Network, American Society of Training and Development and National Training Laboratory.

At many colleges, faculty development staffing has been a creative endeavor in cost effectiveness. The Clinic to Improve University Teaching at Massachusetts initiated the idea of graduate students as teaching consultants. Faculty members on release time, faculty wives,

TABLE 1 Characteristics Required in Faculty Development Leaders from Lindquist et al. (1978)					
Characteristics	Surveys at Two Community Colleges	Chet Case	Claude Mathis	Tom Clark	Jack Lindquist
Interpersonal Communication Skills					
Credibility	X				
Openness	X				X
Trustworthiness	X			X	X
Enthusiasm	X	X			X
Perceptiveness	X				X
Acceptance, Tolerance	X	X	X		X
Flexibility	X		X		X
Optimism	X	X			X
Determinism and Persistence					X
Energy	X				X
Assertiveness	X				X
Good Sense of Reality	X	X			X
Collaborative		X		X	X
Eclecticism			X		X
Caring				X	X
Respect					X
Empathy				X	X
Humor					X
Areas of Expertise, Skills and Knowledge					
Communication Skill, Speaking, Listening	X	X		X	X
Group Dynamics, Theory and Skills	X	X		X	X
Learning Theory	X	X	X		X

Starting a Faculty Development Program

Characteristics	Survey of Two Community Colleges	Chet Case	Claude Mathis	Tom Clark	Jack Linguist
Research Skills	X			X	X
Aware of Faculty Development Field	X				X
Past Experiences					
Experience and Effectiveness as a Teacher		X	X		X
Experience in Innovative Teaching				X	
Seasoning in Learning Institutions		X	X		X
Tenured		X			
Recognition as a Scholar		X	X		
Planning Skills and Administrative Skills					
Coordinating Skills	X	X			X
Takes Advice				X	X
Technician				X	
Fiscal Management				X	
Writing Reports				X	
Attention to Detail				X	

emeritus faculty, advanced undergraduate students, and peer teams have all been tapped with success in a number of institutions. The key ingredients seem to be communication skills and creativity rather than official diplomas from prestigious institutions. Perhaps the most important undertaking of any developing center is the selection and training of caring and creative persons to provide program services.

This emphasis on personal skills is not to suggest that certain areas of content expertise are unnecessary. Skills in instructional and curriculum design, program evaluation, teaching methodology, educational research, psychology, adult learning, career change, and management of change are essential to the staff members of a comprehensive program providing personal, instructional, and organizational development.

How Do We Publicize Our Programs and Reward Participants?

Goals are set. The program is planned. A staff is trained and ready to begin. Two remaining issues demand attention. How do we notify faculty members of the types of services to be offered and how do we reward those who decide to participate? In response to the first, use all avenues possible. Ride the circuit. Visit faculty members in their offices or coffee rooms. Meet with department chairmen and deans. Locate friends and start with them. Seek the assistance of opinion leaders. In short, use person-to-person avenues of communication. Supplement these efforts with traditional information dissemination strategies: a newsletter, campus publications, radio, campus television spots, posters, presentations, phone calls. However, the personal contact, even in conjunction with these latter, seems to procure the best results.

As for incentives for participation, both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards should be considered. The literature on faculty motivation is mixed—some studies suggesting only that money motivates while others suggesting personal satisfaction as the key. The faculty development staff person should be responsible for seeking out links with the reward structure of the institution. Growth contracting, letters of achievement, documentation of participation are possible methods for contributing to the professional advancement of the faculty participant. Second, the staff person should find out what is rewarding to those faculty members with whom he or she is working. Sometimes for a good listener, a pat on the back for a job well done, a special word to a superior, are all the incentives needed.

A number of strategies have been tried to increase faculty participation. Program leaders can invite participants from each academic unit. At one university, the faculty development committee held an afternoon round table and invited influential guests. These faculty members were asked to react to the program plans that had been made and suggest revisions or expansions. Growth contracting provides another method for increasing participation. In this procedure, each faculty member designs a "growth" project for the year which may or may not include assistance from the faculty development office (Gordon College, 1979). Finally, new programs can identify and involve faculty leaders. During our first semester of operation at both the University of Massachusetts and Murray State University, I asked key

leaders to participate in the experimental implementation of program activities. We stressed the invaluable assistance that they could offer to us in terms of program weaknesses and strengths. This cadre of leaders—if pleased with program outcomes—may serve as an important liaison with other faculty members within their own spheres of influence.

No matter which strategy is employed, two ingredients will determine, above all else, the extent and nature of faculty participation. First, services offered must be of the highest value and quality possible. If faculty members are satisfied with the services acquired, if they perceive both immediate and long-term change as possible and desirable, if problems identified and solved are of crucial importance to the personal or professional well-being of the faculty member, word will spread. A satisfied participant is the best publicity possible for a growing program.

Second, faculty development personnel need to be involved in an informed about all aspects of faculty life. Lindquist advises us to “ride the circuit” to keep in touch with institutional issues and pervasive feelings. Service on departmental, college, and university committees, major undergraduate teaching responsibilities, activity in faculty governance systems by program staff indicates the “faculty” nature of the operation. On campus where the chasm between “us” and “them” is wide, the program staff needs to clearly be viewed as faculty in nature and orientation if their primary service is to be to faculty.

How Do We Evaluate Our Accomplishments? One major planning area remains to be discussed—program evaluation. Unfortunately, faculty development practitioners have paid too little attention to this area until recently. In our rush to provide services in areas of need, we have neglected to document what we have done (Menges, 1981, Hoyt and Howard, 1977). As a result, much has been lost of our early experiences. Programs have disappeared, unable to demonstrate effectiveness or persuade administrators of crucial need for services.

Evaluation begins before the Center opens its doors. What are the outcomes expected? What will you take as evidence of the achievement of that outcome? What data will administrators need to determine funding levels? The purpose of evaluation is to emphasize what is being done, critique it, and improve it.

Both formative and summative procedures are essential to the development of a quality program (O'Connell and Meeth, 1978). A wide number of procedures are available although the first impulse is to collect survey data. The services of an external consultant may be beneficial in the early stages to objectively observe and comment on program aspects from a point of view broader than the single campus. J.S. Stevens and L.N. Aleamoni (1984) University of Arizona, recently published results of a 10 year study of the effectiveness of a system of student evaluation with consultation support. Data from the student evaluation instrument and records for workshop attendance and participation in individual consulting were utilized to examine long-term effects of this faculty development program activity. More studies of this nature need to be done in spite of methodological difficulties. Only with persuasive data to document program impact will faculty development programs be spared in the continuing rounds of budget cuts.

References

- Berquist, W. H. and Philips, S.R. *A Handbook for Faculty Development Volume 2*. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.
- Bland, C. J. and Frobery, D. G. "A Systematic Approach to Faculty Development for Family Practice Faculty." *J. of Family Practice*, 14, (1982), pp. 537-543.
- Centra, J. *Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976. (PR-76-30)
- Gordon College. *Handbook: Professional Development Through Growth Contacts*. Wenham, Mass.: Gordon College, 1979.
- Havelock, R. *A Guide to Innovation in Education*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1972.
- Hoyt, D. P. and Howard, G. S. *The Evaluation of Faculty Development Programs*. Research Report #39. Kansas State University: Office of Educational Research, May 1977.
- Jaggard, S. "Planning, Implementing and Developing a Staff Development Program." Paper presented for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Conference, May 11, 1977.
- Lindquist, J. *Designing Teaching Improvement Programs*. San Francisco: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978. (Distributed through Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Suite 320, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036).
- Lindquist, J. *Strategies for Change*. Washington, D.C.: Council for Independent Colleges, 1978.
- Nelson, W. C. "Faculty Who Stay: Renewing Our Most Important Resource." In R. G.

- Baldwin and R. T. Blackburn, *College Faculty: Versatile Human Resources in a Period of Constraint*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, *New Directions for Institutional Research*, December, 1983, pp. 85-94.
- O'Connell, W. R. and Meeth, L. R. *Evaluating Teaching Improvement Programs*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine, 1978.
- Rose, J. L. and Menges, R. J. "Improving College Teaching: A Critical Review of Research." *Review of Educational Research*, 51 (Fall 1981), pp. 403-434.
- Seldin, P. *Successful Faculty Evaluation Programs*. Crugers, New York: Coventry Press, 1980.
- Slater, P. *Pursuit of Loneliness: American Culture at the Breaking Point* (revised edition) Scranton, Pennsylvania: Beacon Press, 1976.
- Stevens, J. J. and Aleamoni, L. The Effectiveness of Consultation in Support of Student Evaluation Feedback. *Post Secondary Education Newsletter*, AERA Division J., February 1984.
- Toombs, W. Faculty Development: The Institutional Side. In R. G. Baldwin and R. T. Blackburn, *College Faculty: Versatile Human Resources in a Period of Constraint*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, *New Directions for Institutional Research*, December, 1983, pp. 85-94.

APPENDIX A
Planning and Implementing a Program to Improve Teaching: Issues to Consider

General Statement of Purpose and/or Rationale:

Model for Change:

(Consider the criteria for excellence and those assumptions that underlie the purposes of your program. The model should suggest the conditions which your program will seek to produce.)

Basic Program Considerations:

I. Participation

(who in the college is to participate? Expected numbers, voluntary vs. mandatory participation, etc.)

II. Procedure for Determining Needs

(Outline a plan for assessing the needs of those to be served.)

III. Goals and/or Objectives

(From your needs assessment, determine at least two major objectives to be met by the program. A review of program descriptions from other colleges would be extremely helpful at this point. The attached consensus sheet could also be used if planning is being done by a group.)

IV. Position Within the Institution

(Consider issues such as place in the institutional organizational structure, ownership, status, links to departments.)

V. Program Plans

(Using the needs and goals generated earlier outline the types of program activities that would best meet the objectives set. Committee members might visit programs at other campuses in order to observe those programs. A matrix of objectives and activities might be constructed.)

Starting a Faculty Development Program

VI. Financing	(Establish a tentative one-year budget indicating the sources of required funding. Begin with non-personnel items. Add personnel lines after completing X.)
VII. Time Table	(Set some time guidelines for yourself in terms of deadlines. What needs to be done first to get from planning to implementation? By when?)
VIII. Program Evaluation	(How will program effectiveness be determined? What data should be obtained for formative and summative evaluation? What criteria will you use in determining success or failure of the program?)
IX. Incentives for Participation	(What kinds of rewards or positive sanctions can you provide for participation? What other units within your institution need to be contacted in order to increase positive sanctions and reduce negative consequences?)
X. Staffing	(What staffing needs will the program have? Number? Type? Full or part time? Qualifications and characteristics? You might need to go back to your budget at this time and add personnel lines.)
XI. Publicity	(How will your clientele find out about the new program? What existing publicity lines could best be used? What new publicity approaches need to be undertaken? Consider long-range plans as well.)
XII. "Force Field" Analysis	(Once you are ready for implementation, you need to identify those factors within your college that will serve to facilitate the implementation of the new program and those that will hinder. Consider both personnel and environmental factors. Study the balance. Do restraining factors outweigh facilitating factors? What can you do if this is the case?)
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center; padding: 10px;"> <div style="text-align: center;"><i>Facilitating Forces</i></div> <div>vs.</div> <div style="text-align: center;"><i>Restraining Forces</i></div> </div>	

APPENDIX B Characteristics of Instructional Improvement		
<p>Instructions: Your task is to rank the items below as most essential (1) to least essential (10) prerequisites to instructional improvement in your opinion. It may be helpful if you proceed by ranking 1 (most) then 10 (least), 2 (second-most) then 9 (second-least), etc.</p> <p>After each of you have completed the ranking, you will be asked to rejoin the group and discuss the items below until we arrive at a consensus about the relative essentiality of the 10 items.</p>		
Your Ranking	Ranking by Group Consensus	
_____	_____	a. Instructional improvement occurs primarily when instructors acquire, through training, new skills that can be used in the performance of specific tasks like teaching, advising, etc.
_____	_____	b. Instructional improvement occurs when information on instructional or related issues is collected, analyzed, and fed back to an instructor with the assistance of a trained consultant.
_____	_____	c. Instructional improvement occurs when specific attention is paid to those personal and organizational aspects that support change.
_____	_____	d. Specific methods or technologies of teaching are at least partial answers to instructional improvement.
_____	_____	e. Instructional improvement occurs when instructors are provided with the resources and expertise to develop instructional materials.
_____	_____	f. Instructional improvement occurs when new technological equipment is acquired and used by the instructor.

Starting a Faculty Development Program

Your Ranking	Ranking by Group Consensus	
_____	_____	g. Instructors entering into in-depth discussions about their teaching will gain a more mature perspective on the teaching profession, and a more explicitly defined educational philosophy, both of which lead to instructional improvement.
_____	_____	h. Instructional improvement takes place when an instructor has easy access to books, periodicals, and other sources of current information on instructional issues.
_____	_____	i. Instructional improvement occurs when a tangible reward system for effective teaching exists.
_____	_____	j. Instructional improvement occurs when students become better learners.

APPENDIX C

Teaching Improvement Programs

<i>TYPE</i>	<i>PURPOSE</i>	<i>SAMPLE PROGRAMS</i>	<i>ADVANTAGES</i>	<i>DISADVANTAGES</i>
Workshops, seminars and discussion groups 1. for new faculty 2. for all faculty 3. for teaching assistants 4. for specific departments	1. Increase communication among faculty about teaching 2. Affect attitude toward teaching 3. Explore various methods and techniques of instruction 4. Orient teachers to institutional needs and programs	UC La Jolla-TA training Syracuse University—once a year conference on teach sponsored by Senate committee on Instruction Univ. of Wisconsin, Green Bay—Brown Day seminars on teaching once a month	Cost effective Potential for reaching large numbers Disseminates new ideas and information Increases interdepartmental discussion of teaching	May not meet individual needs. May lack follow up to assist teacher in adoption phase Requires skilled leadership Timing of session is difficult Unlikely to produce lasting changes
Analysis and assessment procedures 1. student ratings 2. peer observation 3. videotape and review 4. master teachers 5. teaching improvement process with educational consultant	1. Assist teacher in analyzing teaching practices 2. Produce options for improving performance 3. Support teacher in the process of improvement	Brown Univ.— experienced faculty as mentors for new faculty St. Olaf College—Peer observation Harvard—Arts and Sciences provides videotaping and review Mississippi State University— Faculty Teaching Analysis Program	Meets the individual needs of the teacher Provides data for self analysis of teaching strengths and problems Can provide assistance in changing teaching behaviors through	Costly of peer or consultant time May be perceived as high risk by teacher Although improvement is focus, can be confused with personnel evaluation system Little evidence of change without peer or professional consultation

<i>TYPE</i>	<i>PURPOSE</i>	<i>SAMPLE PROGRAMS</i>	<i>ADVANTAGES</i>	<i>DISADVANTAGES</i>
Teaching awards 1. awards for excellence 2. small grants for faculty 3. paid time off for improvement activities 4. fellowships in teaching	1. Support those faculty who demonstrate excellence as teachers 2. Support the development of new courses and teaching materials 3. Encourage innovation	Univ. of Vermont—Instructional Incentive Grants Univ. of Wisconsin System—pays two faculty per campus to attend a three-day course on teaching Wichita State Univ.—has a Blue Sky Committee to recognize and bring together outstanding teachers	Rewards teaching efforts of of the recipient Indicates value attached to teaching by institution or unit	Available to only a limited number of faculty Difficult to determine recipients May be costly to institution. Requires staff assistance for optimum results
Circulation of newsletters, articles, etc., that are pertinent to teaching improvement	1. Disseminate information about teaching and teachers 2. Stress the value of good teaching	Dalhousie Univ.—newsletter on teaching Univ. of N. Dakota—circulates monographs about teaching written by faculty	Signals institution's intent to reward or publicize teaching Lost effective Capable of reaching large numbers Increases access to new ideas about teaching	Difficult to prepare May not be read

<i>TYPE</i>	<i>PURPOSE</i>	<i>SAMPLE PROGRAMS</i>	<i>ADVANTAGES</i>	<i>DISADVANTAGES</i>
Periodic review of faculty apart from tenure and promotion process 1. required student evaluations of teaching 2. "growth" contracting	1. Provide data to administrators on teaching, usually on comparative basis 2. Encourage attention to quality teaching 3. Initiate teacher/administrator review of teacher performance for improvement	Univ. of Oklahoma—annual review of each faculty member by chairman Gordon College—uses three-year growth contracts to help faculty set professional development goals Developed with and results evaluated by chairman	Provides periodic feedback on teaching performance Encourages review of teaching performance between teacher and chairman	Time consuming to collect and analyze data and review with faculty member May be confused with personnel evaluation purposes
Educational consultants who are available to assist teachers to: 1. develop teaching skills, 2. obtain and use AV; 3. use instructional technology as a teaching aid; 4. construct tests 5. develop new courses or instructional materials	1. Support faculty efforts to improve teaching skills and materials 2. Support innovation in teaching	Univ. of Texas, Austin and Arlington—consultation on teaching skills and course materials Pace Univ.—person to assist faculty in improvement of teaching skills Oklahoma State Univ.—Center for Effective Instruction provides assistance in producing CAI and AV materials	Provides individual assistance based on teacher's needs Provides expertise of the consultant Supports the process of change	Can reach limited number of faculty Requires one or more skilled consultants

<i>TYPE</i>	<i>PURPOSE</i>	<i>SAMPLE PROGRAMS</i>	<i>ADVANTAGES</i>	<i>DISADVANTAGES</i>
Faculty exchange programs 1. visitations to other institutions to review educational programs and innovative projects 2. exchange of faculty between institutions 3. exchange of faculty between an institution and other organization 4. faculty take courses offered by colleagues 5. career retraining	1. Expand teacher's view of possibilities in teaching 2. Renew faculty energy and interest through change in environment 3. Expose faculty to new ideas and approaches	Murray State Univ.—faculty exchange with Puerto Rico Bucknell Univ.—workshops on life and career renewal	Benefits institution as well as individual Low cost to institution	Difficult to arrange Available to only limited numbers
Sabbaticals, leaves, continued schooling 1. paid sabbaticals 2. leaves 3. travel funds for professional meetings	1. Encourage continual development of subject matter expertise 2. Keep faculty members up-to-date in their fields 3. Support tenured faculty in career shifts within the institution for meeting of institutional needs	All Institutions	Builds professional status of faculty Leads to publications and presentations	Does not guarantee improved teaching

<i>TYPE</i>	<i>PURPOSE</i>	<i>SAMPLE PROGRAMS</i>	<i>ADVANTAGES</i>	<i>DISADVANTAGES</i>
Organizational development of activities to improve environment in which teaching occurs 1. departmental functioning 2. institutional reward system 3. institutional mission and goals	1. Improve organizational climate in which teachers work 2. Assist faculty in developing all aspects of their institutional roles	California State Univ., Long Beach—consultants intervene with academic units on conflict/cooperation issues Fairleigh Dickinson Univ.—involves faculty in long range institutional planning	Moves level of change beyond the individual to departmental and/or institutional level Supports faculty efforts at improving teaching Integrates role of teacher into larger context of the institution	Difficult to accomplish; Requires skilled intervention