A Survey of Faculty Development Practices

Glenn Erickson

University of Rhode Island

The POD Network decided to conduct a survey of faculty development practices for several reasons. First, many people believed that the "faculty development movement" was a casualty of tight budgets and an inevitable loss of faith in yesterday's strategies; some of us had our doubts. Also, we were curious about just what kinds of services were being offered by whom in our colleges and universities and whether things had changed dramatically in the years since Centra's survey (Centra, 1976). Finally, we had never had a decent mailing list of "development" practitioners, yet we claimed to be committed to putting such folks in touch with each other.

In mid-1984, we mailed a letter to the chief academic officers of the 1,588 four-year (or more) colleges and universities in the U.S. asking them to send us the names and addresses of people at their institutions who directed or coordinated "... what are typically called faculty development, instructional development, or teaching improvement programs or activities." About 1,200 responded to that letter or to a subsequent prompt; 450 indicated that they didn't have any formal program; the remaining 750 sent us the names of nearly 1000 coordinators, directors, committee chairs, or administrators.

We asked those 1,000 people to complete a 47-item questionnaire adapted from Centra's (1976) earlier survey. The questionnaire listed 40 different activities in five categories:

workshops and seminars; assessment practices; individual consultation; grants, leaves, and exchanges; and other practices. (Table 2 lists the 40 activities.) We asked people to check those activities that had been generally available to their faculties within the most recent 12-18 months. The questionnaire also asked who was responsible for planning and coordinating such services, how their current investment in faculty development compared to that of three years ago, and for some demographic information. Unlike Centra's survey, POD's did not ask for estimates of the extent of participation or degree of effectiveness.

We received about 800 completed questionnaires from 650 different institutions after mailings in the spring and fall of 1985. We combined multiple returns from individual institutions, discarded incomplete questionnaires, and excluded the few from two-year colleges. We then had 630 usable responses, a coordinator response rate of about 79%. Table 1 describes the sample of respondents by region, institutional type, enrollment, and whether public or private. We have completed questionnaires from half of the four-year colleges, universities, and professional schools in the Southeast, Midwest, and West. Perhaps because of a high proportion of very small schools in the Northeast, we have responses from only 38% of the schools in that region.

The responses to survey questions about responsibility for and relative investment in services suggest that the "faculty development movement" is neither dead nor even in decline. Ten years ago, 41% of the 408 four-year colleges and universities responding to Centra's survey claimed "... an on-campus person or unit(s) for faculty development or instructional improvement . . ." (1976, p. 34); 44% claimed such a person or unit in 1985. Moreover, 66% of the 1985 respondents indicated that their institutions' current investment in faculty, instructional, and professional development was much or somewhat greater than it had been three years earlier; only 9% rated their relative investment as somewhat or much less now. Although we can all name centers and programs that have been shut down or dramatically scaled back, responses to the POD survey suggest that more programs are starting up than closing down. We can't know, of course, what the survival rate will be for current programs (half were created since 1981), but we have no evidence here to suggest faculty development is dying.

TABLE 1

Survey Questionnaire Respondents by Region, Enrollment, Public vs. Private, and Institutional Type

Region and institutional type	Under 1,000		1,000-2,500		2,500-5,000		5,000-10,000		10,000-20,000		Over 20,000		All		
	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	all
Northeast															
Four-year	2	31	5	44	10	10	9	2	5	1	0	0	31	88	119
University	0	0	0	3	0	4	2	5	6	2	3	2	11	16	27
Professional	2	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	11
all NE	4	38	5	49	10	14	11	7	11	3	3	2	44	113	157
Southeast															
Four-year	2	38	8	33	15	2	8	1	4	1	0	0	37	75	112
University	0	0	1	0	4	1	5	1	11	0	7	0	28	2	30
Professional	2	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	6	12
all SE	4	43	11	34	20	3	13	2	16	1	7	0	71	83	154
Midwest															
Four-year	2	64	6	48	10	7	10	1	5	0	0	0	33	120	153
University	0	2	1	0	0	1	4	5	11	2	11	0	27	10	37
Professional	1	11	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	15
all MW	3	77	8	50	10	8	14	6	16	2	11	0	62	143	205
West															
Four-year	1	18	5	19	8	3	5	0	6	0	1	0	26	40	66
University	0	2	0	1	3	1	5	2	11	2	11	1	30	9	39
Professional	0	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	9
all W	1	27	5	21	11	4	11	2	17	2	12	1	57	57	114
All															
Four-year	7	151	24	144	43	22	32	4	20	2	1	0	127	323	450
University	0	4	2	4	7	7	16	13	39	6	32	3	96	37	133
Professional	5	30	3	6	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	11	36	47
combined	12	185	29	154	51	29	49	17	60	8	33	3	234	396	630

Note. Northeast includes CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT; Southeast--AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN, VA, WV; Midwest--IA, IL, IN, KS, MI, MN, MO, ND, NE, OH, OK, SD, WI; the West--AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NM, NV, OR, TX, UT, WA, WY.

Tables 2-8 provide information about the activities offered to faculty in responding institutions. Table 2 reports the percentages of institutions that offered each of the services or activities within the preceding 18 months. It shows, for example, that student ratings of instruction were available on more than 95% of these campuses, although under half provided individual help from trained consultants in interpreting such ratings. Tables 3-8 report the median number of faculty development practices in each category that institutions made available to their faculties. The tables also show how many institutions offered half or more of the options listed in the questionnaire. Institutions are sorted by geographic region, type, and enrollment in the tables.

It's apparent that the most popular category of practices is the traditional one of grants, awards, leaves, and exchanges (Table 6). Individual consultation services (Table 5) are available at the fewest number of institutions. Regional differences are not dramatic, but there seems to be more variety in services as one moves west (Tables 3-8). Not surprisingly, larger institutions—especially universities—offer a greater variety of services than smaller ones. Tables 2-8 present the findings in considerable detail because information about faculty development practices in particular kinds of settings is likely to be of more interest than sweeping generalizations.

We were also curious about who was responsible for coordinating faculty development practices on these campuses. There were faculty development committees at 62% of the schools (also true in 1976), but they apparently serve advisory roles. Committees actually coordinated or provided services in only 14% of the institutions. Committees shared responsibility with an administrator at 4% of the schools. Fourteen percent of the institutions had centers or programs, and another 14% had coordinators or directors of faculty development. Most typically, however, a dean or other administrator had responsibility for faculty development as one of his or her several duties. Predictably, institutions with a center or designated coordinator offered the most services; fewest services were available on campuses where faculty development was one among many of an administrator's responsibilities.

TABLE 2

Percentages of Private and Public Four-year Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools That Offer Various Faculty Development Services

Faculty development practices	<u>Colleges</u>		<u>Universities</u>		<u>Professional</u>		<u>All</u>	
	prv (323)	pub (127)	prv (37)	pub (96)	prv (36)	pub (11)	prv (396)	pub (234)
Workshops or seminars on								
1) various methods or techniques of instruction	61	61	62	73	47	64	60	66
2) course or curricular planning	38	24	30	41	39	55	38	32
3) testing and evaluating student performance	32	29	27	52	50	64	33	40
4) academic advising and counseling skills	62	57	57	42	33	27	59	50
5) research and scholarship skills	16	34	32	45	33	45	19	39
6) improving the management of departmental operations	19	28	27	35	13	18	19	31
7) general issues or trends in higher education (e.g., competency testing, general education)	39	40	27	40	31	9	37	38
8) personal development (e.g., improving interpersonal skills, values clarification, career planning)	26	29	16	40	31	18	25	33
9) understanding college students (e.g., learning styles, developmental patterns)	40	31	22	46	11	27	35	37
10) theories and principles of instruction	29	28	22	46	25	45	28	36

TABLE 2—Continued

Faculty development practices	<u>Colleges</u>		<u>Universities</u>		<u>Professional</u>		<u>All</u>	
	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub
Resources available to faculty for assessing and improving their teaching								
1) student ratings of instruction	97	96	100	96	97	91	97	96
2) classroom observation by peers	66	65	68	61	56	64	65	64
3) review of course materials by peers	53	59	51	52	56	55	53	56
4) systematic self-assessment techniques	39	36	27	30	42	45	38	34
5) consultation about teaching from trained colleagues or other instructional resource people	43	45	57	64	47	73	45	54
6) videotaping and critique of classroom instruction	43	50	49	69	44	73	44	59
Individual help from trained consultants available to faculty								
1) interpreting student ratings of instruction	28	32	43	60	31	82	30	46
2) course planning or development	29	32	41	52	39	91	31	43
3) constructing tests or evaluating student performance	19	28	32	58	33	82	21	43
4) developing teaching skills (e.g., asking questions, lecturing)	33	32	38	60	44	73	34	45
5) use of instructional technology (e.g., audiovisual aids, computer-assisted instruction)	52	60	68	75	42	64	53	66
6) career goals and other personal issues	16	17	16	25	19	9	16	20
7) working effectively with or within organizations (e.g., committees, departments)	14	12	22	21	17	27	15	16

TABLE 2—Continued

Faculty development practices	<u>Colleges</u>		<u>Universities</u>		<u>Professional</u>		<u>All</u>	
	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub
Grants or awards, leaves, exchanges								
1) grants for faculty members developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching	64	74	49	72	33	36	60	71
2) faculty exchange program with other institutions	29	61	43	58	28	27	30	58
3) sabbatical leaves with at least half salary	78	83	78	83	78	73	78	83
4) a policy of unpaid leaves covering educational or development purposes	68	78	62	71	36	64	65	74
5) a lighter than normal teaching load for first year faculty	19	17	27	30	39	18	21	23
6) temporary teaching load reductions to work on new course, major course revision, or research area	54	69	70	70	44	36	55	68
7) travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field	59	65	62	65	42	27	58	63
8) travel funds available for attending professional conferences	93	94	92	94	83	82	92	93
9) summer grants for project to improve instruction or courses	64	59	68	63	31	18	61	59

TABLE 2—Continued

Faculty development practices	<u>Colleges</u>		<u>Universities</u>		<u>Professional</u>		<u>All</u>	
	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub	prv	pub
Other practices								
1) special professional library readily accessible to faculty concerned with instructional methodology, teaching skills, psychology of learning, and similar topics	33	40	38	48	44	73	35	45
2) annual awards to faculty for excellence in teaching	50	72	81	91	44	100	53	81
3) professional and personal development plan (often called "growth contracts") for individual faculty members	29	24	22	23	17	18	28	23
4) circulation of newsletter, articles, etc. that are pertinent to teaching improvement or faculty development	49	36	32	56	42	45	47	45
5) a specific calendar period set aside for professional development	26	19	14	11	25	0	24	15
6) a visiting scholars program that brings people to the campus for short or long periods of time	46	57	51	73	58	55	47	63
7) a periodic review of all faculty members, whether tenured or not	76	80	68	77	50	55	72	78
8) a campus committee on faculty development	67	61	51	58	53	9	64	58

TABLE 3

Summary by Region, Institutional Type, and Enrollment of the Median Number of 10 Faculty Development Related Topics Treated in Workshops or Seminars Within Preceding 18 Months, and the Number of Institutions Which Treated Half or More of the Topics

Region and institutional type	Under 2,500			2,500-5,000			5,000-10,000			Over 10,000			All		
	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4
Northeast															
Four-year	82	3.0	20	20	3.0	4	11	3.0	3	6	4.5	3	119	3.0	30
University	3	2.0	0	4	2.0	0	7	3.0	0	13	6.0	8	27	3.0	8
Professional	11	1.0	2	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	11	1.0	2
all NE	96	3.0	22	24	3.0	4	18	3.0	3	19	5.0	11	157	3.0	40
Southeast															
Four-year	81	3.0	20	17	2.0	4	9	4.0	3	5	3.0	1	112	3.0	28
University	1	-	1	5	1.0	1	6	5.5	4	18	5.0	11	30	5.0	17
Professional	10	3.5	2	1	-	1	0	-	0	1	-	0	12	3.5	3
all SE	92	3.0	23	23	2.0	6	15	4.0	7	24	4.5	12	154	3.0	48
Midwest															
Four-year	120	4.0	48	17	4.0	5	11	6.0	6	5	5.0	3	153	4.0	62
University	3	2.0	1	1	-	0	9	5.0	4	24	5.0	12	37	5.0	17
Professional	15	3.5	5	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	15	3.5	5
all MW	138	4.0	54	18	4.0	5	20	5.5	10	29	5.0	15	205	4.0	84
West															
Four-year	43	4.0	16	11	5.0	6	5	5.0	3	7	5.0	4	66	4.0	29
University	3	4.0	1	4	2.0	0	7	4.5	3	25	5.0	17	39	5.0	21
Professional	8	2.5	2	0	-	0	1	-	0	0	-	0	9	2.0	2
all W	54	4.0	19	15	3.5	6	13	4.5	6	32	5.0	21	114	4.0	52
All															
Four-year	326	4.0	104	65	3.0	19	36	4.0	15	23	4.5	11	450	4.0	149
University	10	3.0	3	14	2.0	1	29	4.0	11	80	5.0	48	133	5.0	63
Professional	44	3.0	11	1	-	1	1	-	0	1	-	0	47	3.0	12
combined	380	4.0	118	80	3.0	21	66	4.0	26	104	5.0	59	630	4.0	224

TABLE 4

Summary by Region, Institutional Type, and Enrollment of the Median Number of Six Teaching Evaluation and Critiquing Resources Generally Available to Faculty Within Preceding 18 Months, and the Number of Institutions Which Offered Half or More of Those Resources

Region and institutional type	Under 2,500			2,500- 5,000			5,000- 10,000			Over 10,000			All		
	N	Mdn	>3	N	Mdn	>3	N	Mdn	>3	N	Mdn	>3	N	Mdn	>3
Northeast															
Four-year	82	3.0	34	20	4.0	11	11	4.0	8	6	4.5	5	119	3.0	58
University	3	3.0	1	4	3.5	2	7	4.0	4	13	4.0	7	27	4.0	14
Professional	11	3.0	3	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	11	3.0	3
all NE	96	3.0	38	24	4.0	13	18	4.0	12	19	4.0	12	157	3.0	75
Southeast															
Four-year	81	3.0	27	17	3.0	5	9	2.0	1	5	4.0	3	112	3.0	36
University	1	-	1	5	2.0	0	6	3.0	3	18	4.0	10	30	3.0	14
Professional	10	3.0	4	1	-	1	0	-	0	1	-	1	12	3.5	6
all SE	92	3.0	32	23	3.0	6	15	2.0	4	24	4.0	14	154	3.0	56
Midwest															
Four-year	120	4.0	67	17	3.0	7	11	5.0	8	5	3.0	2	153	4.0	84
University	3	3.5	1	1	-	1	9	3.0	3	24	4.0	13	37	3.5	18
Professional	15	4.0	9	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	15	4.0	9
all MW	138	4.0	77	18	3.0	8	20	4.0	11	29	4.0	15	205	4.0	111
West															
Four-year	43	3.0	19	11	3.0	5	5	4.0	4	7	4.0	4	66	3.0	32
University	3	2.0	1	4	2.5	0	7	3.0	3	25	4.0	16	39	4.0	20
Professional	8	3.0	2	0	-	0	1	-	0	0	-	0	9	3.0	2
all W	54	3.0	22	15	3.0	5	13	4.0	7	32	4.0	20	114	3.0	54
All															
Four-year	326	3.0	147	65	3.0	28	36	4.0	21	23	4.0	14	450	3.0	210
University	10	3.0	4	14	3.0	3	29	3.0	13	80	4.0	46	133	3.5	66
Professional	44	3.0	18	1	-	1	1	-	0	1	-	1	47	3.0	20
combined	380	3.0	169	80	3.0	32	66	4.0	34	104	4.0	61	630	3.0	296

TABLE 5

Summary by Region, Institutional Type, and Enrollment of the Median Number of Seven Individual Consultation Services Generally Available to Faculty Within Preceding 18 Months, and the Number of Institutions Which Offered Half or More of Those Services

Region and institutional type	Under 2,500			2,500-5,000			5,000-10,000			Over 10,000			All		
	N	Mdn	>3	N	Mdn	>3	N	Mdn	>3	N	Mdn	>3	N	Mdn	>3
Northeast															
Four-year	82	1.0	9	20	1.0	5	11	1.0	3	6	3.0	2	119	1.0	19
University	3	0.0	0	4	1.0	0	7	1.0	2	13	5.0	10	27	2.0	12
Professional	11	2.0	3	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	11	2.0	3
all NE	96	1.0	12	24	1.0	5	18	1.0	5	19	5.0	12	157	1.0	34
Southeast															
Four-year	81	1.0	10	17	2.0	4	9	2.0	2	5	5.0	3	112	1.0	19
University	1	-	1	5	0.0	1	6	5.0	3	18	4.0	11	30	4.0	16
Professional	10	4.5	7	1	-	1	0	-	0	1	-	1	12	5.0	9
all SE	92	1.0	18	23	2.0	6	15	2.0	5	24	4.0	15	154	2.0	44
Midwest															
Four-year	120	3.0	32	17	2.5	2	11	4.0	7	5	4.0	2	153	3.0	43
University	3	1.5	0	1	-	1	9	4.5	4	24	5.0	16	37	5.0	21
Professional	15	5.5	5	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	15	5.5	5
all MW	138	3.0	37	18	3.0	3	20	4.0	11	29	5.0	18	205	3.0	69
West															
Four-year	43	2.0	6	11	3.5	4	5	4.0	4	7	3.5	2	66	3.0	16
University	3	3.0	0	4	1.0	0	7	3.0	1	25	4.0	17	39	4.0	18
Professional	8	2.5	2	0	-	0	1	-	0	0	-	0	9	2.5	2
all W	54	2.0	8	15	3.0	4	13	4.0	5	32	4.0	19	114	3.0	36
All															
Four-year	326	2.0	57	65	2.0	15	36	3.0	16	23	3.0	9	450	2.0	97
University	10	1.5	1	14	1.0	2	29	3.0	10	80	5.0	54	133	4.0	67
Professional	44	3.0	17	1	-	1	1	-	0	1	-	1	47	4.0	19
combined	380	2.0	75	80	2.0	18	66	3.0	26	104	5.0	64	630	2.0	183

TABLE 6

Summary by Region, Institutional Type, and Enrollment of the Median Number of Nine Teaching Grant, Award, Leave, or Exchange Programs Generally Available to Faculty Within Preceding 18 Months, and the Number of Institutions Offering Half or More of Them

Region and institutional type	Under 2,500			2,500-5,000			5,000-10,000			Over 10,000			All		
	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4
Northeast															
Four-year	82	6.0	56	20	7.5	17	11	8.0	10	6	7.5	6	119	6.0	89
University	3	8.0	3	4	5.5	4	7	4.0	3	13	7.0	11	27	6.0	21
Professional	11	3.0	2	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	11	3.0	2
all NE	96	5.0	61	24	7.0	21	18	6.0	13	19	7.0	17	157	6.0	112
Southeast															
Four-year	81	5.0	55	17	6.0	11	9	4.0	4	5	7.0	4	112	5.0	74
University	1	-	0	5	5.0	3	6	5.5	4	18	7.0	15	30	6.0	22
Professional	10	4.0	5	1	-	1	0	-	0	1	-	1	12	5.0	7
all SE	92	5.0	60	23	6.0	15	15	5.0	8	24	7.0	20	154	5.0	103
Midwest															
Four-year	120	6.0	82	17	6.0	15	11	6.0	10	5	6.0	4	153	6.0	111
University	3	3.0	1	1	-	0	9	7.0	8	24	6.0	21	37	7.0	30
Professional	15	4.0	6	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	15	4.0	6
all MW	138	6.0	89	18	6.0	15	20	7.0	18	29	6.0	25	205	6.0	147
West															
Four-year	43	5.0	27	11	7.0	8	5	7.0	5	7	6.0	7	66	6.0	47
University	3	4.0	0	4	6.5	3	7	5.0	4	25	7.0	19	39	6.0	26
Professional	8	5.0	5	0	-	0	1	-	0	0	-	0	9	5.0	5
all W	54	5.0	32	15	7.0	11	13	5.0	9	32	7.0	26	114	6.0	78
All															
Four-year	326	5.0	220	65	6.0	51	36	6.5	29	23	6.0	21	450	6.0	321
University	10	4.0	4	14	5.5	10	29	5.0	19	80	7.0	66	133	6.0	99
Professional	44	4.0	18	1	-	1	1	-	0	1	-	1	47	4.0	20
combined	380	5.0	242	80	6.0	62	66	6.0	48	104	7.0	88	630	6.0	440

TABLE 7

Survey by Region, Institutional Type, and Enrollment of the Median Number of Eight Miscellaneous Faculty Development Related Practices Generally Available Within Preceding 18 Months, and the Number of Institutions Which Offered Half or More of Those Practices

Region and institutional type	Under 2,500			2,500- 5,000			5,000- 10,000			Over 10,000			All		
	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4	N	Mdn	>4
Northeast															
Four-year	82	3.0	21	20	3.0	5	11	5.0	6	6	4.5	3	119	4.0	35
University	3	2.0	1	4	2.5	1	7	3.0	1	13	4.0	5	27	4.0	8
Professional	11	2.0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	11	2.0	0
all NE	96	3.0	22	24	3.0	6	18	4.0	7	19	4.0	8	157	4.0	43
Southeast															
Four-year	81	4.0	25	17	3.0	3	9	5.0	5	5	4.0	2	112	4.0	35
University	1	-	0	5	2.0	0	6	5.0	4	18	5.0	11	30	4.5	15
Professional	10	3.5	4	1	-	1	0	-	0	1	-	0	12	4.0	5
all SE	92	4.0	29	23	3.0	4	15	5.0	9	24	5.0	13	154	4.0	55
Midwest															
Four-year	120	4.0	50	17	4.0	6	11	5.0	7	5	3.0	2	153	4.0	65
University	3	2.0	0	1	-	0	9	5.0	6	24	4.0	8	37	4.0	14
Professional	15	4.0	6	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	15	4.0	6
all MW	138	4.0	56	18	4.0	6	20	5.0	13	29	4.0	10	205	4.0	85
West															
Four-year	43	3.0	11	11	5.0	7	5	3.0	0	7	4.0	3	66	4.0	21
University	3	2.0	1	4	3.5	0	7	4.0	2	25	5.0	16	39	4.5	19
Professional	8	2.5	1	0	-	0	1	-	0	0	-	0	9	2.0	1
all W	54	3.0	13	15	4.0	7	13	3.5	2	32	5.0	19	114	4.0	41
All															
Four-year	326	4.0	107	65	4.0	21	36	4.5	18	23	4.0	10	450	4.0	156
University	10	2.0	2	14	2.0	1	29	4.0	13	80	5.0	40	133	4.0	56
Professional	44	3.0	11	1	-	1	1	-	0	1	-	0	47	3.0	12
combined	380	4.0	120	80	4.0	23	66	4.0	31	104	4.0	50	630	4.0	224

TABLE 8

Summary by Region, Institutional Type, and Enrollment of the Median Number of 41 Faculty Development Programs and Activities Generally Available to Faculty Within Preceding 18 Months, and the Number of Institutions Which Offered Half or More of Those Services

Region and institutional type	Under 2,500			2,500-5,000			5,000-10,000			Over 10,000			All		
	N	Mdn	>20	N	Mdn	>20	N	Mdn	>20	N	Mdn	>20	N	Mdn	>20
Northeast															
Four-year	82	16.0	18	20	19.0	7	11	19.0	5	6	24.5	4	119	17.0	34
University	3	17.0	0	4	15.5	1	7	16.0	1	13	24.0	10	27	18.0	12
Professional	11	13.0	1	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	11	13.0	1
all NE	96	16.0	19	24	18.5	8	18	18.0	6	19	24.0	14	157	17.0	47
Southeast															
Four-year	81	17.0	18	17	17.0	4	9	16.0	3	5	22.0	3	112	17.0	28
University	1	-	1	5	12.0	0	6	25.0	4	18	23.0	12	30	22.0	17
Professional	10	18.0	3	1	-	1	0	-	0	1	-	1	12	19.5	5
all SE	92	17.0	22	23	16.0	5	15	19.0	7	24	22.5	16	154	18.0	50
Midwest															
Four-year	120	19.0	54	17	19.0	7	11	23.0	9	5	18.0	2	153	19.0	72
University	3	13.0	0	1	-	0	9	20.0	4	24	21.5	13	37	20.0	17
Professional	15	16.0	7	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	15	16.0	7
all MW	138	18.5	61	18	18.0	7	20	23.0	13	29	21.0	15	205	19.0	96
West															
Four-year	43	16.0	15	11	22.0	7	5	24.0	4	7	21.0	4	66	19.0	30
University	3	14.0	1	4	15.5	0	7	18.0	3	25	25.0	20	39	21.0	24
Professional	8	15.0	1	0	-	0	1	-	0	0	-	0	9	15.0	1
all W	54	16.0	17	15	20.0	7	13	22.0	7	32	22.0	24	114	20.0	55
All															
Four-year	326	17.0	105	65	18.0	25	36	21.5	21	23	22.0	13	450	18.0	164
University	10	15.0	2	14	15.0	1	29	18.0	12	80	23.0	55	133	21.0	70
Professional	44	15.0	12	1	-	1	1	-	0	1	-	1	47	15.0	14
combined	380	17.0	119	80	17.0	27	66	20.5	33	104	23.0	69	630	18.0	248

What we have, then, is evidence that the faculty development movement has survived the budget cuts and shifting interest of recent years, even if many specific programs have not. Probably half or more of our four-year colleges, universities, and professional schools offer some formal faculty development, instructional development, and/or teaching improvement services. Those activities are most often coordinated by a committee, an administrator whose primary responsibilities lie elsewhere, or a committee and administrator working together. We don't know many details (e.g., Are workshops one hour, one day, one week? Are consultations "one shot" or "longterm"?) Nor do we know who participates, what really works, what's just window dressing. However, we do have an extensive mailing list of those responsible for faculty development activities, and it is available to those who might seek answers to such questions.

REFERENCES

- Centra, J. (1976). *Faculty development practices in U.S. colleges and universities* (Project Report 76-30). Princeton: Educational Testing Service.