University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

To Improve the Academy

Professional and Organizational Development
Network in Higher Education

1993

Taking the Lead: Faculty Development As Institutional Change Agent

Kenneth J. Zahorski

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

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

Zahorski, Kenneth J., "Taking the Lead: Faculty Development As Institutional Change Agent" (1993). *To Improve the Academy*. 297.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimproveacad/297>

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.

Taking the Lead: Faculty Development As Institutional Change Agent

Kenneth J. Zahorski

St. Norbert College

This article looks at the nature, role, and functions of faculty development from a particular philosophical perspective, exploring ways in which faculty development professionals might step beyond their traditional institutional role as facilitators to become even more powerful change agents. More specifically, the author (1) identifies areas where change agent strategies may be used, (2) provides some concrete examples of faculty development serving as an effective institutional change agent, and (3) identifies the conditions needed for faculty developers to become successful change agents.

Throughout its brief but dynamic history, faculty development has been synonymous with service. From the seminal articles of the seventies through the books and conference papers of the nineties, the service *leitmotif* persists unabated. It was in large part this characteristic feature that drew me into the field in the early eighties. I found the idea of serving my colleagues attractive then, and I still do today. But my work in faculty development over the past decade has revealed dimensions of the profession I had not seen at the beginning of my tenure. This gradual broadening of view, combined with an awareness of the needs of academia at century's end, has significantly changed my conception of the role of faculty development.

If I had been asked to write a classified ad for the position of Director of Faculty Development ten years ago, it would have looked something like this:

Position Available
DIRECTOR OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Bella Luna College is seeking a Director of Faculty Development to provide professional development assistance to its faculty.

In addition to being a good facilitator, the successful candidate must be capable of conducting teaching-learning workshops, seeking grants to support instructional improvement, and helping faculty enhance their teaching skills.

However, if I were to write the same help wanted ad today, based upon my new perspective on faculty development, the tone and criteria would differ substantially:

Position Available
DIRECTOR OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Bella Luna College is seeking an exceptional individual to assume a challenging leadership position in a program designed to provide faculty with professional growth opportunities.

The successful candidate must be a dynamic, highly motivated person capable of formulating and implementing creative, meaningful plans. In addition to possessing strong organizational, communication, and administrative skills, candidates must demonstrate the ability to take the lead in promoting a spirit of community among faculty, students, and administrators. The position demands vision, creativity, and a take-charge attitude.

The language of these ads reflects two significantly different conceptions of faculty development. The first takes the traditional service approach with its use of words such as “assistance,” “facilita-

tor," "helping," and "conducting." The second sees faculty development through a different lens, as evidenced by its use of key descriptors such as "leadership," "motivation," "creativity," "vision," and "initiative."

It is this second view I wish to explore in this article. More specifically, I hope to foster a dialogue aimed at answering the following kinds of questions: (1) Should those of us serving as faculty developers take an even stronger proactive approach to helping solve campus issues and problems? (2) Should we begin taking even more active roles as campus leaders, as initiators of action, as vigorous institutional change agents? (3) What are the prerequisites for our becoming more effective change agents? (4) What kinds of institutional change can we hope to bring about? (5) What are the risks involved with our becoming more active change agents?

This is a topic deserving of a more thorough treatment than I can give here. However, I will attempt to provide a foundation for future discussions by (1) identifying some areas where change agent strategies are already being used, as well as suggesting some where more initiatives might be taken; (2) providing some concrete examples of faculty development's serving as an effective institutional change agent; (3) identifying the conditions needed for faculty developers to become successful change agents; and (4) pointing out some of the challenges, and risks, facing the faculty development change agent.

Where change agent strategies can be used

Change agent strategies can be used effectively in all three conventional areas of faculty development: personal, instructional, and organizational. Indeed, it is this rich potential that makes redirecting the role of the faculty developer toward change agency so attractive and compelling.

Personal Development

Many faculty development professionals already serve as powerful change agents in the area of personal development. Perhaps the most striking example is that of individual consulting. For example, when faculty developers help colleagues find ways of coping with

stress, grief, and burnout; when they help them improve their personal and professional relationships with colleagues; and when they help acclimate them to a new institutional culture, they are serving as potent change agents. Developers also serve as influential change agents when they consult with colleagues on such matters as career development, retirement planning, and time management. Faculty development consultation typically cuts across the whole spectrum of faculty, thus providing a valuable service to a broad cross section of ranks, age groups, and academic units. In short, the change agent possibilities in the area of personal development are numerous and varied, possessing great potential for constructive and meaningful change.

Instructional Development

Change agent opportunities also abound in the area of instructional development. Faculty development-sponsored funding, for example, can be used to foster risk-taking and innovation in the classroom, to develop new programs, to change the curriculum, and to promote scholarship—particularly classroom research. Faculty developers can set up peer observation programs designed to change, fundamentally, the way instructors perceive the teaching enterprise. Faculty development initiatives promoting active and collaborative learning can transform the classroom climate throughout an institution. Faculty developers who have trained their colleagues in the uses of the teaching portfolio report remarkable changes in the academic climate of their institutions. These are but a few of the many faculty development activities and strategies with great potential for affecting change in the realm of instructional development. Although many of the fields of opportunity in this area are not as vigorously cultivated as they might be, overall faculty development efforts have been energetic and fruitful.

Organizational Development

Organizational development also possesses great potential for generating change—especially on the institutional level. But here the potential seems not to have been as successfully exploited as in the other two areas. Since the genesis of the concept of organizational

development in the seventies (e.g., French & Bell, 1973; Sikes, Schlesinger & Seashore, 1974; Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Gaff, 1978), this area has not received the kind of attention regularly given personal and instructional development. In 1974, for example, Ernest Boyer (Gaff, 1978) noted that “applications of organizational development theory and techniques have been very limited” (p. 78). A decade later, when evaluating the faculty development resulting from the Bush Foundation Faculty Development Project in Minnesota and the Dakotas, Kenneth Eble and Wilbert McKeachie (1985) stated that “consequential *organizational change* was not a major feature” of any of the Bush Foundation programs (p. 32). Members of an Organizational Development Interest Group which met during the 1992 POD Conference (Nichols, 1992) also remarked on this short shrift, and identified well over a dozen areas in which faculty developers could play a more significant role as organizational development change agents, including consortial collaborations, shared governance, collective bargaining, long-term planning retreats, and institutional budget making.

The birth of this Interest Group, the more frequent appearance of conference sessions devoted to organizational development, and the recent publication of writings reexploring this area (e.g., Schuster, Wheeler & Associates, 1990; Lunde & Healy, 1991), signal an encouraging reemergence of interest in this vital area of faculty development. Nonetheless, of the three conventional areas of faculty development, this one, because of its unfulfilled potential, offers the faculty development change agent the most exciting new possibilities.

Examples of faculty development as change agent

The potency of faculty development as institutional change agent can best be conveyed through specific illustrative examples. Those described below are drawn from my experience as Director of Faculty Development at St. Norbert College (SNC), a small, private liberal arts institution of 1,900 students and 115 faculty in De Pere, Wisconsin. The College’s Faculty Development Program, inaugurated in 1984, is holistic, sponsoring a broad spectrum of activities and programs ranging from a new faculty orientation and mentor program to

various in-house funds. Although the SNC Program promotes change in all three areas of faculty development, because of the lack of attention given to organizational development, I will draw most of my examples from that area. While the initiatives described below are most readily replicable in institutions about the size of St. Norbert College, with some modification most could also be effective in larger institutions, despite their more complex organizational and governance systems.

Institutional reward structures

One of the best places for faculty developers to begin the change agent process is with the institutional reward system. All institutions have some type of reward structure; these structures have high visibility, and they naturally fall within the purview of faculty development. A good initial target is the academic award system.

Until the inauguration of the Faculty Development Program in the mid-eighties, St. Norbert College offered only one institutional academic award, the Leonard Ledvina Outstanding Teacher Award. This Award publicly recognizes and rewards faculty who have reached the highest level of achievement in fulfilling the College's first academic priority: dedication to excellence in teaching. Presented at the annual commencement ceremonies, the Ledvina Award is highly respected by members of the College community.

The members of the Faculty Development Committee—a Committee comprised of five elected faculty, one student representative, and the Director of Faculty Development—strongly supported the Ledvina Award, but thought the College should also offer a scholarship award. They reasoned that such an award would not only reinforce the College's long-standing endorsement of the concept of the complementary nature of scholarship and teaching, but also would promote further the professional growth of the faculty. Taking the initiative, the Committee drafted the following proposal for establishing a scholarship award and sent it to the Dean of the College in October 1985:

Although teaching has always been, and will continue to be, the *raison d'être* for St. Norbert College, our academic community also

rightly places a high value on scholarship, the foundation upon which outstanding teaching rests. Scholarship not only nurtures teaching; it brings recognition and prestige to the scholar who undertakes it and to the institution which encourages and supports it.

Since awards are one means of fostering research and scholarship, the Faculty Development Committee recommends establishing an annual scholarship award equal in prestige and monetary award to the Leonard Ledvina Outstanding Teacher of the Year Award. We recommend, further, that this honor be called the Faculty Development Scholarship Award and that it be conferred upon each year's recipient during the spring commencement ceremonies.

Shortly after receiving the Faculty Development Committee's proposal, the Dean took it to the Administrative Advisory Council where it was discussed and subsequently approved. In May 1986, the first scholarship award was presented during commencement ceremonies. Since then this award has taken its place alongside the teaching award as one of St. Norbert College's most coveted and sought-after honors. Designed to serve as both incentive and reward, the Donald B. King Distinguished Scholar Award fulfills both goals, while also nurturing the College's community of scholars.

In-house funding systems

Like the reward system, an institution's in-house funding system is highly visible and within the purview of faculty development. Further, it is an area in which a faculty development change agent can practice both ingenuity and creativity. With a little imagination and resourcefulness, funds can be set up to support a wide variety of teaching-learning and scholarly enterprises, can be instituted with relatively modest amounts of money, and can be targeted at specific institutional needs.

In 1984, three sources of institutional in-house funding existed at St. Norbert College: (1) the Faculty Personnel Fund, administered by the Faculty Personnel Committee and dedicated primarily to sabbatical support; (2) the Faculty Publications Fund, a small discretionary fund administered by the Dean of the College for the purpose of helping faculty to prepare materials for publication; and (3) divisional

travel funds, administered by the Divisional Advisory Council for the support of professional travel.

Although the SNC in-house funding support system was working quite smoothly, there was room for improvement. Because the Personnel Committee spent most of each fall semester reviewing tenure, promotion, and sabbatical applications, faculty submitting requests for support of other kinds of professional growth opportunities sometimes did not get their requests processed in a timely manner. Further, faculty were often unclear about the purpose of the Fund, not knowing if the activities for which they needed financial support fell within its compass. In addition, no fund existed for the express purpose of supporting scholarly, curricular, and teaching enhancement projects undertaken during the summer. In short, the in-house funding system needed both clarifying and beefing up.

These needs, combined with the Dean of the College's welcoming attitude toward constructive change, prompted the Faculty Development Committee to embark on an initiative to (1) provide more in-house funding sources; (2) more clearly define the purpose of each fund; and (3) make it easier for faculty to make use of in-house funding sources.

During a five year period, from January 1985 to September 1990, the Faculty Development Committee—working closely with the Personnel Committee, the Divisional Chairs, and the Dean of the College—initiated several changes in the St. Norbert College in-house funding system. To begin with, three new funding sources were created: the Summer Grants Fund, dedicated to support for scholarly, artistic, curricular, and instructional activities undertaken during the summer; the Faculty Development Fund, offering support for professional growth activities and projects undertaken during the regular academic year; and the Student-Faculty Development Endowment Fund, designed to encourage and support joint student-faculty scholarly and teaching improvement projects. All three funds are administered by the Faculty Development Committee.

In addition, the Faculty Development Committee more clearly defined the procedures and scope of existing in-house funds and streamlined the system. This was in part accomplished by rewriting the in-house funding descriptions in the *Faculty Handbook* and by

constructing and distributing a schematic that provided information about each fund's purpose, as well as its application procedures.

Further, the Committee devised application forms for the three funds it administers, the general format of which has been replicated by other in-house funding sources, thus creating a more uniform, efficient, and user-friendly institutional funding system.

One of the most attractive outcomes of these changes has been ease of faculty use. With the system's demystification and clarification have come greater faculty satisfaction and participation. In a typical year, for example, the Faculty Development Committee processes nearly a hundred grant applications. In addition, the changes described above have helped widen the channels of communication among all in-house funding agencies, with the end result of making the institutional funding system more uniform and equitable.

One of the funds created during this period deserves special note, both because of its unique genesis and its special qualities. The story of the Student-Faculty Development Endowment Fund is particularly important here because it clearly demonstrates the institution-wide benefits of change agent initiative.

The concept of the Student-Faculty Development Endowment Fund was developed in spring semester 1985-86 through a series of meetings involving the students of the Class of '86 Gift Committee, the Director of Planned Giving, and the Director of Faculty Development. Early in the semester, the Chair of the Gift Committee visited me in my office, asking for help in generating ideas for a class gift. Eager to assist, I attended the Gift Committee's planning meetings and urged its members to consider establishing an endowment fund dedicated to encouraging and supporting joint student-faculty scholarly, artistic, and teaching improvement projects. The Committee endorsed the concept and launched "Project '86: The Ultimate Partnership," asking the Faculty Development Committee's help in drafting a set of funding guidelines and in administering the Fund. To help the dream of "Project '86" become reality, each member of the senior class was invited to donate \$86 over a three-year period. The students responded enthusiastically, pledging nearly \$25,000. On June 30, 1990, the date marking the end of that three-year period, the Endowment Fund

principal had generated sufficient interest to provide a \$1,000 award for 1990-91.

Since then the endowment has grown considerably, thanks to the generosity of the F.W. Olin Foundation. Citing St. Norbert College as a "center of academic excellence," in the fall of 1991 the Foundation awarded a \$100,000 grant to the College for the purpose of supporting joint student-faculty learning partnerships. With the added monetary support, the Office of Faculty Development has been able to offer a total of thirteen \$1,000 learning partnership grants over the past two years. These student-faculty collaborations cut across all divisions and involve students as *equal* partners in the scholarly process, providing them with learning partnership opportunities usually found only in graduate schools. The Fund is now at the heart of a collaborative approach to learning that has become a hallmark of St. Norbert College.

Faculty recruitment process

Faculty recruitment, although dramatically affecting the teaching-learning environment and other key faculty development areas, rarely involves faculty developers. This is unfortunate. There is tremendous potential here for generating constructive change.

As part of SNC's New Faculty Orientation and Mentor Program, the Director of Faculty Development interviews all candidates for teaching positions, attends their class presentations, and participates in the candidate evaluation process. While this does constitute a fairly heavy time investment for the Director, the dividends are substantial. To begin with, the procedure enables the Director to inform candidates about the Faculty Development Program. Invariably, applicants are impressed to learn of an institution's strong commitment to their professional growth—knowledge that often represents the crucial margin of difference when they must choose between two institutions of similar quality. Second, the process gives the Office of Faculty Development a strong voice in the recruitment process, especially in terms of supporting the candidacy of strong teachers who practice active learning. And, finally, through this process the Director gets a

head start in determining how to help prospective colleagues become better teachers.

Unfortunately, the sheer numbers of applicants passing through the system of a large university every year probably make it difficult for its faculty developers to get as actively involved in the recruitment process as a developer at a small college. However, in lieu of the kind of direct involvement described in the SNC case study, developers at large institutions should look for other ways of sharing their expertise. For example, they might seek appointment to recruitment committees or perhaps offer recruitment workshops that help their colleagues become better classroom observers.

Fostering attitudinal change

Of all the change agent functions open to the faculty developer, none is more potentially powerful than that of promoting attitudinal change. Attitudinal change is vital in that it serves as the foundation for all other significant organizational, curricular, and instructional changes on campus. Although it is usually achieved through a combination of several activities and programs over long periods of time, one of the best vehicles for bringing it about is the faculty development newsletter.

At St. Norbert College, *The Beacon*, a newsletter published as a service to the entire College community, has proven to be a versatile instrument for promoting attitudinal change. Issued six times a year, *The Beacon's* primary purpose is to publicize and promote faculty development activities and programs, but it also acts as an effective medium for exchanging ideas and views about teaching, learning, and scholarship. Through its pages the Director of Faculty Development has promoted and nurtured such concepts as active learning, student-faculty learning partnerships, collaborative learning, and classroom research. The Director has done this through articles, a "Notes from the Director" column, several carefully targeted series, and a column called "Teaching Tips." Timely mailings to all faculty of materials dealing with the subjects under discussion reinforce these *Beacon* messages.

Faculty response to *Beacon* articles takes the form not only of regular feedback, but also of suggestions for topical sessions and workshops. In one instance, enthusiastic faculty reaction to a series of faculty articles recounting sabbatical experiences resulted in the Director of Faculty Development compiling a sabbatical handbook. Another series on the history of the College led to an institution-wide faculty development conference on fostering community. Still other features have helped promote Socratic questioning and techniques for generating classroom discussion. In short, the attitudinal change resulting from the faculty development newsletter has been tangible and enduring.

Conditions necessary for becoming a change agent

But how can the kinds of changes described above be effected? How can faculty developers become even more active and effective change agents? What conditions are necessary? While I do not pretend to have definitive answers to these questions, and while I am aware that necessary preconditions for change may vary from institution to institution, the following list should be of some help, especially to new faculty developers. And even experienced developers may find a few suggestions worth adding to their repertoire of ideas.

Establish the position of Director of Faculty Development

Without a director of faculty development on a release-time appointment it will be difficult to initiate the kind of change agent activities described above. Even the least sophisticated of change initiatives take considerable time. Further, the kind of leadership needed to initiate change is not likely to come from a committee. Experience tells us that while many agents may be involved in a change initiative, the process is most effectively guided and coordinated by an individual charged with overseeing a program. Diffusion of power and authority works counter to the kind of intense focus needed for generating change.

Seek and nurture both faculty and administrative support

It is difficult to maintain a dynamic faculty development program if faculty do not feel a sense of shared ownership. Faculty must be involved in the program from initial design through implementation. The more faculty involvement the better. A sense of shared ownership and regular involvement translate into the kind of support and backing a faculty developer needs to generate change. But just as essential is administrative support—both monetary support and strongly articulated moral support. Most change initiatives are very difficult, if not impossible, to generate and sustain without a supportive administration. In brief, the faculty developer must seek and nurture the active support of both faculty and administrative colleagues.

Study all aspects of your institution

At a recent AAHE Convention, Stephen Brookfield (1992) pointed out that faculty developers must immerse themselves in the culture of their institutions. More specifically, Brookfield encouraged faculty development professionals to become the “cultural anthropologists” of academe, carefully and regularly studying the cultural artifacts of their institutions. While excellent advice for faculty developers in general, this anthropological approach is essential for developers striving to become constructive change agents. Change cannot be generated without an intimate understanding of such things as an institution’s academic programs, committee system, administrative hierarchy, and organizational structure. The more faculty development professionals know about an institution’s culture and organization—even its politics—the better their chances for initiating and carrying through change.

Establish your willingness to serve

Change, especially organizational change, is most readily generated by those in leadership positions. However, these kinds of positions are almost impossible to attain without establishing a viable candidacy. Make known your willingness to serve on committees or

task forces that have impact on instructional and organizational development (Fink, 1991). And be patient. We earn positions of leadership by doing good work in the trenches. It takes time to earn the trust and respect of your colleagues.

Institute an elected faculty development committee

The faculty development committee should have standing committee status and should be viewed as a prestigious committee—perhaps on the same level as a personnel committee, or a curriculum and educational policy committee. The faculty development committee, furthermore, should be elected rather than appointed and should represent all major faculty cohorts. Only when a committee is perceived as representative, fairly constituted, and important can it serve as an effective vehicle for institutional change.

Devise strategies for making your program more visible

With identity and visibility comes credibility, and only from a foundation of credibility can a faculty development program foster change. There are several ways of establishing visibility and identity, but some of the most effective are to (1) create a logo; (2) send out all memos and routings under the logo and on the same color of paper; (3) design and purchase stationery with distinctive letterhead; and (4) make sure the logo gets placed on all faculty development posters.

Publish a faculty development newsletter

As mentioned earlier, a newsletter serves as a dependable vehicle for fostering attitudinal change. Further, the newsletter can be used to disseminate information on the results of changes made through the office of faculty development.

Develop a holistic program

A holistic program provides the developer not only with a greater number of change agent opportunities from which to choose, but also with a broader base of operations. Further, a more diverse program makes it possible to put several activities, instruments, and programs

to work simultaneously on accomplishing change. Through the simultaneous use of a number of activities, the developer can create a synergism in which the whole truly is greater than the sum of its parts.

Maintain the facilitative function

Despite the importance and promise of the change agent function, the first rule of the faculty development professional should be to prevent this function from either replacing or overshadowing the facilitative role. The two functions must work together if faculty development is to assume its full potential in academe.

The challenges of change agency

Change carries with it new challenges, and sometimes even risks. Faculty developers who become more active change agents must prepare themselves for these challenges and risks. While the organizational dynamics of an institution will determine the kinds of challenges encountered, most developers will probably have to deal with the following concerns.

Master the system

All members of the academic community must have at least a general understanding of their institution's organizational system. But for most collegial citizens, the focus is on the organizational unit in which they work, usually the departmental or divisional system. The task of a faculty developer who wants to assume a leadership role in an institution is considerably more complicated and demanding. The developer must take a holistic approach, studying the interrelationship of all the units within the overall system.

Mastering the intricacies of the organizational system of a large university, or even a small college, is not an easy task. And a faculty developer who hopes to have impact as a change agent must be able to move through the labyrinthine organizational structure with ease and confidence. Few can confidently navigate an institutional system without careful study of college catalogues and viewbooks, faculty handbooks, committee systems, college policy statements and by-

laws, mission statements, faculty constitutions, and the like. Just as good advisors must become intimately familiar with all the academic programs and regulations affecting their advisees, so too must faculty developer change agents become intimately familiar with their institution's organizational structure, its culture, its politics, and its personnel.

Cultivating this familiarity will take time. An anthropologist does not—indeed cannot—work at a speedreading pace. Faculty developers who begin studying the cultural artifacts of their institutions will find that they have undertaken a rewarding and fascinating task, but one which will also make large demands on their time and energy.

Maintain a nonpolitical stance

Trying to remain above institutional politics as a change agent may be impossible since most change is “political” in one way or another. However, a faculty developer serving as change agent must try to avoid becoming embroiled in politically-charged issues. Political issues almost always create a for-or-against situation and thus may generate divisiveness and ill will. A faculty development program can maintain its credibility and effectiveness only if it maintains its neutrality and the trust of its constituencies.

This means that faculty developers must cautiously choose the areas in which they wish to bring about change. The motivation for change should have a firmly-rooted apolitical orientation. However, it may be possible to do some work in a politically sensitive area by carefully selecting tasks within it. For example, if an institution is embarking on an initiative to redefine scholarship, the faculty developer may appropriately lead a task force charged with drafting a new definition of scholarship, but probably should step out of the process during the more controversial phase of modifying tenure and promotion policies to reflect the new definition. Or, in the case of a politically-charged activity such as collective bargaining, the office of faculty development might sponsor a series of workshops or informational sessions aimed at helping faculty better understand the institutional budgeting process, but avoid actively taking part in bargaining activities.

In short, a faculty development program has little to gain from taking political sides, but a great deal to lose. Maintaining an apolitical stance may not be easy, but it is vital to the health of a faculty development program.

Maintain neutrality

Faculty developers must be good tightrope walkers. Because they must seek and nurture the support of *both* faculty and administrators, they must be particularly diplomatic in their words and deeds, especially involving issues in which faculty and administrators are opposed.

But this is not the only problem involving the developer's dual relationship with faculty and administration. Because some faculty are naturally suspicious of academic administrators, and because a faculty development program, if it is to be effective, must work for and with the faculty, faculty developers must avoid being seen as instruments of the administration. At the same time, developers must assure administrators that they understand and appreciate their position and policies. Not an easy balancing act to be sure, but with some patience and practice, manageable.

Keep a balanced perspective

Taking the lead in an important change initiative can be a heady experience. Indeed, seeing the tangible results of major change initiatives may be more exhilarating and immediately satisfying than working on long-term teaching enhancement projects, most of which do not yield dramatic changes. Thus, it is possible to be lured deeper and deeper into the realm of change agency, sometimes to the detriment of a faculty development program's facilitative services. Developers must guard against this potential imbalance, making sure their facilitative role is not overshadowed by the more glamorous possibilities of the change agent function.

Conclusion

This paper looks at the nature, role, and functions of faculty development by exploring ways in which faculty development professionals might step beyond their traditional institutional roles as facilitators to become even more powerful change agents. Few would question the assertion that a faculty development program should be *primarily* facilitative in nature. But is there any reason an agency with such vast synergistic potential should not also assume a leadership role in institutional affairs? All that is needed is a broader vision of faculty development, a modest repertoire of strategies and techniques for generating institutional change, a good understanding of an institution's governance and organizational systems, and a willingness to take a proactive stance on issues. Indeed, in an age when higher education is crying out for leadership, faculty developers have an obligation to help fill the vacuum.

During the past few years a term which has become popular in both academia and the corporate world is "servant-leader." It is a delightful oxymoron which seems to have been specially coined for the role of the faculty developer. I strongly believe those of us in the field of faculty development can be *both* servants and leaders, that we can serve our colleagues while leading them through constructive and deep-rooted institutional change. In fact, I believe this represents the promise and the future of our professional field.

References

- Bergquist, W.H., & Phillips, S.R. (1975). Organizational development. In G. H. Quehl (Ed.), *A handbook for faculty development* (pp. 141-195). Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.
- Brookfield, S.D. (1992, April). The other side of the mirror: Reframing faculty development as an adult learning process. Paper presented at the AAHE's 1992 National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, IL.
- Eble, K. & McKeachie, W. (1985). *Improving undergraduate education through faculty development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fink, L.D. (1991). Organizational development "Bright Idea." In B. J. Millis (Ed.) *The bright idea network* (6th ed., p. 6). University of Maryland University College: College Park, MD. Produced for the Professional and Organizational Development Network.

- French, W.L., & Bell, Jr., C.H. (1973). *Organization development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Gaff, J.G. (1978). *Toward faculty renewal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lunde, J.P. & Healy, M.M. (1991). *Doing faculty development by committee*. Stillwater, Oklahoma: New Forums Press.
- Nichols, D. (1992, November). Memo to organizational development interest group. 17th Annual POD Conference, Wesley Chapel, FL.
- Schuster, J.H., Wheeler, D.W. & Associates (1990). *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sikes, W.W., Schlesinger, L.E., & Seashore, C.N. (1974). *Renewing higher education from within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.