ED 313 986   HE 023 091

AUTHOR   Arnold, David L.
TITLE   Beyond Mentoring: A Rationale for the Study of Higher
              Education in Pre-Service Faculty Development
              Programs. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE   Nov 89
NOTE   18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
              Association for the Study of Higher Education
              (Atlanta, GA, November 2-5, 1989).
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Career Development; Doctoral Programs; *Educational
              Planning; Educational Quality; Education Work
              Relationship; *Faculty Development; *Higher
              Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Preservice
              Teacher Education; *Student Development; Teacher
              Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS   *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT
              A rationale for studying the history and organization
of higher education in pre-service faculty development programs is
presented. Faculty development has generally focused on the
improvements of individual instructional skills and practice,
becoming localized and isolated from the cosmopolitan world of higher
educational institutions and disciplines. It is important that there
be mechanisms by which students in doctoral programs receive
deliberate orientation to institutional and career characteristics of
higher education and faculty service. Programs in higher education
should assemble a repertoire of export seminars addressing various
aspects of the institutional environment of higher education. These
programs could then be marketed to central administration and deans
of colleges as components in the various intercollege seminars that
characterize most doctoral programs. Attached are: a chart on degrees
of program development; a chart explaining such a program; and
examples of institutional factors for discussion. Contains 4
references. (SM)

BEYOND MENTORING: A RATIONALE

FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

IN PRE-SERVICE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

David Arnold

This paper was presented at the annual meeting
of the Association for the Study of Higher
Education held at the Ritz-Carlton, Buckhead
in Atlanta, Georgia, November 2-5, 1989. This
paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to
be of high quality and of interest to others
concerned with the research of higher education.
It has therefore been selected to be included
in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

14th Annual Conference • November 2-5, 1989

Ritz-Carlton, Buckhead • Atlanta, Georgia

BEYOND MENTORING: A RATIONALE
FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IN PRE-SERVICE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

David L. Arnold

Back in the early days of Johns Hopkins University, G. Stanley Hall went to Daniel Coit Gillman with a proposal. As the story goes, he had a fairly simple proposal. Johns Hopkins was obviously committed to a model of studies that was oriented toward producing future academic leaders and scholars. That being the case, it seemed to Hall that the students would benefit by a course that attempted to provide them with an understanding of the history and organization of higher education. If they were going to commit their lifetime to working in higher education, they ought to know something about how it worked in an institutional sense as well as knowing their own disciplines.

Gillman turned him down. Who knows, he may even have muttered something about a bunch of damned educationalists and pseudo-disciplines.

I suspect that what I am about to say is going to be a bit of preaching to the choir, because I am going to do is propose that Hall was right, and we ought to do something about it. What Hall had his finger on was an idea about faculty development that has become lost. There are some good arguments about why it should not have been lost. There are also some good arguments as to why this may be the time to do something about the situation.

There is an agonizingly complex body of literature about faculty development. There is another entire body of literature about faculty attitudes toward faculty

development. This literature is complex, but it is limited. As early as 1979, Freedman was reporting that comprehensive surveys would show that both the literature and the practice were truncated. The consideration of faculty development seemed to concentrate almost exclusively on the improvement of individual instructional skills and practice. Even such strategies as sabbaticals, release time, professional travel, and the like concern the individual faculty member in isolated practice. Faculty development, like much of the teaching practice it attempts to concentrate on, has become localized and isolated from the cosmopolitan world of higher educational institutions and disciplines.

Anyone who has watched the notion of organizational culture develop over the last decade in management literature can pinpoint the weakness in this sort of isolation and single-task orientation in development programs. Institutions, organizations, and the individuals in them are not simply task oriented. Their practices are not even defined by the two-dimensional management models that balance of task and relationships or some similar pair of concerns. Organizations and institutions have deeper characteristics and cultures that shape them. Shein talks about the "deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization...that define in a basic taken for granted fashion an organization's view of itself and its environment" (Shein, 1985,p.6) Organizational culture literature argues that such cultural structures in organizations are powerful, accessible to study, and can be transmitted by a number of formal and informal means.

On a more pragmatic level, there are certain kinds of institutions that a e so coherent that they have more than their own internal cultures or lore. They have special relationships to the law, to other organizations, to communities, and to social notions. The institution of the military or the institution of various religions provide examples. And higher education is this kind of institution. We exist in

2

specialized relations to many aspects of the law. We exist in special relations to our communities. We have specialized traditions and structures of governance. We exist in special relationships to other organizations. A quick look at the debates about corporate funding of research should prove that instantly.

Masland (1985) calls this the special "web" of the institution, and its existence in higher education is well documented and accepted both within higher education and by the outside community. But we ignore it in our own development. In our faculty development programs at all levels, we leave the consideration of our own notions of ourselves to tribal lore.

Toombs, in 1975, proposed a multi-dimensional model of faculty development that addresses this issue and provides an intriguing possibility for action. His model expands faculty development past the domain of individual teaching skills and identifies three dimensions of development. He labels these dimensions "professional," "curricular," and "institutional." He also extends his model over time, recognizing that developmental needs change with experience, age, and personal goals. His model results in the matrix shown in Chart 1. Toombs, like Freedman and others to follow, argued that faculty development ignored the institutional aspects of faculty service and much of the professional aspect. If we fill in current practice in this model, I suspect it would look something like what I have filled in on Chart 2.

Unfortunately, Toombs' discussion falters a bit. He contends that "a complete faculty development program has to include an institutional dimension and acknowledge the importance of the setting in which every professional practices," (Toombs, 1975, p.713) but does not go much further with suggestions as to how one might develop programs that "substitute sound information for coffee-hour conversation" (Toombs, 1975, p. 713). That's kind of odd, because a major

3

portion of the answer was staring right out of his own chart. It was there because the really unique thing about this model is not the institutional component but the pre-service component.

Toombs spoke of pre-service in internal terms, a warm-up period in which a newly employed faculty member would be run up to speed. But the major pre-service arena for faculty development is pre-hire. It is the doctoral program. It is certainly true that many doctoral recipients proceed to non-academic careers, but it also generally true that the doctoral degree is a *sine-qua-non* for entry to the higher education faculty. And there, it seems to me, is the handle for both the idea of developing institutional components in faculty development and for useful involvement by programs for the study of higher education.

Departments and programs for the study of higher education should turn outward within their institutions and work to establish mechanisms by which students in doctoral programs receive deliberate orientation to institutional and career characteristics of higher education and faculty service. They should do this in fashions that respect the primacy of the disciplinary nature of doctoral programs and in fashions that are distinct and separate from the instructional skills goals of the G.T.A experience.

What would go in such a program. There are lots of things that we could all figure out. If we had a blackboard, we could fill it with no trouble in a couple of minutes. Toombs suggests a list of topics, some of which I've pulled out on Chart 3. There are plenty of others. How about what is the difference between working in a unionized and a non-unionized faculty? How do faculty retirement programs work? What is academic freedom and what does the AAUP statement say? What have the courts said about peer review? How does the government pursue fraud, waste, and abuse in federal grants and what is the responsibility of

4

the faculty? What roles do department heads and deans have in different organizational structures? What are faculty salary expectations in various types of institutions? And so on and so forth.

This type of topic makes up the substance of much of our research. In the study experience of other disciplines, I suspect that this type of knowedge is left to chance and to whatever the individual student happens to pick up as they thumb through the Chronicle looking for the want-ads.

How can such programs be implemented? Well, I once proposed a research survey to look for such programs, so I had to come up with a set of short-hand descriptions for what they might look like. Chart 4 shows five categories of program level. I suspect that what we would find most often is levels one and two. In fact, we were so sure of that outcome that we did not do the survey. Deliberate/Informal is a nice idea, but it seems to rely on the good intentions of a lot of nice people, and most nice people are already up to their beltlines in alligators. The best informal bet that I could think of would be to have the college or university buy every doctoral student his or her own subscription to the Chronicle. Malcolm Scully would probably appreciate that suggestion, and it might well be a considerable improvement over the current situation. However, I would like to work toward some degree of formalization, level 3 on the chart.

The most profitable approach for departments of higher education would be the institution of a requirement for all 6000 level students to take a formal course in a survey of American higher education. That's what Hall wanted. But it would take one heck of a salesman to sell that in today's institutional environment. Everybody knows how jealously FTE's are guarded and hoarded; particularly in formula funded institutions. And most doctoral students don't have a spare course slot or two anyway. All such an approach would gain would be massive

resistance.

To me the best approach seems to be to treat the idea as a problem in field service. I would propose that programs in higher education should assemble a repertoire of export seminars addressing various aspects of the institutional environment of higher education. These programs should then be marketed, if you will, to central administration and deans of colleges as programs to be included in the various intercollege seminars that characterize most doctoral programs.

This approach has several advantages. It works to allow tailored, high impact presentations which can be developed and maintained easily. It does not compete with the disciplinary core or with GTA programs. It provides a visible, productive service component for the higher education faculty and offers the very real possibility of institutional or grant funding proposals. And it offers a high probability of acceptance because organizers of seminar programs are almost always willing to accept ideas that will help them to schedule and maintain their programs at a minimum cost to their own resources.

Over the next decade there will be a sea-change in the composition of the faculty. We are all familiar with the statistics of faculty turn-over. We are in window of opportunity. The students in doctoral programs now and for the next few years will shape the character of the higher education faculty for decades. Is it enough that they have only disciplinary content in preparation for their careers, or is there more? The academic and scholarly career, for better or worse, is almost exclusively a province of institutionalized higher education, so those who wish to pursue such careers have an undeniable interest in the nature of the institutions. The more they know, the more empowered they will be.

Freedman, in speaking of institutional content in faculty development has said, "Our concern is that faculty better understand themselves and their social and

6

organizational situation, and our hope is that such knowledge will make them better teachers, better researchers, and better educators generally" (Freedman, 1979, p. v).

John Thelin, a member of our board and one of my favorite authors has said somewhat more lyrically, "My fear is that the current generation of researchers, administrators, faculty, and graduate students who affiliate with higher education pay scant attention to (the) autobiographies of institutions in which we live, study, and work" (Thelin, 1983, p.233).

G. Stanley Hall's proposal is still on the table. We have the expertise. We have the organizational ability to make the case and to field the programs. We have the opportunity and the vehicles. If we believe that what we know and study is valid and important to the institutions, then it seems to me that we have the obligation to teach to the faculty of the future.

DIMENSION OF DEVELOPMENT	PRE-SERVICE	NEW - INEXPERIENCED	NEW - EXPERIENCED	ESTABLISHED AND EXPERIENCED	NON-TEACHING ACADEMICS
PROFESSIONAL AND CAREER					
CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION					
INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTER AND PRACTICES					

11

1.

DEGREES OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

NONE	WE DON'T THINK THAT IS AN APPROPRIATE ELEMENT FOR OUR PROGRAM.
SERENDIPITIOUS	WE HOPE THAT THEY'LL PICK THAT UP ALONG THE LINE SOMEHOW.
DELIBERATE INFORMAL	THAT IS A PROGRAM GOAL, BUT WE HAVE NO FORMAL STUCTURE.
DELIBERATE FORMAL	WE RECOGNIZE THAT GOAL AND WE HAVE IT IN DELIBERATE PROGRAM ELEMENTS
DELIBERATE FORMAL VALIDATED	WE RECOGNIZE THAT GOAL, WE HAVE DELIBERATE PROGRAMS, AND WE FOLLOW UP TO SEE HOW WE ARE DOING.

14

DIMENSION OF DEVELOPMENT	PRE-SERVICE	NEW - INEXPERIENCED	NEW - EXPERIENCED	ESTABLISHED AND EXPERIENCED	NON-TEACHING ACADEMICS
PROFESSIONAL AND CAREER	/////////			SABBATICALS; PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT; TRAVEL	MANAGERIAL; PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION	G.T.A.	THE MAJORITY OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS			
INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTER AND PRACTICES	/////////				

15

16

EXAMPLES OF INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS
FOR DISCUSSION

GOVERNANCE AND AUTHORITY PATTERNS
COSTS AND BUDGETS
OUTCOMES AND OUTCOME ASSESSMENT
MANAGEMENT INDICATORS; VITAL SIGNS
COST PER CREDIT HOUR/FTE STRUCTURES
STUDENT ADMISSIONS
STUDENT MIX
CREDIT LOAD AND CLASS SIZE DECISIONS
COMMITTEE SERVICE
STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS
POLITICAL STRUCTURES
TOWN AND GOWN CONSIDERATIONS
HIRING PRACTICES
ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES AND
ADMINISTRATORS

Freedman, Mervin. Academic Culture and Faculty Development. New York,
     New York: Montaigne Press, 1979.

Masland, Andrew T. "Organizational Culture in the Study of Higher Education."
     The Review of Higher Education, vol. 8, no. 2 (1985) pp. 157-168.

Toombs, William. "A Three Dimensional View of Faculty Development." The
     Journal of Higher Education. vol. 46, no. 6 (1975) pp. 701-717.

Schein, Edgar. Organizational Culture. San Fransisco, California: Jossey Bass,
     1985.