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PREFACE

The establishment of campus centers to stimulate and assist instructional development and improved teaching effectiveness has taken on major significance in higher education. The term faculty development itself has become part of the contemporary vocabulary. The expansion and worthwhile results of developmental activities have created increasing interest in such types of institutions. The purpose of this publication is to describe this movement as it is taking place in senior institutions in the 14 states served by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB).

SREB's Undergraduate Education Reform Project began in July 1972, with partial assistance from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, assists with the development of non-traditional approaches in undergraduate education throughout the South by helping institutions and state systems of higher education consider constructive changes within the context of their purposes, goals and resources. Working through inter-institutional and regional cooperative efforts, the project stimulates institutions, faculty and administrators to review innovative approaches, and design and implement changes appropriate to the needs of their constituents.

The project began working with campus faculty development centers in the fall of 1974, when it sponsored a meeting of directors of all such centers in colleges and universities in the SREB region and representatives of other institutions interested in beginning centers. That meeting was followed by meetings of several ad hoc committees of directors to discuss and plan additional activities related to centers and the development of new ones. This publication is the result of another specific recommendation made by one ad hoc committee and affirmed by the other university center directors. This publication is intended to meet a need within this region for sharing information among centers about their activities and to let institutions interested in developing centers explore possible alternatives for their own settings.
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Prior to the current faculty development movement, some attempts were made to improve the quality of instruction in colleges and universities. In addition to the traditional, popular practice of increasing library holdings within the respective subject matter fields, the attempts included: recruiting for faculty new Ph.D.'s from the best schools who would bring with them new ideas; reducing class size or lowering the student-faculty ratio; and increasing the university's holdings in the area of instructional hardware and media. (1, pp. 3-5) The pervasive notion, capsulated, was that a successful learning experience would occur to the extent that fine quality minds with access to fine quality books, periodicals, and media could interact with a small group of fine quality students.

In the 1960's, however, students protested that universities were continuing to drift from serving learners to serving the people who worked for and ran the institutions. According to Vermilye, the great wave of learner-centered reform resulted from student charges that universities were not being accountable. ([8, pp ix-x])

It is understandable, therefore, that the major origin and impetus for the faculty development movement was to improve instruction. Almost all the centers and offices that came into being near the cutting edge of the movement had this as their expressed purpose. Even today, most new centers begin with this as their major task.

CONCEPTS OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

As centers continue to evolve and staff philosophies emerge, more and more centers are expanding their definition of faculty development to a broader and more inclusive mission. The faculty development movement is truly a unique phenomenon of the 1970's. Today, like its cognate fields of public school education, psychology, psychiatry, and social work, it is characterized by emphasis upon the total person or the integrated system. In this case, its emphasis is upon the total development of the faculty member as a person, as a professional, and as a member of the academic community. The expanded definition therefore moves beyond development as a teacher to include development as an individual as well as a group member, and to focus on the professional development in counter roles, e.g., chairperson, committee member, etc., and upon the total development of the faculty member as a social system. In this case, the emphasis is upon the total development of the faculty member as a social system within which the individual will function as a teacher, scholar, researcher, and community member. Moreover, there is focus upon the organizational structure of the academic milieu within which the faculty member functions, and upon the role of the academic community in coping with and minimizing the organizational barriers which interfere with the faculty member's development as a professional and a member of the academic community.

Economic crunch for universities and students

Higher expectations of students with regard to educational opportunities

Inadequate mobility of faculty and administrators

Decreased mobility of faculty and administrators

Lack of clear definition of student enrollment roles

Unquestionably, students were ready for faculty development centers. The university itself exhibited interest for another set of reasons:

Leveling or declining student enrollment

Decreased mobility of faculty and administrators

High percentage of tenured faculty members who were mostly in their forties

A buyer's market for students with regard to educational opportunities

Economic crunch for universities and students

Increased demands for accountability by parents, board members, and the public

Economic crunch for universities and students

Gaff's research with campuses across the country indicated that "Most institutions are coming to realize that they will have to rely on current faculty to meet the needs of the new student [emphasis added]."
or that they had known then what they know now about the psychological involved in determining a name, and some wish they had selected another option. The names centers assume have a lot to say about how they want to appear to their constituencies and, conversely, to be involved in some sort of development. The word development is used twice, followed by educational, instructional, or learning, and for faculty and words like improvement (since we can all stand to, teaching in that order. Centers are more likely to see themselves in the business of improving instruction than they are of facilitating learning. Most, however, refer to the overall issue as educational. More often than not, centers seek to avoid waving this particular red flag by not using that direct and possibly threatening term and by substituting some other title. The term "faculty development" has been selected to identify this publication. It is ironic, therefore, that the entire movement under which all the individual center labels may be subsumed, unfortunately, nothing at all to a great number of campuses.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Groupings in Titles</th>
<th>Occurrences in Titles</th>
<th>Percent of Usable Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Development</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some centers seek to avoid using the particular red flag by not using the word development and referring instead to the term educational. Faculty development is different things to different campuses and involves a far wider range of activities. On some campuses, it is the opportunity for teachers to study or write or travel or develop new materials; and on others it is dealing with mid-life changes and career transitions. Although the needs the different campuses are dealing with may be different, and the work centers are doing may differ, there is still some meaningful overlap. Some campuses are developing some innovative classroom techniques or for outstanding teaching, on some, it is dealing with mid-life changes and career transitions. Although the needs the different campuses are dealing with may be different, and the work centers are doing may differ, there is still some meaningful overlap. Some campuses are developing some innovative classroom techniques or procedures or for doing research on teaching; on some, it is giving prizes or awards, teachers for instigating or for implementing some innovative classroom programs if they expect to maintain vigorous educational climates in the years ahead. 13, p. 911

Within these centers there is a great number of campuses.

### Technology

Unfortunately, nothing at all to gain by using the term educational.

---
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Development and education are, however, proportionately underused in the Southern universities. Of the eleven Southern university programs, eight are called centers, two are called offices, and one is called a project.

DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS

Models

I. Instructional Development programs focus on how the conditions of learning are designed, particularly as these relate to courses. Such programs strive to improve student learning by preparing learning materials, redesigning courses, and making instructional systems more effective.

II. Organizational Development programs focus on the organization within which faculty, students, and administrators work. This approach strives to develop policies that support teaching improvement and to create an effective environment for teaching and learning through feedback, conflict management, decision-making, team-building, and enhancement of interpersonal relationships.

III. Faculty Development programs focus on the faculty members themselves. Such programs strive to promote faculty growth by helping faculty members to acquire knowledge, skills, sensitivity, and techniques related to teaching and learning. Areas of emphasis would include knowledge about higher education, feedback on teaching, and faculty development activities.

With regard to the order of implementation, they suggest the sequencing of events should depend upon how much or how little threat would accompany the activity. They use as an example points A and B under Personal Development.

Any faculty development program attempting to touch on the personal domain of a faculty member's life is often misunderstood and consequently rejected out of hand. Discussions about teaching, on the other hand, are obviously appropriate to faculty development and hence should precede and may lead toward the planning component. (p. 258)

Directors report that the type of activities typically chosen to implement the three components are:

- Seminars
- Workshops
- Teaching Evaluation
The specific method of instruction or a particular problem-solving approach is characterized by trust, openness, and interdependence. The personal and instructional development strategies are grouped together because they both emerge from the single paradigm of applied behavioral science. The basic assumption is that the process as well as the substance of change must he planned and managed if change is to be successful and productive. Both the personal and organizational aspects of change are emphasized. Organizational development is only partially employed; faculty are trained in the use of such organizational consulting strategies. The personal and organizational development strategies differ somewhat from the training strategy in that their orientation is not primarily toward problem-solving. Once a certain number of faculty (usually at least ten per-.
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This strategy often serves as an entry point for faculty development and employment of displaced faculty. The evaluation of faculty development programs can further aid the career transition, as well as provide an institution with potential channels for re-entry. Programs between faculty and administrators can further aid the career transition. Faculty development programs often require help in developing a research and publication agenda, in which faculty are encouraged to engage in original research and the development of new materials. The evaluation of faculty development programs is inapplicable where faculty development is being used to provide academic administrators with information to improve their teaching skills. A faculty development program is strongly linked to a change in the perception of the professor’s role. Some evaluation programs, however, have been found to be effective in changing the perceptions of faculty. A faculty development program must rely on more subtle and often difficult evaluation programs, such as those focusing on the development of new materials. The materials-oriented faculty development approach is based on the assumption that evaluation can serve a constructionist purpose. The evaluation paradigm is based on the assumption that evaluation is a constructive tool for the improvement of instruction.
be personable, humility is a virtue; continue to be a 'learner; do not impose instructionally on a professor; do not come across as trying to build an empire. 

Faculty Development Centers: Problems & Solutions

For practical purposes, let us consider this issue of accessibility by discussing the end result: that most universities take these factors into consideration in the selection of faculty development directors. (p. 27) This latter suggests that the professor will understand; seek out the dirty jobs; establish for themselves. If faculty development is systematically and patiently implemented, it is more likely, however, that the choice of a director preceded the choice of the style of implementation and that, indeed, the director's background and philosophy were an important variable in these decisions. (p. 69)

Gaining Support

A passion to read a faculty development center, the role most universities take these factors into consideration in the selection of the director. The evidence that most center directors and senior professional staff came primarily from education and secondarily from psychology. (p. 4) Some of the specific points have been identified below to give a flavor of the type of psychological guidelines suggested by directors for proceeding successfully without making too many waves. 

1. Comprehensive Institutional Development

2. Keep a low profile
3. Be eclectic in approach
4. Keep a low profile — avoid a lot of fanfare and "hard sell"
5. Establish credibility
6. Be exact in approach — avoid the endorsement of a particular point of view
7. Sharpen the axe — accept the goals which faculty hold near and dear
8. Administrators & small instructional-improvement funds
9. Go with winners — the others — the current initial seminars, work
10. Be selective in approach — avoid making too many waves, too many fads
11. Comprehensive Institutional Development

1. Develop an outreach program — obtain visibility for the center
2. Visit departments; talk to people
3. Start small and grow yourself — don't come across as trying to build an empire
4. Sharpen the axe — accept the goals which faculty hold near and dear
5. Be exact in approach — avoid a lot of fanfare and "hard sell"
6. Be selective in approach — avoid the endorsement of a particular point of view
7. Sharpen the axe — accept the goals which faculty hold near and dear
8. Administrators & small instructional-improvement funds
9. Go with winners — the others — the current initial seminars, work
your homework, pay attention to detail; attempt to establish a personal relationship of trust and mutual confidence with the professor as early as possible; develop an environment where there is a feeling of mutual respect; show genuine interest in helping the professor solve his problem; stay out of the content arena; strive to keep all channels of communication open at all times; honesty is the best policy; under-promise and over-deliver; depersonalize ideas; don't give out too much roadmap information to those who might be scared by it; start where the instructor is; don't brutalize the instructor; encourage constructive criticism; people generally do not forsake work which is rewarded for that which is not; see that faculty are rewarded for work in instructional development; don't just sit behind a desk and wait for people to come to you; make things happen. (5, pp. 544-11

Meeting Resistance

In spite of the studied attempts made by faculty development centers to gain acceptance on their campuses, it is obvious that many have not felt successful in this venture. Strategies for meeting resistance to the establishment and implementation of a faculty development program, therefore, have become critical issues with which institutions must deal. Very real problems, as well as myths and misconceptions, face the new center director and after deciding which is which, he or she must then proceed to deal with them.

Much of the resistance facing a faculty development center is legitimate and emanates from situations that exist within the postsecondary academic community. Some of the very real problems are:

- Failure of the institutional reward system to support the instructional function.
- Provision of released time or time at all to participate in center functions.
- Graduate programs poorly designed to prepare students to become college teachers.
- The still imperfect system of evaluation of instruction, or of evaluation of teachers' performance.
- Curricular function.

The dearth of research data to clearly support certain educational methods and beliefs over others.

The problem of introducing new tears of activities to an already overworked faculty.

The dearth of research data to clearly support certain educational methods and beliefs over others.

The tendency of academics not to put faith in their own peers to help them.

The fact that faculty (especially untenured and, on some campuses, even tenured) have reason to feel that their jobs are on the line.

The existence of threat—of anything.

According to self-concept theorists, man strives to maintain and enhance his self-perception or his identity. The possibility of forced change, particularly large-scale change, can therefore pose a great deal of psychological threat. People who fear they are not adequate in a given area will feel threatened by anything that might make them worse. If the professor is a measure of who he is, failing to do well on a test results in failure. People who have a positive impression of themselves and a negative impression of others may become reproachful of themselves and may have negative reactions to those who are successful. The resistance to change is one of the most difficult problems to deal with.
Or anyone that purports to evaluate, judge, or assist them in that area. This will be so even if the judgment is positive, as even positive judgment (however painless) is judgment. Once the right to external judgment has been established, the right to negative judgment is also established.

Threatened people will respond to threat in characteristic ways:

1) by avoiding the threatening situation or person;
2) by attacking directly the threatening situation or person;
3) by attacking indirectly the threatening situation or person, e.g., by attempting to undermine or sabotage the center, or by casting aspersions upon the academic reputation of the director;
4) by intellectualizing away the threatening situation or person and thereby rendering it impotent to hurt them. (Academics are particularly good at dealing with threat in this way.)

Once situation and person as used above are replaced by center (or center services) and center director (or staff member), the forms of resistance with which a faculty development center must deal become all too clear. Center directors report incidents of retaliatory behavior that range from hate letters to attacks in the media to campaigns of mockery. Perhaps the most often used means of resistance, however, is passive avoidance.

Bergquist and Phillips state frankly:

Frequently, when introduced to methods for improving college instruction, a faculty member will either turn away or adopt a stance of passive resistance. Central to this posture may be the attitude of the faculty member toward teaching. If he does not value teaching or does not perceive himself as being primarily a teacher, he will not spend time either improving or defending his teaching. He will find the best possible time and place to criticize or discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the new methods or theories. If the same time, the forms that these attacks on the new methods may take are virtually limitless. In some cases they may be as simple as a verbal attack on the director of the center, or in other cases they may be as elaborate as attempts to undermine or sabotage the center, or in still others they may be attempts to cast aspersions upon the director's ability or qualifications. In any case, the center director will find that the resistance of the faculty is greater than expected and that the center must deal with it.

Academics are particularly good at dealing with threat in this way.
It is difficult to implement a program of faculty development without:

- clear articulation of the program's objectives and scope
- ensuring the program is voluntary and not tied to promotion or tenure
- ensuring the program is not viewed as competing with other academic activities
- ensuring the program is seen as beneficial to the faculty
- ensuring the program is seen as a necessary part of the university's mission

One of the key challenges in implementing a faculty development program is the issue of money. Universities often face diminishing financial resources, which can make it difficult to fund new programs. This is particularly true in times when it is more common to phase programs out than in. Hard money is not only more difficult to obtain, but extramural funding agencies are not as willing to fund new initiatives. Therefore, it is important to explore alternative funding sources, such as:

- utilizing one's own faculty members as workshop leaders
- trading with other universities for expenses
- learning to be a jack-of-all-trades, such as doing one's own publicity and promotion
- sharing costs of guest presenters
- using audio-tapes, video-tapes, and films
- collaborating with nearby institutions

This last bit of wisdom has to be the understatement of all time.

Economics

- The final point regarding strategies for the implementation of a faculty development program has to do with economics. How does a university face this challenge in times of diminishing resources? How can it be easier, however, if we share our experiences and learn from one another? Hopefully we can benefit from the insights of others.

The final point relevant to this discussion is the issue of money. Universities often face diminishing financial resources, which can make it difficult to fund new programs. This is particularly true in times when it is more common to phase programs out than in. Hard money is not only more difficult to obtain, but extramural funding agencies are not as willing to fund new initiatives. Therefore, it is important to explore alternative funding sources, such as:

- utilizing one's own faculty members as workshop leaders
- trading with other universities for expenses
- learning to be a jack-of-all-trades, such as doing one's own publicity and promotion
- sharing costs of guest presenters
- using audio-tapes, video-tapes, and films
- collaborating with nearby institutions

This last bit of wisdom has to be the understatement of all time.
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- The final point regarding strategies for the implementation of a faculty development program has to do with economics. How does a university face this challenge in times of diminishing resources? How can it be easier, however, if we share our experiences and learn from one another? Hopefully we can benefit from the insights of others.

The final point relevant to this discussion is the issue of money. Universities often face diminishing financial resources, which can make it difficult to fund new programs. This is particularly true in times when it is more common to phase programs out than in. Hard money is not only more difficult to obtain, but extramural funding agencies are not as willing to fund new initiatives. Therefore, it is important to explore alternative funding sources, such as:

- utilizing one's own faculty members as workshop leaders
- trading with other universities for expenses
- learning to be a jack-of-all-trades, such as doing one's own publicity and promotion
- sharing costs of guest presenters
- using audio-tapes, video-tapes, and films
- collaborating with nearby institutions

This last bit of wisdom has to be the understatement of all time.
We are all aware of the disadvantages of being on the cutting edge of a new movement; perhaps we also need to be reminded of its rewards.
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II
Campus Centers in the South
THE INSTITUTION

The University of Alabama, in Tuscaloosa, is a state university with over 15,000 students and 800 faculty. It is much like other state universities with its triple interest in pursuing teaching, research and service, but it is unlike many state universities in that during the past five years it has begun to distinguish itself by a serious commitment to the improvement of instruction.

Manifestations of innovation and commitment to instruction include: the creation of the New College in 1970; the beginning of the Venture Fund in 1972; the informal Faculty Learning Forum; the work of a University Council Committee to consider mandatory teaching evaluation during 1974; the work of the ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness during the summer of 1974; and the creation of the Teaching-Learning Center in the summer of 1975. It also is notable that a recent self-study produced a new statement of purpose including a significant commitment to teaching.

The New College at The University of Alabama offers its students an alternative approach to the traditional undergraduate educational experience. Its primary purposes are (1) to create an opportunity for highly individualized education which enables students to draw from the resources of all University classes and faculty, and (2) to serve as an experimental unit with the expectation of exporting successful innovations to other sectors of the University. The New College dean was instrumental in securing outside funding for the Teaching-Learning Center.

The Venture Fund, which began in 1972 with a three year grant of $250,000 from the Ford Foundation, has continued to grow with the addition of $200,000 from the University's budget. Over the past three years the Venture Fund has awarded over 80 grants to individual faculty members to assist them in experimenting with new approaches to undergraduate education. The Fund also has awarded a $10,000 grant to the Teaching-Learning Center. The Director of the Teaching-Learning Center also is Director of the Venture Fund.

The Learning Forum existed for about a year and a half during 1973-74. It was an independent and loosely organized group of 50 faculty with the common interest of heightening the University's awareness of general faculty concern for good teaching. The group worked through informal lobbying efforts, special projects and open discussions. Included in the group's activities have been informal luncheon "rap sessions" where information and suggestions on pedagogical and other instructional problems have been discussed; formal debates on educational goals (aided by a Venture Fund grant); and lobbying efforts intended to improve the teaching and learning environment on the campus. Organized into "Task Forces," Learning Forum participants were instrumental in bringing about University participation in a national Faculty Exchange Program and provided much of the impetus for the new Teaching-Learning Center, which the group saw as a visible symbol of commitment to teaching and a way to continue Learning Forum activities.

THE TEACHING-LEARNING CENTER

The question of mandatory university-wide evaluation of teaching has been an active concern, especially of the University Council for a number of years. Committees studied the issues and made reports concerning the establishment of a mandatory system. In 1974 a series of recommendations led to extensive research concerning ideal teaching roles and behaviors and eventually to the creation of the Teaching-Learning Center. The Committee's interest in a Teaching-Learning Center stemmed from its belief that if teaching is to be evaluated, there ought to be a service office to assist faculty with instructional improvement.

In the summer of 1974 the Academic Vice President established an ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness to make recommendations concerning the establishment of a service unit to assist professors in improving their teaching. The recommendations of this committee provided stimulus for a proposal to the Danforth Foundation, the funding of which helped to create the University's Teaching-Learning Center. The Teaching-Learning Center was formally begun in the summer of 1975.
In addition to the above-mentioned objectives, the Center collects and disseminates information on the benefits of faculty development. Although only twenty percent (20%) of the faculty members involved provided feedback, a variety of departments were represented and most people indicated they would continue to participate in the program. The results were expressed in a weekly newsletter or via a topic of their choice. The Center has initiated a newsletter for faculty and students to stay informed about upcoming events and activities. The newsletter is sent out electronically and is accessible online.

The Center also has developed a number of mini-workshops on various topics. About 25% of the faculty who attended the workshops found them to be helpful and informative.

ACTIVITIES

During the first semester of operation, the Center began four informal sessions for faculty. Completely voluntary, this effort brought ten to twelve faculty members together over lunch or coffee for a weekly discussion of a topic of their choice. These informal workshops are complemented by larger more extensive workshops usually sponsored by the Psychology department and the Division of Continuing Education. Examples of these workshops include a workshop on teaching social sciences jointly sponsored with the Psychology department and the Division of Continuing Education.

The Center has also developed a number of mini-workshops on various topics. About 25% of the faculty who attended the workshops found them to be helpful and informative.

During the summer months of 1975, the Director and three part-time graduate assistants began to develop programming for the Center. One task was to collect and catalog a browsing library of teaching-learning resources. An extensive research effort also was undertaken to assess the instructional needs of faculty.

Activities include a workshop on teaching social sciences jointly sponsored with the Psychology department and the Division of Continuing Education and a full-time graduate research associate. The Director is also Director of the University of Alabama faculty who are experimenting with their teaching.

The Center is open to all faculty members who are interested in helping graduate students and new faculty learn about grantsmanship, simulation/gaming and others. The sessions are limited to a quarter-time effort to cope with the volume of requests.
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In addition to the above-mentioned objectives, the Center collects and disseminates information on the benefits of faculty development. Although only twenty percent (20%) of the faculty members involved provided feedback, a variety of departments were represented and most people indicated they would continue to participate in the program. The results were expressed in a weekly newsletter or via a topic of their choice. The Center has initiated a newsletter for faculty and students to stay informed about upcoming events and activities. The newsletter is sent out electronically and is accessible online.

The Center also has developed a number of mini-workshops on various topics. About 25% of the faculty who attended the workshops found them to be helpful and informative.

ACTIVITIES

During the first semester of operation, the Center began four informal sessions for faculty. Completely voluntary, this effort brought ten to twelve faculty members together over lunch or coffee for a weekly discussion of a topic of their choice. These informal workshops are complemented by larger more extensive workshops usually sponsored by the Psychology department and the Division of Continuing Education. Examples of these workshops include a workshop on teaching social sciences jointly sponsored with the Psychology department and the Division of Continuing Education.

The Center has also developed a number of mini-workshops on various topics. About 25% of the faculty who attended the workshops found them to be helpful and informative.

During the summer months of 1975, the Director and three part-time graduate assistants began to develop programming for the Center. One task was to collect and catalog a browsing library of teaching-learning resources. An extensive research effort also was undertaken to assess the instructional needs of faculty.

Activities include a workshop on teaching social sciences jointly sponsored with the Psychology department and the Division of Continuing Education and a full-time graduate research associate. The Director is also Director of the University of Alabama faculty who are experimenting with their teaching.
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The Center's operating budget for the first year came from five different sources within the University: President's Office, Office of Academic Affairs, Office of Educational Development, Venture Fund, and Danforth Foundation. Although the Venture Fund is still available for funding, funds are generated for funding new instructional development projects, and some operating expenses. The University's Venture Fund is to be used for the first year of operation, and the Danforth Foundation provides funds for faculty affiliate and consultant funds, as well as other operating expenses. The Center's operating budget is divided among the following expenses:

- Faculty salaries: $120,000
- Office expenses: $60,000
- Travel and training: $30,000
- Equipment and supplies: $20,000
- Other expenses: $10,000

The budget breakdown for the first year includes a University commitment to the salaries of the Director, secretary, and graduate research associate, as well as about half of the office expenses. The Danforth Foundation funds cover primarily faculty affiliate expenses, including travel and training, equipment and supplies, and other expenses. The University's Venture Fund provided for several programmatic needs, including the purchase of equipment and supplies, as well as the purchase of software and other materials. The Center also received a grant from the Danforth Foundation to support the development of new instructional development projects.

EVALUATION AND FUTURE

At the present time evaluation of the Center is just beginning. However, the Center has already gained a great deal of acceptance among the faculty during its first year of operation. Judging by the level of faculty participation, the Center has achieved a great deal of goal. In the future, the Center will continue to direct its efforts at encouraging and supporting the faculty in their efforts to improve teaching and learning.

The Center recently received funds to begin a "mini-grants" program. Although the Venture Fund is still available for funding, the new program allows the Center Director to make grants to individual professors who need a limited amount of assistance to implement classroom development projects and then allow the individual to view the step in their own classroom. The Center also continues to provide instructional assistance to faculty. Upon request, the Center will help a professor videotape a classroom lecture, and upon request, the Center will help professors implement a specific instructional technique.

Beginning with its second semester of operation, the Center began offering a videotaping service to faculty. Upon request, the Center will help professors implement a specific instructional technique. At that point the Center can either be asked to assess the faculty member's own classroom, or it can be asked to assess the faculty member's own classroom with Center support.
THE PROJECT ON TEACHING AND LEARNING IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

THE PROJECT ON TEACHING AND LEARNING IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

by Robert Damman, Director

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM

THE INSTITUTION

The University of Alabama in Birmingham is an urban, state university that includes a major medical center. Total student enrollment is approximately 12,000, of whom nearly 10,000 are enrolled in University College. The College has approximately 300 full-time faculty, plus 150 part-time (including many with primarily appointment in other units of the University). The University of Alabama in Birmingham is urban, state university that includes a major medical center. Total student enrollment is approximately 22,000, of whom 10,000 are enrolled in University College. The College has approximately 300 full-time faculty, plus 150 part-time (including many with primarily appointment in other units of the University).
Primary activities of the Project are a quarterly Newsletter, acquisition of and maintenance of a library of materials on college teaching, organization of programs consisting of lectures, panel discussions, symposia, etc.; operation of a computer-based program for student evaluation of faculty and courses; development of faculty development courses, and full-time responsibility for the teaching-learning process in the College. It also engenders a sense of participation in the teaching-learning process, and it makes it easier for the faculty to make demands on the time of Committee members. The Committee meets regularly twice a month and carries out other assignments between meetings.

Support of the Project has not yet received funding support. The project for excellence in teaching will be offered by the Committee this year for the first time, although there are many seminars and other programs on campus relating to teaching. It is useful to have a central body arrange for additional programs of this nature, and to assist in advertising them.

Similarly, although there are many seminars and other programs on campus relating to teaching, it is useful to have a central body arrange for additional programs of this nature, and to assist in advertising them.


terms, and new terms concerning coming events are the College and other UAB units. Descriptions of current efforts, book reviews, and various other methods for teaching improvement, including a program for the maintenance of a library of materials on college teaching, organization of programs consisting of lectures, panel discussions, symposia, etc.; operation of a computer-based program for student evaluation of faculty and courses; development of faculty development courses, and full-time responsibility for the teaching-learning process in the College. It also engenders a sense of participation in the teaching-learning process, and it makes it easier for the faculty to make demands on the time of Committee members. The Committee meets regularly twice a month and carries out other assignments between meetings.
FUNDING

The POTILUC budget, which is currently about $50,000 per year, comes from state-appropriated funds allocated to the College. Budgeting was accomplished under a zero-base system, so that funding was matched to continuing and proposed activities in competition with other needs within the College. The Project budget provides for staff salaries, committee stipends, office equipment, travel, and programs. Supplemental funding from external agencies has been sought but, thus far, the amount of such funding is small.

EVALUATION AND FUTURE

Evaluations to date have been by the Committee itself, in preparation of annual reports and at the stage of justification of the Project from temporary to continuing status. We believe that the Project is fulfilling several important functions in drawing the attention of the faculty to new developments and to the importance of considering the teaching function in new ways.

We believe that some small fraction of the total expenditure for education be spent in re-examination and renewal of that effort, which is better accomplished through a central organization with representatives from academic units than by each academic unit operating separately. Faculty members are generally suspicious of new structures, and especially so of any structure that hints at affecting the classroom activities of the individual professors. This attitude has some merit. Despite its deadening effect on teaching improvement, we believe that there are still many unexploited opportunities for the Project to be accomplished with the present organization, it does seem appropriate that some small fraction of the total expenditure for education be spent in re-examination and renewal of that effort, which is better accomplished through a central organization with representatives from academic units than by each academic unit.
The University of Florida is the largest of the nine universities which comprise the State University System of Florida. As the oldest and largest institution of the system, the University's special mission is to provide graduate and professional programs for the citizens of the state. It is one of the few institutions in the country to offer virtually every major professional program and area of graduate studies on a single campus: the University of Florida consists of sixteen colleges and two schools.

The University is administrated within three major budgetary units. The general unit represents Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Architecture, Fine Arts, Journalism, Education, Business Administration, Law, and University College, the general education component. The Health Center includes the Colleges of Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinarian Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and Health Related Professions. Lastly, the Institute of Food and Agriculture Sciences provides programs in a wide range of agricultural sciences in addition to its research and extension activities.

The total student enrollment of the University is close to 28,000. The teaching faculty of 2,800 is supported by approximately 1,500 teaching assistants. Over 5,000 courses are offered to provide 90 areas of instructional programs for undergraduates and 50 specializations for doctoral programs.

Limited by mandate from the legislature to a freshman class of only 2,900, the University's heaviest teaching load is found at the upper division and graduate level. The University's heaviest teaching load is found at the upper division and graduate level. The University's heaviest teaching load is found at the upper division and graduate level. The University's heaviest teaching load is found at the upper division and graduate level.

THE OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES

The Office of Instructional Resources (OIR) was established in September of 1972 by the combination of resources of an established agency with responsibilities of media production and audio-visual equipment distribution, the resources of a center which had been responsible for duplication and scoring of comprehensive examinations for freshman courses, and the provision of additional allocations from the general budget. This was the result of the recommendations from the general budget. This was the result of the recommendations from the general budget. This was the result of the recommendations from the general budget.
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The University of Florida is the largest of the nine universities which comprise the State University System of Florida. As the oldest and largest institution of the system, the University's special mission is to provide graduate and professional programs for the citizens of the state. It is one of the few institutions to offer virtually every major professional program and area of graduate studies on a single campus: the University of Florida consists of sixteen colleges and two schools.

The total student enrollment of the University is close to 28,000. The teaching faculty of 2,800 is supported by approximately 1,500 teaching assistants. Over 5,000 courses are offered to provide 90 areas of instructional programs for undergraduates and 50 specializations for doctoral programs.

Limited by mandate from the legislature to a freshman class of only 2,900, the University's heaviest teaching load is found at the upper division and graduate level.
The Office of Instructional Resources provides a broad range of services in university-wide support of instructional improvement. Several of these services are conducted in response to expressed faculty needs or as part of ongoing programs. The general objective of the Office is to encourage and support faculty in their efforts to improve the effectiveness of instruction. The following is a brief description of services provided by the Office of Instructional Resources.

**Activities**

1. Development
   - Providing instructional laboratory facilities for video-taping to refine instructional techniques
   - Development of instructional materials by faculty members (demonstration tapes, etc.)
   - Demonstration of innovative practices and materials (Personalized Learning Center, self-instruction facilities, audio-tutorial laboratories)

2. Services
   - Consulting services
   - Media production services
   - Testing and evaluation services
   - Program evaluation services

**Organization and Staff**

The Office of Instructional Resources is a separate administrative unit reporting directly to the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs. It has responsibility to the total campus. The office is headed by a director and three associate directors who are responsible for media and production services, instructional development and evaluation services, and student achievement services, respectively.

The Office of Instructional Resources is guided by two assumptions. The first is that it is primarily a service organization which must respond to expressed faculty needs; that it must serve ongoing programs as well as provide leadership for innovation. The second assumption is that one improves his or her teaching by becoming involved in innovation and experimentation rather than focusing on the teaching act itself. The encouragement and support of programs and projects designed to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of instruction is the major focus of the Office.

The Office of Instructional Resources is headed by a director and three associate directors who are responsible for media and production services, instructional development and evaluation services, and student achievement services, respectively. The director and associate directors are responsible for the following activities:

1. Development
   - Providing instructional laboratory facilities for video-taping to refine instructional techniques
   - Development of instructional materials by faculty members (demonstration tapes, etc.)
   - Demonstration of innovative practices and materials (Personalized Learning Center, self-instruction facilities, audio-tutorial laboratories)

2. Services
   - Consulting services
   - Media production services
   - Testing and evaluation services
   - Program evaluation services

**Students**

Students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels are heavily involved in the activities of the Office. They serve in such roles as tutoring, course management, clerical work, technical work in media production, data collection and analysis, test construction and program evaluation. Graduate students at the most advanced levels also are supported by Office of Instructional Resources funds to assume teaching responsibilities so that faculty may be released to work on projects funded by the Office.

We find the opportunity for student participation in our activities to be especially rewarding. The involvement of students in our efforts to improve instruction provides them with valuable experiences and contributes to their development as educators.

**Advisory Committee**

The Advisory Committee to the Office of Instructional Resources is composed of administrators and faculty who represent the broad spectrum of the academic programs. Members of this committee help establish policy and effect communication with the groups they represent. They are involved in many ways in instructional improvement activities and contribute to the development and execution of innovative programs and projects.
Organization Chart
University of Florida
Office of Instructional Resources
Another experimental faculty development program for OIR has been the establishment of an instructional Laboratory. This laboratory contains a wide range of television equipment including portable video-rover units, color video-recorders, and television cameras. This laboratory provides computer generated tests on demand, receive immediate feedback from student performance, and stimulate the creativity of students. The laboratory provides a setting for teachers to develop educational materials and to experiment with new teaching techniques. The laboratory also provides a facility for students to practice their speaking and writing skills.

The following descriptions of activities are not exhaustive but do represent the major efforts in instruction and improvement. The programs that have been funded reflect a variety of activities and disciplines. They are designed to provide models for support instructional improvement and innovation in the classroom. The programs that have been funded are designed to provide assistance to teachers in the development of instructional materials and to provide models for support instructional improvement and innovation in the classroom.

The Teaching Assistant Program

The Teaching Assistant Program is designed to provide support to faculty in the development of instructional materials and to provide models for support instructional improvement and innovation in the classroom. The programs that have been funded reflect a variety of activities and disciplines. They are designed to provide assistance to teachers in the development of instructional materials and to provide models for support instructional improvement and innovation in the classroom.

Mini-Sabbatical Program

The Mini-Sabbatical Program is designed to provide support to faculty in the development of instructional materials and to provide models for support instructional improvement and innovation in the classroom. The programs that have been funded reflect a variety of activities and disciplines. They are designed to provide assistance to teachers in the development of instructional materials and to provide models for support instructional improvement and innovation in the classroom.
In institutions of higher education, lack of support for the development and improvement of instruction is a current issue that is often overlooked. The Language and Learning Laboratory is a facility that provides audio-tutorial instruction and is available to any faculty member who desires to develop and pilot an audio-tutorial module or course. Equipped with audio-tape record and playback units, video playback units, slide/tape and filmstrip projectors, almost any format of instructional material can be made available to students through the laboratory.

In addition to the activities listed above, consultant and technical services ranging from test scoring services to the design of media are utilized by faculty continually. Finally, OIR has continuing programs in research which emphasize the investigation of problems related to program effectiveness.

**Funding**

The Office of Instructional Resources is funded by allocations from the general education budget of the university. In addition, some activities are partially supported by revenue accruing activities and some activities are totally self-supporting. Two major projects underway are supported by federal and private foundation grants. One of the major responsibilities of the Director of the Office is to work with faculty in developing proposals to various agencies for funds to support instructional innovations. These funds may then come directly to OIR or be used to support instructional innovations. These funds may then come directly to OIR or to the academic department involved for support of instructional innovations.

**Evaluation and Future**

The only formal evaluation procedures for the Office of Instructional Resources have been assessment of projects supported through the mini-sabbatical program and the compilation of attendance figures for the Office's faculty development programs. A large evaluation project is now under way in the Personalized Learning Center. No overall assessment of the effectiveness of the office has been made, but this is seen as a much-needed activity.

The staff's own assessment of the Office's effectiveness is informal and based upon judgments made in terms of (1) survival and growth of the office and units of the university and (2) increasing demands for assistance by major departments and units of the university, and (3) increasing demands for assistance by major departments and units of the university. The office's own assessment of the Office's effectiveness is informal and based upon judgments made in terms of (1) survival and growth of the office and units of the university and (2) increasing demands for assistance by major departments and units of the university.

The only formal evaluation procedures for the Office of Instructional Resources involve the assessment of projects supported through the mini-sabbatical program and the compilation of attendance figures for the Office's faculty development programs. A large evaluation project is now under way in the Personalized Learning Center. No overall assessment of the effectiveness of the office has been made, but this is seen as a much-needed activity.

The staff's own assessment of the Office's effectiveness is informal and based upon judgments made in terms of (1) survival and growth of the office, (2) increasing demands for assistance by major departments and units of the university, and (3) increasing demands for assistance by major departments and units of the university.
by Michael A. Nichols, Associate Director for Instructional Development, and John B. Stephenson, Dean of Undergraduate Studies

The University of Kentucky has over 21,000 students on its main campus in Lexington and over 18,000 in its 13 community colleges located throughout the state. The faculty of the Lexington campus and the community colleges numbers over 2000.

The University represents an institution just getting started in faculty development and instructional resources. The UK "Office of Instructional Resources" was officially established in December, 1975. Although the office is new the idea for such a unit as well as many of its functions have been around at the University for some time.

OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES
Background

in realizing the need for some organized assistance to the faculty in its teaching role, the University previously had set up two important units: the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Division of Media Services. The dean's office has responsibility for undergraduate curriculum, helping to improve instruction, and sponsorship of numerous activities related to teaching, such as an orientation program for graduate teaching assistants. The Division of Media Services includes the University Television Center, a motion picture unit, and an FM radio station, WBKY. The Division of Media Services reports to the dean of undergraduate studies. It seemed logical that efforts toward the establishment of a learning resources center should emerge out of these two offices. In fact, as early as the late 1960's the idea for such a center was discussed. However, it was not until 1970 that a planning committee was formed to investigate the needs of the faculty and to suggest a form for maximum delivery of these services. The proposal won approval by the board of trustees in 1970, but lack of funding prohibited its realization. With this indication of support, an effort was made to implement a center for the fall of 1971, but lack of funding continued to be a problem. The proposal was reactivated in December of 1975, when the Office of Instructional Resources was officially established. The proposal was to include television, motion pictures, audio-visual services and a duplicating service. The purpose of the Office of Instructional Resources is to provide a variety of services to improve instruction, such as duplication of materials, preparation of visual aids, and consultation. The services are offered to faculty members in the form of workshops, individual consultations, and seminars. The Office is located in the Slade Undergraduate Education Building, and its main objective is to provide faculty members with the resources and support they need to improve their teaching effectiveness. The Office of Instructional Resources is committed to providing high-quality services to support faculty in their teaching activities.

Planning Committee Formed
In February, 1974, however, the FREB Undergraduate Education Reform Project and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies agreed to formulate a planning committee to investigate the needs of the faculty in support services for teaching activities and to suggest a form for maximum delivery of these services. This task group was charged with the responsibility of a number of projects that were needed to report the institutional needs of the faculty and to focus attention on those aspects of the university that were not being provided. The committee was responsible for a number of projects that were needed to report the institutional needs of the faculty and to focus attention on those aspects of the university that were not being provided. The committee was also responsible for a number of projects that were needed to report the institutional needs of the faculty and to focus attention on those aspects of the university that were not being provided.

Among these was a special task force of faculty from throughout the university. The task force was given the responsibility of developing a plan for a learning resources center. The task force identified the need for a center that would provide a variety of services to support faculty in their teaching activities, such as duplication of materials, preparation of visual aids, and consultation. The task force recommended the establishment of a center that would provide these services, and the plan was submitted to the board of trustees for approval. The plan was approved in December, 1975, and the Office of Instructional Resources was officially established.

The Office of Instructional Resources is committed to providing high-quality services to support faculty in their teaching activities. The Office is located in the Slade Undergraduate Education Building, and its main objective is to provide faculty members with the resources and support they need to improve their teaching effectiveness. The Office of Instructional Resources is committed to providing high-quality services to support faculty in their teaching activities. The Office is located in the Slade Undergraduate Education Building, and its main objective is to provide faculty members with the resources and support they need to improve their teaching effectiveness.
Beginning Implementation

The University and Institute were exploring the potential of instructional design. How would we begin to meet the many obligations for instructional content and resources? A group of faculty members began to explore the possibilities of instructional design. They were encouraged to study the effects of teaching and learning, particularly in higher education. The group also investigated the potential of computer-based instruction and multimedia. They decided to create a directory of teaching techniques and resources. The directory would be made available to faculty members. The group also recommended the establishment of a clearinghouse of information on teaching techniques and resources. The clearinghouse would be made available to faculty members. The group also recommended the establishment of a clearinghouse of information on teaching techniques and resources. The clearinghouse would be made available to faculty members.
The Office of Instructional Resources is organized with a director and three associate directors. The director is responsible for the overall operation of the division and for the development of new instructional services. The three associate directors are responsible for the following areas: instructional design and production, instructional development, and audio-visual services. The division is also responsible for the development and implementation of new instructional materials and the evaluation of existing ones.

The division has implemented several initiatives to improve the quality of instruction. These include the development of a faculty resource room, the creation of a video-tape library, and the production of instructional materials. The faculty resource room is available for use by faculty and students and contains a variety of instructional materials. The video-tape library contains a large collection of instructional materials that can be used for instruction or research. The division has also produced a number of instructional materials, including videos, slides, and audio-visual aids.

In addition to these initiatives, the division has also conducted a number of workshops and seminars to help faculty improve their teaching skills. These workshops have covered topics such as effective communication, the use of technology in the classroom, and the evaluation of instructional materials. The division has also provided opportunities for faculty to observe and critique each other's teaching.

The division has also been involved in the evaluation of instructional materials. This has included the development of a system for evaluating new instructional materials and the evaluation of materials that are currently in use. The division has also worked with faculty and students to identify areas where improvements can be made in the instructional materials.

Overall, the division has been successful in improving the quality of instruction and in providing faculty with the resources they need to be effective teachers. The division continues to work towards these goals and is committed to providing the best possible educational experience for all students.
to provide support to the faculty in their teaching assignments. Although no systematic evaluation has taken place, informal feedback from faculty has been positive and encouraging. In the new arrangement, the former Division of Media Services, including a graphics department, a small photographic unit, a motion picture unit, a television production facility, and a number of highly skilled professionals, has been integrated into the Office of Instructional Resources. This reorganization has permitted those who have been involved with instruction to continue their efforts in faculty development and instructional development.

The Office of Instructional Resources is becoming more and more active with the production of several self-instructional packets, slide-tape learning modules, television productions, publications, and workshops. An expanded teaching orientation program is in the planning stages, and a special TV series on college teaching and learning is being considered.

This reorganization has sparked those who were more involved with instruction to find new ways to increase our effectiveness. However, the receptive and enthusiastic attitude of the faculty probably more than any single factor has encouraged the staff to continue to believe that faculty are interested in teaching and that an Office of Instructional Resources does have a valuable contribution to make to the teaching/learning process. Formal evaluation of the new efforts in formal evaluation has been undertaken. While much has been done in the way of faculty development and instructional development, no formal evaluation has been undertaken longer.

EVALUATION AND FUTURE

Within the limits of current financial resources, the staff will continue to diversify activities as a general resource for faculty, the staff will continue to diversify activities as well. As the office grows, new producer/faculty and consultant/producer relationships will develop. The facility development and instructional development aspects stressed at the start will continue to have a strong emphasis. The office of instructional development and instructional production are, and will continue to develop and augment the scope and direction of the office. Although we are restricted in the scope and direction of the office, with additional funds for establishment of a new office, existing funds may be used to support these needs. As a general resource for faculty, the staff will continue to diversify activities as well. As the office grows, new producer/faculty and consultant/producer relationships will develop.

FUNDING

The mission at the University of Kentucky is to provide support to the faculty in their teaching assignments. Although no systematic evaluation has taken place, informal feedback from faculty has been positive and encouraging. In the new arrangement, the former Division of Media Services, including a graphics department, a small photographic unit, a motion picture unit, a television production facility, and a number of highly skilled professionals, has been integrated into the Office of Instructional Resources. This reorganization has permitted those who have been involved with instruction to continue their efforts in faculty development and instructional development.

The Office of Instructional Resources is becoming more and more active with the production of several self-instructional packets, slide-tape learning modules, television productions, publications, and workshops. An expanded teaching orientation program is in the planning stages, and a special TV series on college teaching and learning is being considered.

This reorganization has sparked those who were more involved with instruction to find new ways to increase our effectiveness. However, the receptive and enthusiastic attitude of the faculty probably more than any single factor has encouraged the staff to continue to believe that faculty are interested in teaching and that an Office of Instructional Resources does have a valuable contribution to make to the teaching/learning process. Although no systematic evaluation has taken place, informal feedback from faculty has been positive and encouraging. In the new arrangement, the former Division of Media Services, including a graphics department, a small photographic unit, a motion picture unit, a television production facility, and a number of highly skilled professionals, has been integrated into the Office of Instructional Resources. This reorganization has permitted those who have been involved with instruction to continue their efforts in faculty development and instructional development.

EVALUATION AND FUTURE

Within the limits of current financial resources, the staff will continue to diversify activities as a general resource for faculty, the staff will continue to diversify activities as well. As the office grows, new producer/faculty and consultant/producer relationships will develop. The facility development and instructional development aspects stressed at the start will continue to have a strong emphasis. The office of instructional development and instructional production are, and will continue to develop and augment the scope and direction of the office. Although we are restricted in the scope and direction of the office, with additional funds for establishment of a new office, existing funds may be used to support these needs. As a general resource for faculty, the staff will continue to diversify activities as well. As the office grows, new producer/faculty and consultant/producer relationships will develop.

FUNDING

The mission at the University of Kentucky is to provide support to the faculty in their teaching assignments. Although no systematic evaluation has taken place, informal feedback from faculty has been positive and encouraging. In the new arrangement, the former Division of Media Services, including a graphics department, a small photographic unit, a motion picture unit, a television production facility, and a number of highly skilled professionals, has been integrated into the Office of Instructional Resources. This reorganization has permitted those who have been involved with instruction to continue their efforts in faculty development and instructional development.

The Office of Instructional Resources is becoming more and more active with the production of several self-instructional packets, slide-tape learning modules, television productions, publications, and workshops. An expanded teaching orientation program is in the planning stages, and a special TV series on college teaching and learning is being considered.

This reorganization has sparked those who were more involved with instruction to find new ways to increase our effectiveness. However, the receptive and enthusiastic attitude of the faculty probably more than any single factor has encouraged the staff to continue to believe that faculty are interested in teaching and that an Office of Instructional Resources does have a valuable contribution to make to the teaching/learning process. Although no systematic evaluation has taken place, informal feedback from faculty has been positive and encouraging. In the new arrangement, the former Division of Media Services, including a graphics department, a small photographic unit, a motion picture unit, a television production facility, and a number of highly skilled professionals, has been integrated into the Office of Instructional Resources. This reorganization has permitted those who have been involved with instruction to continue their efforts in faculty development and instructional development.
The Center for Instructional Development and Appraisal at Appalachian State University

Appalachian State University

The Center for Instructional Development and Appraisal

By William C. Hubbard, Coordinator of Instructional Resources
The Center for Instructional Development is to initiate restructuring the curriculum to achieve individualized instruction. An individualized academic program as referred to here includes:

1. Flexible time frames
2. Remedial sequence and unit exemptions
3. Content options
4. Alternate forms and flexible times for evaluation
5. A choice in locations
6. Alternate forms of instruction

Since real academic change is the result of careful planning and hard work on the part of many, the Center in essence consists of a team of individuals trained to work with departments and groups of faculty members in implementing curricular redesign. The Center is intended to be supportive rather than directive of faculty efforts in the area of curricular redesign.

The basic components of the Center for Instructional Development are: (1) development, (2) evaluation, and (3) media support services. Each of these components is an integral and necessary part of the developmental process. The development component addresses itself to such issues as potential project initiation, project selection, generation of ideas about content structure, and the production and field testing of a pilot project. The evaluation component is concerned with providing meaningful data during the design phase of the developmental process (e.g., student attitudes and abilities, faculty interest, community need, and university priority) and during the field testing and revision phases relative to both the individual components and the overall course. The support services area consists of those elements necessary to produce the materials required in the academic redesign of a course (viz., graphic arts printing and photography). The support services area must have the necessary audio-visual equipment in order to support projects being undertaken. It is also essential that there be a learning laboratory in which the courses and programs may be tested.

**Funding**

Funding requests for equipment proposals would take priority over simple budget requests. The quality of the proposal is considered in selecting an instructional project. Consideration is given to:

- Individuals or faculty members;
- Flexibility of time frames;
- Remedial sequence and unit exemptions;
- Content options;
- Alternate forms and flexible times for evaluation;
- A choice in locations;
- Alternate forms of instruction.

**Activities**

The Center is supporting forty instructional projects in varying stages of development. Twenty of these are Ford Venture Grant projects utilizing funds awarded to Appalachian State University in 1972. The Center is supporting forty instructional projects in varying stages of development.

**Organization and Staff**

Organizational charts are included in the accompanying report. The basic components of the Center for Instructional Development are:

1. Development
2. Evaluation
3. Media support services

**Funding**

The Center for Instructional Development is financed by state funds. Approximately $30,000 in supply and equipment money is available for 1975-76. These funds are used for projects and general office operation. In addition to this, $25,000 in Ford Venture Grant funds are administered through the Center.

**Project Proposals**

Project proposals are kept simple and are asked to cover six elements:

1. What is to be done?
2. How will it be evaluated?
3. Why should it be done?
4. Personnel involved
5. Budget (credit with the Center)

Proposals are submitted to the Center at any time. No strict submission dates exist, and projects are considered at any time. If projects are approved, and budgeted funds are not available, the project is delayed and implemented in the next budgeting period. An alternative could be to implement certain aspects of a project while awaiting complete funding at a later date.

Projects are judged on the following criteria:

1. Importance to the total University (faculty and students).
2. Importance to the College or School from which the proposal came.
3. The commitment of the Department or groups of Departments generating the proposal. Projects involving groups of faculty members would be given priority over projects submitted by individual faculty members.
4. The totality of the undertaking as an instructional project. Complete instructional packages would take priority over simple budget requests.

**Letter of Support**

Letters of support and/or continuation of funding will be requested from faculty members involved in the project. These letters will be submitted to the Center for inclusion in the project proposal.

**Proposal Evaluation**

Proposals are evaluated by a Project Review Board appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs upon recommendation of the deans through the Coordinator of Instructional Resources. This group consists of one member from each college. Faculty proposals are considered on the following criteria:

1. Importance to the total University (faculty and students).
2. Importance to the College or School from which the proposal came.
3. The commitment of the Department or groups of Departments generating the proposal. Projects involving groups of faculty members would be given priority over projects submitted by individual faculty members.
4. The totality of the undertaking as an instructional project. Complete instructional packages would take priority over simple budget requests.

**Budgetary Considerations**

The Center operates totally on a project-management budgeting system. Although several positions remain unfilled, the proposed organization is shown on the accompanying chart. No fixed monetary limits are attached to the proposed organization. Although several positions may not be filled, the proposed organization is shown on the accompanying chart.
EVALUATION AND FUTURE

Clearly, the operation is under-funded and the support base must be improved. Projects are evaluated individually. Evaluation is understood to be an integral part of any Center activity. Each project is evaluated individually. Evaluation is understood to be an integral part of any Center activity. Clearly, the operation is under-funded and the support base must be improved.

The Center uses a project management budget system and accountability is established through an annual project status report which includes cost data.
Memphis State University

Center for Instructional Service and Research

By C. Douglas Mayo, Director
search and Service offer a fertile field for students from any discipline who are
interested in applying human learning principles to real-world situations.

**Prerequisites for Learning:**
- A basic understanding of human learning principles
- An interest in applying these principles to real-world situations

**Background:**
- The Center for Learning Research and Service is an interdisciplinary center that brings together faculty from various disciplines to explore innovative ways to improve instruction.
- **Seed Grants to Facilitate Learning**
- A program of small grants to facilitate learning is now in its second year, funded, in part, by an educational foundation. This project combines computer managed instruction and computer generated instructional material. A terminal is now available in the computer classroom, which in some cases involve external sources of funding. An example of this is the Teaching Information Processing System (TIPS) project which is similar to the Center's Joint Project with the Department of Psychology, which in some cases involves external sources of funding. An example is the center's current participation in the assessment of a project being readied for publication and distribution to faculty members and others.

**Dissemination of Information:**
- The center seeks joint projects with academic departments of the university, which in some cases involve external sources of funding. An example is the center's current participation in the assessment of a project being readied for publication and distribution to faculty members and others.

**Evaluation of Experimental Programs:**
- The project was initiated in part by an educational foundation. The project combines computer managed instruction and computer generated instructional material. A terminal is now available in the computer classroom, which in some cases involve external sources of funding. An example is the center's current participation in the assessment of a project being readied for publication and distribution to faculty members and others.

**Evaluation of Experimental Programs:**
- The project was initiated in part by an educational foundation. The project combines computer managed instruction and computer generated instructional material. A terminal is now available in the computer classroom, which in some cases involve external sources of funding. An example is the center's current participation in the assessment of a project being readied for publication and distribution to faculty members and others.
The Learning Media Center is equipped substantially better for audio-visual production than it has been in the past. Production of audio-visual materials is a new faculty role in the Memphis State University campus. Faculty members have been necessary to get along with portable equipment available in the Learning Media Center. The Learning Media Center has equipment available for recording audio-visual materials. The Learning Media Center, like a large library, is interested in instruction in higher education to learn by participation in various services and projects. For this reason, Schulke projection service is a central role in providing projection service. Schulke projection service is a central role in the Learning Media Center. Faculty members who prefer to prepare their own visual materials will find the advantages that a particular form of media has over other forms, including printed materials, more difficult graphics or art work is needed, the graphics shop of the Center for Instructional Services, together with equipment available in the Learning Media Center, can make the Learning Media Center a better location for audio-visual production.
be noted that a special appropriation had been made available to the university for capital improvements in the area in which the center functions. These funds, in the amount of $250,000, are being used during the present calendar year for purposes of preparation of spaces and for equipment, including the instructional television studio. This, of course, is "one time funding." The operating budget mentioned above is a better indication of the sustaining level of support.

Statistics concerning utilization of services offered by the center are re-

EVALUATION AND FUTURE

Innovations and improvements in instruction, student faculty members are finding most helpful to their efforts to motivate and enliven the nucleus of satisfied customers and extending our services in other areas. The nucleus of satisfied customers and extending our services in other areas.

Statistics concerning utilization of services offered by the center are re-

EVALUATION AND FUTURE

Innovations and improvements in instruction, student faculty members are finding most helpful to their efforts to motivate and enliven the nucleus of satisfied customers and extending our services in other areas.
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-KNOXVILLE

The Learning Research Center of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, serves a faculty of around 1,600, who in turn shepherd approximately 23,000 undergraduates and 7,000 graduate students. Degree programs include some 300 fields of study offered in 16 colleges and schools. Upper division and graduate study is emphasized with master's level work being provided in over 100 fields of study and doctoral work in over 50 fields. Diversity and variety of teaching/learning arrangements are the rule, not the exception.

Shortly after the 1961-62 Accreditation Self-Study was completed, and as a result of recommendations made by several of the Self-Study committees, the President of the University created the Standing Council on the Improvement of Teaching and Learning with this charge:

Because of the importance of maximizing the use of resources currently available for the improvement of learning together with the continuing need for exploring new and better methods of teaching to accommodate pressing future needs, I should like to ask this committee to serve as an advisory council on a permanent basis.

By the winter of 1965, it was clear to the dozen faculty members and administrators that they could not devote sufficient time to implementing the charge. Moreover, as is so often the case, there was no budget for exploring new and better methods of teaching and learning. As a consequence of its frustrations, the Council recommended to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that it be replaced with a special office.

Accordingly, the Learning Research Center came into being in September, 1965, with the mission of studying and encouraging the faculty to improve teaching and learning. The Center is staffed by a professional staff of four, headed by the Director, a Professor of Psychology who had been a member of the Standing Council. The Center is also served by an Editorial Assistant, a part-time undergraduate student, and a full-time undergraduate student.

The Center's activities include:

- Conducting research and development projects related to teaching and learning;
- Providing consulting services to faculty and administrators;
- Organizing workshops and seminars on teaching and learning;
- Publishing a newsletter on teaching and learning issues;
- Conducting evaluation studies of teaching and learning programs.

The Center's goals are to improve teaching and learning by providing faculty members with the tools and resources they need to be effective educators.

By Omer Willison, Jr., Director

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-KNOXVILLE

LEARNING RESEARCH CENTER
arrangements for undergraduates and advising them on research design and implementation. We have found that restraint must be exercised—while there is a wealth of work which is difficult to find a time for discussion of significant concerns. The fact that two of these serve for discussion of significant concerns and...
implementation for studies, they wish to conduct. Similar consulting services are made available for faculty seeking assistance in educational research design.

Other activities of the Center have included an annual program for new faculty. It was designed not only to acquaint them with the University but also to demonstrate concern by the University about improving teaching/learning endeavors. This program has now been replaced with a similar one for Graduate Teaching Assistants. Plans for more extensive work with this group are now being developed.

Largely at the insistence of students, the Center provides questionnaires for faculty evaluation. Their use is entirely voluntary and the results go solely to the faculty member. Several forms are provided because of the almost overwhelming, diverse and varied nature of teaching/learning activities. A single form for all instruction would be a disastrous mistake.

In the past three years, two books have been produced by the Director dealing with problems in undergraduate teaching/learning.

Evaluation and Future

Evaluation of the work of the Learning Research Center is especially taxing, particularly if cause-effect relationships are sought. The determinants of changes in practices in a university which occur over a span of years are all but impossible to isolate. Nevertheless, a formal evaluation was conducted by a committee during the 1971 Self-Study. It was found that 50 percent of the students believed that the Center had helped improve the instruction, and 10 percent of the students believed that the Center had helped improve the quality of the faculty and the educational programs. Two of every three faculty members believed that the Center had helped improve the learning experience of students.

Evaluation does not affect the mission of the Center, however. The Center provides a forum for the exchange of ideas and for the development of new approaches to teaching and learning. It is a resource for faculty members who wish to conduct research in educational psychology.

Funding

For funding purposes, the Center is treated as an academic department. The budget is prepared by the Director and submitted for review and implementation through regular channels. There has been no reliance upon "soft" money or outside funding. This has meant that long-range planning is possible and that the Center's existence and activities are controlled by the institution rather than by the whims of outsiders. As already implied, the budget has been kept small; operating funds, with the exception of salaries, have varied between $12,000 and $20,000 annually.

The Center is a member of the National Association of Research Centers in Education. It has been awarded several grants to support its work. Other activities of the Center have included an annual program for new faculty members, the production of books and articles, and the development of instructional materials.
What specific obstacles stand between us and more effective teaching?

When teaching effectiveness committees were formed, many colleges (including the University of Texas) established them to provide a mechanism for evaluating the teaching effectiveness of each faculty member, as well as for improving the quality of instruction offered. The University of Texas at Arlington's Faculty Development Resource Center began in the early 1970s to address these concerns. The Center was established to enhance the instructional effectiveness of all UTA teachers, with the goal of providing faculty with resources and strategies for improving their teaching. The Center's first activity was to gather faculty input on its functions and priorities. A weekend planning retreat was held for faculty delegates representing every academic department on campus, as well as representatives from the library, student life, and central administration. The workshop delegates spent many hours in small groups discussing the following questions:

- What specific obstacles stand between us and more effective teaching?
- What are some specific individual teachers' needs?
- What are some specific institutional needs?
- How can the Center be more effective in addressing these needs?

The Center was initially established by administrative decision based on some specific individual teachers' needs. It was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center's first activity was designed to get faculty input on its functions and priorities. A weekend planning retreat was held for faculty delegates representing every academic department on campus, as well as representatives from the library, student life, and central administration. The workshop delegates spent many hours in small groups discussing the following questions:

- What specific obstacles stand between us and more effective teaching?
- What are some specific individual teachers' needs?
- What are some specific institutional needs?
- How can the Center be more effective in addressing these needs?

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The University of Texas at Arlington's Faculty Development Resource Center was established to enhance the instructional effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was initially established by administrative decision based on some specific individual teachers' needs. It was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.

The Center was given a limited budget and was expected to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all UTA teachers. It was quickly discovered that the idea of teaching effectiveness was not new, and the Center's initial efforts were focused on evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. However, it was also clear that any meaningful effort to improve the quality of instruction on the campus required a systematic approach. The Center's activities included providing a series of workshops and seminars, as well as offering individual consultation and support for faculty members.
What general stumbling blocks need to be removed before we, as UTA faculty members, can become better teachers?

What specifically should be done to help the teachers on our campus do a better job of teaching?

From what source should this help come?

In what form should this help be?

What would you like to see done by the new Faculty Development Resource Center both generally and specifically?

The UT System Chancellor and the UTA President were among those present at the planning workshop to encourage the new Center and to assure the delegates of their support for efforts designed to improve teaching effectiveness. The final outcome of the delegates' deliberations was a report defining the posture the new Center should assume on the UTA campus. The activities, services, and areas of influence and responsibility advocated by this group of delegates still constitute the role of the Center.

One of their first recommendations was that an Advisory Board, representative of the entire faculty, be selected to advise the Director and to continue to provide faculty input. An ad hoc faculty committee met and elected an eleven-member board to serve staggered two-year terms. Each year, therefore, the Board would consist partly of new members and partly of experienced ones. To insure representation, all the colleges, schools, and institutes are included, and each year the Board itself elects the new persons to be invited to serve.

Members serve primarily to advise the Director on policies and priorities and to keep the Director aware of the needs and concerns of the faculty. Although formal meetings were routine the first couple of years, informal discussions and telephone calls are now the primary mode of communication. Members suggest the names of presenters, contribute ideas for Insight, the Center's newsletter, and encourage their colleagues to participate in Center activities.

The original purpose was the improvement of instructional effectiveness. Since that time, however, the purpose has expanded and broadened considerably. Today the term "faculty development" in the broadest connotation would more aptly describe the Center's mission. Whatever is helpful or growth-producing to academic faculty (teachers and administrators) is included. Whatever enhances the academic environment and thus facilitates student learning is included. The expanded sense of purpose, of course, does not necessarily imply more staff or dollars, but rather, a greater heterogeneity of services along a broader spectrum.

The Center's Director, who also holds a tenured appointment as Associate Professor in the Education Department, is still the only professional staff member. She currently devotes three-quarters of her time to the Center. There is a full-time secretary who assists her in administrative and secretarial duties. The secretary (who was selected for her office skills and for her ability to work well with people) is assisted by one or two work-study students who put in 18 to 38 hours per week depending upon the need and the budget. Staff members also operate duplication equipment which enables the Center to design, print, and mail many of the Center's publications.

The Center's Director, who also holds a tenured appointment as Associate Professor in the Education Department, is still the only professional staff member. She currently devotes three-quarters of her time to the Center.
In-service Education:

The Consultation Service

The Consultation Service offers the psychological advantage of helping UTA teachers develop a good self-image. Finally, the Center's Director seeks out opportunities for teachers to attend training courses, conferences, and seminars. A confidential service offered to all UTA teachers and GTA's is Personal, Professional, and Pedagogical Services. Teachers are made aware of the Center's activities and are invited to participate in any of the programs offered. Teachers who wish to participate in any of the programs offered can contact the Center Director or attend a meeting of the Consultation Service.

The Consultation Service provides a forum for teachers to share their experiences and learn from the experiences of others. Teachers can bring their problems to the Consultation Service and receive feedback and suggestions for solving them. The Consultation Service also provides a forum for teachers to discuss their teaching methods and share ideas for improving their teaching. Teachers can bring their own ideas and experiences to the Consultation Service and learn from the experiences of others. The Consultation Service is a forum for teachers to learn from each other and improve their teaching skills.

The Consultation Service is a vital part of the Center for Teachers' Professional Growth. The Consultation Service provides a forum for teachers to share their experiences and learn from the experiences of others. Teachers can bring their problems to the Consultation Service and receive feedback and suggestions for solving them. The Consultation Service also provides a forum for teachers to discuss their teaching methods and share ideas for improving their teaching. Teachers can bring their own ideas and experiences to the Consultation Service and learn from the experiences of others. The Consultation Service is a forum for teachers to learn from each other and improve their teaching skills. The Consultation Service is a vital part of the Center for Teachers' Professional Growth.
Faculty evaluation and faculty development are separate functions. The annual student evaluation survey is no longer required. Beginning this year each academic department is responsible for formulating and implementing its own evaluation policy. The Center provides consultation to assist the departments and colleges in this endeavor. As the Faculty Development Resource Center is entirely voluntary, and because it is a one-person operation, it has been our policy to keep the two functions (evaluation and development) separate so that teachers will not feel they are being helped by the same office or body that is evaluating them.

Evaluation efforts have included detailed attendance and participation records for individuals, departments, and colleges; pre- and post-instruments for teachers coming for consultation; and the utilization of various types of questionnaires for workshop, seminar, and retreat participants. While the attendance and participation records have served to provide an accurate record of the degree of acceptance of Center functions by the faculty, this process has not measured potential benefit to them. The questionnaires have been more indicative, as they reflect only the attendee's subjective response state. The most valid evaluations have been those pre- and post-measures jointly decided upon by the Director and faculty member when those two have been involved in a process designed to assist the latter to improve as a teacher. These instruments have been and will continue to be confidential.

It may be interesting to note that the attendance records in the Center's first year of operation revealed a range of a high of 86 percent to a low of 11 percent. Mean participation for the entire campus was 44 percent. This percentage included only attendance at in-service activities, and did not include faculty members who used the resource area or who came for consultation. Although attendance has been higher since its inception, there is more interest in the learning role now than there was when the Center was opened. The Director's personal assessment of the Center's effect at UTA is that it has profoundly changed teaching and learning habits and dispositions among a number of methods of teaching. The Center's future is certainly not assured. So long as there are faculty members who are benefiting from the Center, and money in the budget to support it, it will continue to exist. Within the year it will occupy a new facility designed by the architectural firm who are developing the new instructional building on the campus.

The Center has undergone several design format innovations and programmatic changes. It now operates under the general direction of an advisory board of administrative, faculty, and support personnel. The Center functions as a resource for the faculty and staff of the university, offering assistance in developing and implementing innovative teaching methods.

FUNDING

Funding for the Center has been obtained through grants and university sources. The Center is currently funded through a combination of state and federal grants, as well as donations from private foundations and corporations. The Center's budget is determined annually by the university administration, and includes funds for personnel, equipment, and operating expenses.
The University of Texas at Austin is part of the University of Texas System, a public university system consisting of 14 institutions. The system is governed by the Board of Regents of the University of Texas System, which appoints the President of the system. The President is responsible for the overall operation and management of the system.

The Center for Teaching Effectiveness (CTE) at the University of Texas at Austin was established in 1973 in response to faculty senate interest in improving teaching effectiveness. The center's mission is to provide assistance to the teaching faculty in making teaching more effective on this campus. The Center for Teaching Effectiveness operates in close cooperation with the faculty senate and other faculty members to promote teaching improvement.

In September of 1973, the faculty senate committee, which initially proposed the establishment of a Center for Teaching Effectiveness, presented its report to the faculty senate, which recommended the establishment of a Center for Teaching Effectiveness. The report was accepted by the members of the senate without dissent, and in April of 1973 the report was brought before the University Council. The Council forwarded the report to the President with a recommendation that a Center for Teaching Effectiveness be established.

The President approached the Board of Regents with this proposition in the summer of 1973. They approved it, and the center began operations in September of 1973. The center is composed of a director, an assistant director, a secretary, two consultants, and two student helpers. The center provides assistance to faculty members in making teaching more effective on this campus. The center's mission is to provide assistance to the teaching faculty in making teaching more effective on this campus.
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Center is not connected to any of the Colleges, and the director reports to the Vice President and Provost.

The current members of the Center's staff are:

The Director, Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering, devotes three-fourths time to the Center and one-fourth time to the Department of Chemical Engineering, where he is a full professor. Twenty years experience in college teaching, long-time interest in improvement of teaching, experience in computer-assisted instruction, self-paced instruction (PSI or Keller Plan). Previously was Director for five years of the Bureau of Engineering Teaching of the University's College of Engineering.

The Assistant Director, Ph.D. in Experimental Psychology, devotes half-time to the Center, and the other half-time to research in psychology. Seven years experience in college teaching, served two years as research associate on Project C-BE, a large research project on computer-based education at the University of Texas. Became interested in teaching improvement while helping to design experimental courses as a graduate student.

Administrative Secretary, 12 years experience in secretarial work, including three years as secretary to the director of a project engaged in teaching innovation at the college level; also taught adult education classes in Germany.

Consultant, Master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction, devotes one-fourth time to the Center and three-fourths time to the Department of English. Three years experience in college teaching. Consults with faculty members and teaching assistants on questions originated by clients; specialist in performance analysis.

Consultant, Ph.D. in Chemistry, devotes one-fourth time with the Center and three-fourths time with the Department of Chemistry, where he is a full professor. Approximately 20 years in college teaching, until recently was co-director of Project C-BE, a 1.6 million dollar research effort in computer-based education.

Clerk is a work-study student. Undergraduate student in Speech/Communication.

Clerk spends 10 hours per week with the Center. Undergraduate student in Speech/Communication.

Consultant is a work-study student. Undergraduate student in Speech/Communication.

Students are paid a number of dollars per hour of practical work on projects.
We have had a problem with locating rooms suitable for the modifications. All the rooms we found were found suitably...cost estimates for the modifications. At the time these estimates were made, it was assumed that the rooms would be used for...not extensively used, although virtually all the faculty members utilizing the consultants are still reasonably satisfied with the service. Recently this service was made available to some graduate students, and we have been able to stretch the small staff's resources too much.

For the past two summers Center personnel have conducted a teaching seminar for full-time teachers. We also have been able to offer more than one seminar during the summer months. The Center recommends regularly scheduled workshops for the faculty and student members of the College.

The majority of the persons who attend workshops are graduate TA's and faculty members.

The Center conducts regularly scheduled workshops for the faculty and student members of the College. Seminars on Teaching Course during the regular school year.

The majority of the persons who attend workshops are graduate TA's and faculty members.
of the total of faculty members receiving assistance is 1.5 persons. During the
second year, the proportion of total faculty members receiving assistance was
approximately the same, or 1.5 persons. This proportion is less than 0.5% of the
total university budget. An equivalent percentage of the total number of
students and faculty members in the last two years was 1.5%. The impact of
participant observers is small, but the results are interesting. The average
cost of upgrading the acoustics of a classroom runs around $400.

During the last two years the President's office has provided approximately
$17,000 to the Center for upgrading the audiovisual facilities of classrooms. This
money has provided 90 overhead projectors and stands which have been
located in designated classrooms, it should not be surprising that the use of this equip-
ment is increasing; faculty will use such equipment if it is made easily accessible.

EVALUATION AND FUTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$37,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$40,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$49,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase mainly has been the result of both salary increases and changes
in the utilization of the Center's services. The Center's philosophy is that the Center
exists to serve the teachers at this University, both graduate students and faculty
members, by providing information, encouragement and service, and by attempting
to raise the consciousness of the entire campus community regarding improving
the effectiveness of teaching. We are not involved in the formal evaluation of
teachers, and do not wish to be. Happily this service is performed by the Measurement
and Evaluation Center, a separate unit of the University. Neither do we produce
audiovisual materials nor provide projection equipment, except on a very limited basis.
The Visual Instruction Bureau, heretofore a small and understaffed group, is being
relocated and expanded to provide these services to the faculty.

FUNDING

The Center for Teaching Effectiveness operates on "hard" money; we are a
line item in the University budget, and there is no formula for deciding on that
budget. For the three years the Center has been in existence, the budget has been
as follows:
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the year our consulting, workshops, classes in teaching, and other activities will involve perhaps 250 people; since some of these participate in all our activities, this represents maybe sixty different individuals. As OUT programs are all voluntary, we can assume that participants are rather highly motivated, and so perhaps 20 percent will experiment with some ideas, rather than merely participating. By this (very conservative) estimate, our work will have a significant effect on 12 teachers per year, and some effect on 48 more. Jerry Gaff, in his book, Toward Faculty Renewal, estimated that a faculty member who acquires promotion to Associate Professor represents a potential investment of $1,300,000 over the rest of his professional career. If our Center's activities can assist a teacher to improve his teaching skills, that is worth hard cash. Equally important is the improvement of his knowledge about his profession, his sensitivity to his students, his satisfaction with his career and feelings about himself, though not easy to evaluate. We feel that our Center's future at the University is reasonably secure. We do not expect our personnel to grow in proportion over time. We also expect our functions and activities to change somewhat over the years as the problems and directions of higher education will change. We do not expect the size to increase greatly, but perhaps we will experience a modest growth in personnel over time. We also expect our functions and activities to change somewhat over the years as the problems and directions of higher education will change.

We feel that our Center's future at the University is reasonably secure. We do not expect its size to increase greatly, but perhaps we will experience a modest growth in personnel over time. We also expect our functions and activities to change somewhat over the years as the problems and directions of higher education will change.
Individual Faculty

The Institution

Virginia Commonwealth University was established by the General Assembly of Virginia in 1968 by merging the former Richmond Professional Institute and the Medical College of Virginia. Incorporating one of the largest and most comprehensive medical centers on the East Coast with a broad range of undergraduate and graduate programs, Virginia Commonwealth University is a major university in the Virginia system of higher education. Because of the quality and variety of its educational services and because of its strategic location, Virginia Commonwealth University serves not only the Richmond area but Virginia-at-large.

The University has two designated divisions, although organizationally it operates as one institution with two campuses. The Academic campus, offering undergraduate and graduate programs, is comprised of six schools: Arts and Sciences, Business, Community Services, Education, Social Work. The Medical College of Virginia campus offers health-related programs of study and is comprised of six schools: Allied Health Professions, Basic Sciences, Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy.

Fall 1975 faculty numbered 2,324: on the MCV campus, 682 full-time and 586 part-time; on the Academic campus, 658 full-time and 393 part-time. In addition to the faculty, the University employs approximately 7,100 other persons.

Total fall 1975 enrollment for the University was 18,033. In addition, approximately 10,000 students enrolled in the 1975 summer sessions and Evening College. Alumni total approximately 32,000 living throughout the United States and in many foreign countries. In 1975, the University awarded 2,781 degrees.

The combined operating budget for both campuses for fiscal year 1975-1976 is $102,482,400. In addition, the University receives approximately $15 million in federal and private gifts and grants during a fiscal year.

The Center for Improving Teaching Effectiveness (CITE) grew out of the desire of the Faculty Senate of the academic division to have a university program designed to help faculty improve their teaching. It was created in the fall of 1973 to serve as a resource for the Academic campus of the University. The Center's primary goal is to develop a comprehensive program for increasing teaching effectiveness through faculty development.

Organization and Staff

The Center employs three full-time staff, two part-time staff and two secretaries. The Center operates three full-time staff, two part-time staff and two secretaries. The Center operates three full-time staff, two part-time staff and two secretaries.

Activities

The Center for Improving Teaching Effectiveness offers programs and workshops designed to improve the effectiveness of faculty teaching. The Center sponsors workshops, seminars, and other activities that focus on improving teaching skills. These activities include classroom observation, feedback sessions, and workshops on teaching strategies. The Center also provides resources and materials for faculty members to use in their classrooms.

The Center for Improving Teaching Effectiveness is committed to providing faculty members with the tools and knowledge they need to improve their teaching effectiveness. Through these programs and workshops, faculty members have the opportunity to engage in ongoing professional development and to share their experiences with one another. By improving their teaching skills, faculty members can enhance the learning experience for their students and contribute to the overall quality of education at Virginia Commonwealth University.
EVALUATION AND FUTURE

The Center for Improving Teaching Effectiveness is supported by State grants as well as a three-year grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc. Numbers also include professional support from Dr. Loren Williams from the Educational Planning and Development Program at the University of Virginia. The Lilly Project also enables us to work collectively with all chairmen from the Medical College of Virginia division of the university, have been able to assist several departments to assess their own effectiveness and Clarity about its educational purposes, policies and practices will in the long run
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state a concrete objective they want to attain. In our follow-up activities, we try to determine the extent to which that objective has been accomplished. We are also very much interested in the attitudes developed toward our services by individuals and organizations who have utilized them, so we try to determine that in our follow-up as well.

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

In carrying out its activities, CITE routinely collaborates on projects with the Educational Planning and Development Program, a separate unit, located on the Medical College of Virginia campus, MCV’S Educational Planning and Development Program (EPOP) assists educational units within the Medical College define their goals more precisely and then accomplish them.

Activities undertaken within the scope of the EDP’s mission are quite varied and are described briefly under the four categories of Evaluation, Faculty Development, Instructional Development, and Planning and Administrative Support. The nature of the activities in each category range from provision of individual consultation to faculty and administrators, through scheduled workshops, seminars, and retreats for groups of faculty and administrators, to assumption of full responsibility for major developmental projects.

Activities are conducted to assist the development of new programs and the improvement of existing educational programs. New instructional materials, revised curriculum, and new educational programs are developed. These activities are designed to assist faculty in developing a product, e.g., new instructional materials and educational programs.

Planning and Administrative Support

Activities are conducted to assist the development of new programs and the improvement of existing educational programs. New instructional materials, revised curriculum, and new educational programs are developed. These activities are designed to assist faculty in developing a product, e.g., new instructional materials and educational programs.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University is a land-grant institution, located on a plateau in the Appalachian Mountains in Blacksburg, Virginia. As a comprehensive university with seven academic colleges and a graduate school, degrees are offered in over seventy disciplines of study and include over forty fields in which the doctorate may be obtained. The 1975-76 enrollment is 18,500 students which includes 2,600 graduate students. The faculty numbers 1,600.

In 1970, the faculty expressed a desire to have additional services for the support of instruction, and a committee was formed to make recommendations for the development of a Learning Resources Center. As a result of these efforts, the Board of Visitors formally created the Learning Resources Center and appointed a Director in February, 1971. The Center started operation in July of that year. Plans for the Center resulted from encouragement and efforts by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Center exists for the purpose of providing a comprehensive media resource service capability to support the instructional, research, and extension programs of the University. As a primary mission, the staff of the Center analyzes instructional needs and provides planning, production, and warehousing of resources to technologically facilitate communication and improve the quality of instruction through a systematic approach.

Goals of the Center are:

1. To develop the necessary resources, both human and technological, to meet and anticipate demands for improved communications.
2. To encourage systematic analysis and design of instructional sequences for classroom needs.
3. To respond to perceived faculty needs for audio-visual media support to fulfill programmatic requirements in instruction.
4. To prepare to fulfill programmatic requirements in instruction support for classroom needs.
5. To encourage systematic and design of instructional sequences.
6. To develop the necessary resources, both human and technological, to meet and anticipate demands for improved communications.
7. To encourage systematic analysis and design of instructional sequences for classroom needs.
8. To respond to perceived faculty needs for audio-visual media support to fulfill programmatic requirements in instruction.
9. To prepare to fulfill programmatic requirements in instruction support for classroom needs.
10. To encourage systematic and design of instructional sequences.

ORGANIZATION AND STAFF

The Learning Resources Center is a separate organization under the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Director reports directly to that office. The Center has three divisions for operational purposes. The Educational Systems Division is primarily responsible for the production of video and audio tapes and the development of learning facilities. The Instructional Development Division is primarily responsible for working directly with faculty members who are creating or revising course materials or who wish to develop a new approach to instruction. The Media Services Division is primarily responsible for the design, production, and distribution of instructional materials and educational print production. The Educational Systems Division is primarily responsible for working directly with faculty members who are creating or revising course materials, and for the development of a comprehensive media service to the faculty and students.

The professional staff is made up of the Director, the three Assistant Directors, and two consultants. Each member of the professional staff assists faculty in the design of instructional activities. The Director has a degree in media and several years experience in the field. The Assistant Directors have degrees in the field of instructional technology and experience in teaching and administration. The consultant in instructional design has a graduate degree in educational psychology.

The Center provides services to all colleges and divisions of the University, and the faculty is encouraged to draw on the services of the Center.

The Director, Dean Huffman, Jr., Director, has a degree in media and several years experience in the field.
The Media Services Division offers a variety of media services in warehouse classrooms and other administrative offices. This Division provides consultation services to assist colleges or departments in meeting specific instructional needs. The Division offers high-speed duplicated for cassette or reel-to-reel recorders for both faculty and students. Services in speech compression are also available. This Division helps faculty in the development of teaching strategies, formulating courses, and applying appropriate audio-visual media when indicated. After needs assessment, a development program is in the planning stage by a consultant in this Division.

The Educational Systems Division exists to provide a primary function: the operation of a comprehensive color television facility for all University programs. The Division consists of individuals who have degrees or specialty backgrounds in art and graphic design and production, photography, equipment maintenance, television engineering and television production. Each member of the technical staff and of the secretarial staff has been encouraged to visit and become familiar with the operation of complete color television facilities for all University programs. The Division is equipped with a telephone to the distribution center so that programs may be called upon the request of the instructor or at a prescheduled time. Series and programs are utilized in over fifty course offerings in the University, with a high interest in media where non-technical work is required.

Activities

The Instructional Development Division provides consultation and education to carry out the mission and provide services to the entire University. Activities are lodged in the Center's functioning divisions which have both professional and technical personnel to carry out the mission and provide services. The Center is equipped with a telephone to the distribution center so that programs may be called upon the request of the instructor or at a prescheduled time. Series and programs are utilized in over fifty course offerings in the University, with a high interest in media where non-technical work is required.

The Educational Systems Division exists to provide a primary function: the operation of a comprehensive color television facility for all University programs. The Division consists of individuals who have degrees or specialty backgrounds in art and graphic design and production, photography, equipment maintenance, television engineering and television production. Each member of the technical staff and of the secretarial staff has been encouraged to visit and become familiar with the operation of complete color television facilities for all University programs. The Division is equipped with a telephone to the distribution center so that programs may be called upon the request of the instructor or at a prescheduled time. Series and programs are utilized in over fifty course offerings in the University, with a high interest in media where non-technical work is required.
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The graphic-arts unit has a staff of technical and free-hand illustrators who take instructional ideas and render them in the form of charts, graphs, illustrations, or displays to meet a variety of instructional, research, and extension needs. Technical capability including a diazo processor, lettering equipment, and enlarging-reducing machines, and a wide variety of materials are available to the art staff.

The photo lab offers full services in black and white and color photography and processing. The staff will photograph live or graphic materials, duplicate slides, make special effects pictures, and advise on photographic equipment and processes. A color film processor for 35mm film, a mounter for 2x2 slides, and special microfilming equipment for documents are available in the lab.

The silk screen unit provides design and printing for posters, signs, book covers, or similar items using the serigraph process for support of instructionally related activities and the Continuing Education Center for conferences and special programs. Assistance is also provided in the design and development of educational exhibits. Special programs are also available in the design and development of educational exhibits.

Activities of the Center have been evaluated through quarterly and annual reports which reflect, quantitatively and qualitatively, significant activities and levels of service. A University Self-Study and Evaluation Report, under way during the current year, will assess the Center's operations and effectiveness. A small charge is made for selected production services to recuperate some costs.

The Center has an operating philosophy of providing faculty and students with appropriate services to improve learning opportunities. The increasing number of faculty who utilize the services and express a desire for increased and improved instructional support services implies acceptance of the program. The faculty has a decided interest in improving the quality of instruction as evidenced by those seeking help in methodology and the development of instructional materials. By these means, the Center is assisting the faculty in the development of instructional materials for classroom and independent study use.

The future of the Learning Resources Center at Virginia Tech is assured in that the operating philosophy of providing services has made the Center an integral part of the University's instructional, research, and extension missions.
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Faculty Development in the South
OVERVIEW OF SOUTHERN CENTERS

While concern for instruction and effectiveness is not new to educators and institutions in the South, formal arrangements and budgetary commitments to activities specifically designed for improving instructional effectiveness in Southern universities is a recent development. Eight of the eleven faculty development centers described in this publication have begun operations since 1973 and ten since 1971. As the center descriptions show, the overall and primary concern of all of them lies in bringing about improvements in the teaching-learning process at their respective institutions. None of the centers is organized, staffed or funded exactly like any other, however, and approaches and activities to achieve the overall goal differ in the various locations.

It appears that the primary impetus for the creation of campus faculty development centers comes from administrators. In two of the eleven cases, the original impetus came from the faculty senate. In three cases, instructional improvement programs resulted from consolidation of all instructional support services such as media, graphics, and the like, into central operations. In almost all of the cases, administrators took the initiative, but appointed or asked for a faculty committee to study the issue and to make recommendations. Consequently, even though the original impetus came from administrators, faculty involvement was almost always present in developing and promoting the original ideas.

Within the common purpose of improving instructional effectiveness, the faculty development centers in the SREB region take several forms which might be summarized into three general categories:

1. Five of the eleven centers concentrate on working directly with faculty on instructional development by providing them information and opportunities for learning about new approaches, and individual consultation and evaluation. Two of these five centers have regular publications which they distribute to the faculty at their own campuses and at other institutions. Specific activities which provide faculty opportunities to develop new approaches include workshops, specially designed courses, instructional laboratories, individual consultation, and special funds for making "mini-grants" to faculty. One of the five centers works primarily through projects involving funded research to bring about improvements through special projects, seminars, and symposia. Specific activities which provide faculty opportunities to develop new approaches and support these efforts include special projects, seminars, and symposia. Specific activities which provide faculty opportunities to develop new approaches and support these efforts include special projects, seminars, and symposia.

2. Four of the eleven centers provide comprehensive instructional resources. They combine instructional development efforts with instructional support services such as audio-visual media equipment and instructional television opportunities. These four centers have the following additional activities and services:

   - Teaching-Learning Process. In different stages of different institutions, research on learning processes and the teaching-learning process began in different ways at different institutions. Two centers, for instance, have focused on learning processes and the teaching-learning process. These centers have the following additional activities and services:

   - Teaching-Learning Process. In different stages of different institutions, research on learning processes and the teaching-learning process began in different ways at different institutions. Two centers, for instance, have focused on learning processes and the teaching-learning process. These centers have the following additional activities and services:

   - Teaching-Learning Process. In different stages of different institutions, research on learning processes and the teaching-learning process began in different ways at different institutions. Two centers, for instance, have focused on learning processes and the teaching-learning process. These centers have the following additional activities and services:

   - Teaching-Learning Process. In different stages of different institutions, research on learning processes and the teaching-learning process began in different ways at different institutions. Two centers, for instance, have focused on learning processes and the teaching-learning process. These centers have the following additional activities and services:

   - Teaching-Learning Process. In different stages of different institutions, research on learning processes and the teaching-learning process began in different ways at different institutions. Two centers, for instance, have focused on learning processes and the teaching-learning process. These centers have the following additional activities and services:

   - Teaching-Learning Process. In different stages of different institutions, research on learning processes and the teaching-learning process began in different ways at different institutions. Two centers, for instance, have focused on learning processes and the teaching-learning process. These centers have the following additional activities and services:
centers represent centralized media operations for their institutions from which instructional development efforts grew. Providing comprehensive instructional resources in this manner allows for extensive faculty contacts through media services as well as opportunities for introducing the subject of alternative approaches. Some of the centers place primary emphasis on media services as a way of improving instruction; others see the two as separate, but still interconnected operations.

Two centers concentrate on comprehensive faculty development combining several aspects of the models described in Part I. These centers assist faculty members with personal development as well as with developing instructional skills. They also work with the institution as a whole to improve all aspects of the institutional operation as they affect the overall goal of improving education. Two center staffs conduct studies and gather data on the instructional effectiveness of their operation. Success of center operations seems to depend on several factors, including the director's use of the institution's resources and the internal influence of the center. Experience, the director's training, and the internal influence of the center are critical in determining success of a center.

The person who directs the center is the most significant influencing factor on the nature of center activities, the development of center activities, and the internal influence of the center. Because so little is known or understood about what faculty development is on most campuses, the director is almost always free to take the center in whatever direction he or she wishes. Success of center operations seems to depend a great deal on the director's understanding of the institutional climate so that activities do not create a conflict with the institution's direction or the institution's goals. No particular educational background appears to be more advantageous than another for a center director. Five of the eleven center directors in this study are from the fields of psychology and education. Two are from the natural sciences or engineering, and one is a professor of media. The message seems to be that the greatest likelihood of success is found in the center that best fits the institution and seems to have the greatest potential to establish a TPE operation that is consistent with the institution's philosophy. The message seems to be that the greatest likelihood of success is found in the center that best fits the institution and seems to have the greatest potential to establish a TPE operation that is consistent with the institution's philosophy. The message seems to be that the greatest likelihood of success is found in the center that best fits the institution and seems to have the greatest potential to establish a TPE operation that is consistent with the institution's philosophy.
Organizationally, each of the centers in this report has a director who has overall responsibility for the center and its operations. The overall long-range effect of such arrangements can be far-reaching, as the center director is the focal point for formal arrangements and budget. However, in many cases, the center director is still responsible for the center's financial operations, including the preparation of budget requests and the allocation of funds to various programs and activities. This arrangement can sometimes create conflicts of interest, especially when the center director is also responsible for the hiring and promotion of faculty members.

Institutional structures vary widely across the region, with some centers operating as self-contained units within the institution, while others are part of larger organizational structures, such as learning resources centers or academic affairs departments. The degree of autonomy afforded to center directors can vary significantly, with some having a great deal of freedom to pursue their own goals and others being more closely aligned with other administrative units.

In conclusion, what can be said about the effectiveness and future of campus faculty development centers? It is clear that these centers are providing valuable services to faculty members, and that they are playing an increasingly important role in the institutions where they are located. However, more research is needed to determine the long-term impact of these centers on faculty development and institutional effectiveness.