The rationale for and obstacles to faculty development are considered, and recommendations for administrators to follow in initiating and implementing programs are offered. Faculty development is needed for at least three important reasons: knowing a subject does not mean an individual can effectively teach it; faculty need to learn how to teach and counsel adult students; and low enrollment and retrenchments result in heavily tenured faculty with few if any new faculty members added. Traditional faculty development has involved instructional development, personal development, and organizational development. Popular current approaches to faculty development include faculty growth contracts, instructional improvement centers focusing on human rather than material resources, and the auditor-consultant program. The following recommendations to administrators who are responsible for faculty development are considered: involving the faculty in planning the program, attaining administrators' support, making the program comprehensive, and establishing a reward system. A comprehensive faculty development program will offer faculty opportunities to improve as teachers, to develop a supportive environment, and to develop personal values as a professional. A bibliography is appended. (SW)
ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT - BY STANLEY M. GRABOWSKI, Ph.D.
Among the many challenges facing college and university administrators, the central challenge may very well be to prepare faculty—and by extension administrators—for tomorrow's changed postsecondary setting.

During the first half of the 1970s, many institutions were so concerned with survival that they neglected faculty's needs. Faculty development was given only lip service. But now faculty development is suddenly "in" (Cross 1977) and may already be reaching maturity and middle age (Bergquist and Phillips 1981). As with any movement or new trend, the field of faculty development may have created a robot, one that is strong and powerful but is without vision. The faculty development robot sometimes does not seem to know where to go, and hence may wander aimlessly. People ask, "What are faculty being developed for?" We often do not have adequate answers to this question (Bergquist and Phillips 1981, p.306).

First is an abiding need that has never been fully addressed or met, based on the assumption that an individual who knows a subject can effectively teach it. The truth is that while the majority of college and university faculty members are highly specialized individuals with expertise in a particular discipline, few have any formal training in teaching (Lindquist 1980, O'Bannon 1977).

The second reason for faculty development, even for those professors who have mastered the art of teaching traditional students aged 17 to 22, is the need to learn how to teach and counsel adult students. Higher education has a new clientele—an older population. Not all faculty members are meeting this new clientele's needs successfully. "One cannot assume that the faculty enter an institution prepared to serve the educational needs of the lifelong learner." (Christensen 1977, p.28).

The third, compelling reason arises from the current crunch; low enrollments and retrenchments result in heavily tenured faculties with few if any new faculty members added. Many professors entered the profession in the heavy expansion of the 1950s and 1960s when mobility, advancement, and research monies were at their optimistic best. However, the economic, social, and professional factors of the late 1970s and early 1980s have dramatically altered the traditional attitudes and opportunities of the profession (Bumpus 1981, p.6). As a result, faculty are not trained to take up the slack.

College and university administrators must use some systematic, comprehensive, and integrated approaches to faculty development to maintain faculty members' interest, motivation, morale, and vitality and to develop new expertise (Gaff 1975; Shulman 1980, Smith 1978). Nearly 60 percent of all accredited degree-granting institutions of higher education in this country have some type of in-service program for faculty (Centra 1977). Most of these programs are designed for full-time faculty. Part-time faculty, who may need development programs even more, have had very little offered beyond an hour or two of orientation (Hennessy 1982). In many colleges, there is an unwillingness to embrace a philosophical commitment to include part-timers as an integral part of the staff. There has been an unwillingness to spend funds on the professional development of faculty who are not tenured and who may be with the institution for a short time period (Elioff 1980, p.16).

Even though administrators generally agree that faculty development is urgently needed, few can agree as to what form it ought to take. It may well be that no single approach is either suitable or optimal. Indeed, faculty members, whether full-time or part-time, need different kinds of incentives and opportunities (Bevan 1980).

APPROACHES TO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Until recently, most practices under the rubric of "faculty development"—orientation sessions, catalogs and handbooks, and financial help for participation at conferences have been more in the mode of basic employment practices rather than
Traditional faculty development takes three forms: (1) instructional development, which includes curriculum development, teaching techniques, course design, and learning materials development; (2) personal development, which includes training in interpersonal skills and career counseling; and (3) organizational development, which includes team building, management development, and factors that contribute to the institutional environment for teaching and decision making (Berquist and Phillips 1975; Gaff 1975).

Centra (1976) identifies four characteristics of traditional faculty development: (1) high faculty involvement, including workshops on institutional purposes and assessments by experienced staff faculty; (2) instructional assistance, including methods of instruction and course development, teaching skills and techniques, evaluation of students' performance, and use of audiovisual materials; (3) traditional incentives—teaching awards, sabbatical leaves, grants for travel, and temporarily reduced course loads; and (4) assessment, including techniques to improve instruction (p. 46).

Most of these traditional approaches are familiar to academic administrators and have been reported in the literature in detail (Centra 1976; Gaff 1975). But three relatively new approaches to faculty development have received much attention lately.

The most popular current approach to faculty development involves faculty growth contracts. A faculty growth contract includes a faculty member's profile of his or her own strengths and weaknesses, a statement of goals and objectives for development as a professional and as a member of the institution, and a plan for evaluating the faculty member's performance (Schnitzer, Solder, and Verroca, 1979). Generally, the faculty member draws up an annual "contract" with the help of a committee of colleagues within a context of self-determined long-range goals for three to five years (Heie, Sweet, and Carlberg 1979; Schnitzer, Solder, and Verroca 1979; Seldin 1977). Growth contracts enable individual faculty members to respond to their own needs, to those of the department, and to those of the institution.

Faculty growth contracts can help solve three common problems: (1) the need for more individualized faculty roles, the need for more individualized charting of professional growth, and the need for more individualized assessment of teaching performance (Seldin 1977, p. 5). Despite the theoretical advantages of growth contracts and despite faculty's frequenting them as "essential to faculty development" (Centra 1976, p. 24), they are but little used.

Some people equate growth contracts with management by objectives (MBO). While the two approaches share many similarities, growth contracts differ from MBO because "the emphasis in the faculty growth contract is more on providing a mutually supportive environment than upon strict accountability for results" (Schnitzer, Solder, and Verroca 1979, p. 3). Centra (1976) suggests additionally that faculty growth contracts are less threatening to faculty members than some other approaches to faculty development.

In many colleges, there is an unwillingness to embrace "a philosophical commitment to include part-timers as an integral part of the staff."

The second innovative approach to faculty development involves instructional improvement centers, whose focus is on human rather than material resources (Gaff 1975; Shucard 1978). Instructional improvement centers can be structured within a single institution or as a function of a consortium, a state system, or a professional association. Usually such centers operate with a faculty, a program, and a budget. Most have some kind of advisory or policy committee to oversee operations. One important dimension of centers located within an institution is that they are independent of any formal mechanism for promotion and tenure within the institution (Gaff 1975).

On the basis of his extensive review of instructional improvement centers, Gaff (1975) suggests the following plan for starting a center:

- Develop an outreach program.
- Start small and prove yourself.
- Keep a low profile.
- Start where the faculty are.
- Be eclectic in approach.
- Start with a small group of volunteers who will "sell" the program to colleagues.
- Go with winners at the outset.
- Administer a small instructional improvement fund (pp. 123-125).

The third "new" approach, the auditor-consultant program, is an old idea gaining favor with younger faculty members. The program consists of a mutual tutorship between two faculty members, who tutor each other about trends in their own fields of expertise and audit each other's courses. This arrangement works well in institutions of any size (Green and Mink 1973). A variation of the auditor-consultant approach is the use of academic mentors, a buddy system where a senior colleague assists a young faculty member in career development and in coping with institutional politics (Lazarus and Tolpin 1979).

**OBSTACLES TO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

While administrators present an obstacle to faculty development in their failure to look at development from the viewpoint of faculty members' needs, faculty present an obstacle in their failure to take complete responsibility for their development (Reddick 1979).

Three major obstacles—lack of time, financial constraints, and lack of interest—apply to administrators and faculty, whether full time or part time (Heie 1977).

Administrators are overwhelmed, with budgets and with pushing bureaucratic paper, while faculty are busy with research projects, endless committee meetings, and compiling vitae for promotion and tenure. No one has time to formulate or participate in a faculty development program.

Whatever meager funds go into faculty development, 70 percent come from the institution (Centra 1976). Most faculty development programs are subsidized not by direct line items in the budget, but through indirect support in the form of sabbaticals, outside speakers, funds to attend conferences and meetings, and similar traditional lines (Mahy, Ellis, and Abrams 1969). Most of the remaining amount (27 percent according to Centra 1976) comes from governmental and foundation grants, many of which are beginning to dry up. Outside funding, while helpful, is not necessary to mount and conduct effective faculty development programs (Heie, Sweet, and Carlberg 1979). In most instances, outside money for faculty development is used as seed money.

A lack of interest or motivation can also be attributed to both administration and faculty. Academic administrators do not have the skills or even the interest in faculty development precisely because they were selected for their financial and administrative skills and inclinations (Berquist and Phillips 1981, p. 11). Faculty participate in the programs if they perceive that there is something in it for them—praise, recog-
nition, or rewards for improvement (Bevan 1980; Noonan 1974; Sanford, 1971).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A SUCCESSFUL FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The literature on faculty development clearly indicates a number of specific recommendations for administrators to follow in initiating and implementing programs. Those recommendations generally include involving the faculty, attaining administrators' support, making the program comprehensive, and establishing a reward system.

Faculty Involvement

Experts on the subject agree unanimously that faculty members must be involved directly and explicitly in all aspects of planning and mounting faculty development programs. Control by faculty is necessary for their acceptance of and trust in the programs (Chait and Gueths 1981; Gaff 1975; Sanders 1978). One way to ensure faculty members' acceptance is to have faculty advisory groups establish policies and implement programs (Elioff 1980; Gaff 1975). Indeed, it is highly recommended, at least for instructional improvement programs, that a respected faculty member head the program (Gaff 1975).

A good way to kill a faculty development program, especially one that centers around growth contracts, is to impose a full blown program on the faculty from above, either through the administration or an external agency... Members' acceptance is to have faculty advisory groups establish policies and implement programs (Elioff 1980; Gaff 1975). Indeed, it is highly recommended, at least for instructional improvement programs, that a respected faculty member head the program (Gaff 1975).

A good way to kill a faculty development program, especially one that centers around growth contracts, is to impose a full blown program on the faculty from above, either through the administration or an external agency... You have the greatest chance of success if your program is developed and run by the faculty, with suitable external input to assure that institutional needs and requirements will be met (Heie, Sweet, and Carlb erg 1979).

Administrative Support

A comprehensive program of faculty development will offer faculty opportunities to improve as teachers, to develop an environment that will be supportive within the institution, and to develop personal values as a professional. In other words, it provides for instructional development for organizational development, and for personal development (Berquist and Phillips 1975). While all three dimensions ought to be included, the logical entry point for embryonic faculty development programs is instructional development (Berquist and Phillips 1977).

The focus on and support of professional roles and activities normally associated with faculty status should serve as the basis for a career development program and a constructive rather than a remedial rationale (Berquist and Phillips 1981; Chait and Gueths 1981; Mahler and Ebben 1978). The combination of career development and adult personality development appears to be two sides of the same coin (Freedman et al. 1979; Schien 1978).

While professors share some common career goals, a younger professor is more likely to accept help from an older colleague, but an older professor is more likely to work out his career difficulties on his own. Furthermore, younger professors are more apt to participate in formal faculty development programs than their senior colleagues. The vocational experiences a college professor has early in his career play a large role in his later career, implying that an institution should take great interest in the support of new professors (Baldwin 1979).

The label or name given to the program is more critical than may appear at first glance. Faculty members feel...
threatened, defensive, and even reluc-
tant to participate in something called
"faculty development." It appears that it
is better to call it "professional (or in-
tersectional) improvement (or facilita-
tion)" (Goff, 1975, p. 121). Regardless of
what kind of program is established or
its name, administrators need to devel-
lop a communications system that will
encourage a dialogue about teaching
and learning (Elioff 1980; Reddick
1979).

One last caveat concerns the timing
of faculty development programs: "If an
institution is faced with the possi-
bility of cutting back faculty positions and
faculty members are threatened with the
loss of their jobs, that is probably the
least hospitable time to attempt to im-
plement a program of faculty develop-
ment (Gaff, 1975, p. 135).

The Reward System

To be effective, faculty development
must yield benefits for the institution as
well as for individual faculty members
(Reddick 1979). Three types of systems
are available to reward faculty: direct,
including merit pay and promotions;
extrinsic, including research assistants,
more laboratory equipment, higher li-
brary budgets, a reduction in the teach-
ing load, travel funds, and sabbaticals;
and intrinsic, including professional
status and respect of colleagues (Chait
and Gueths 1981). Not all of these
rewards will succeed with all faculty,
because faculty members' preferences
for rewards differ by age, school, and
rank (Fenker 1977).

One of the least effective so-called
rewards is the annual teaching award,
which is used at over three quarters of
the universities. These awards are
sometimes compared to beauty contest
prizes, and thus the assumption that
they provide incentive to all teachers to
improve may not hold" (Centra 1976, p.
62).

Results

Successful faculty development pro-
grams have positive advantages for
both faculty and administrators. Faculty
members have expressed "feelings of
revitalization, indicating that their lives
had actually changed as a result of
faculty development activities" (Nelsen
and Siegel 1980, p. 3). From their view-
point, administrators have seen im-
provements in scholarly output on their
campuses, the design of new interdis-
ципinary courses that attract students,
and the increase of collegial interaction
among the faculties. Campuses as a
whole have been improved also, even in
these difficult times. Committee sys-
tems have been streamlined and re-
ward systems clearly formulated as a re-
result of faculty development (Nelsen
and Siegel 1980, p. 3).

But not all faculty development pro-
grams succeed. "Faculty development
will always be to some degree a risk.
The only greater risk would be to do
nothing" (Chait and Gueths 1981, p. 33).

Faculty development, long underem-
phasized, is here with all its attendant
difficulties, problems, and challenges.
The collected wisdom of successful pro-
grams (and failures) can help an admin-
istrator in higher education to chart a
course through the sensitive waters of
collegiality, economic setbacks, and bar-
gaining units.
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