STARS

University of Central Florida

STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2006

Faculty Development In Member Institutions Of The Florida Faculty Development Consortium: Strategic Plans, Evaluation Models, Organization, and Funding

Laura Ross
University of Central Florida

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons

Find similar works at: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd

University of Central Florida Libraries http://library.ucf.edu

STARS Citation

Ross, Laura, "Faculty Development In Member Institutions Of The Florida Faculty Development Consortium: Strategic Plans, Evaluation Models, Organization, and Funding" (2006). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 1001.
https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/1001

University of Central Florida

STARS

Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF THE FLORIDA
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUM: STRATEGIC PLANS, EVALUATION
MODELS, ORGANIZATION, AND FUNDING

by

LAURA O. ROSS
B.A. Heidelberg College, 1980
M.A. The Ohio State University, 1984

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2006

Major Professor: Rosemarye Taylor

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine strategic plans and evaluation models in light of organizational structures and funding to determine if member institutions in the Florida Faculty Development Consortium were investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria. Data were gathered through a mixed method survey mailed electronically to the individuals responsible for faculty development at 31 member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium.

Even though the Consortium was comprised of public and private four-year institutions and public two-year institutions, faculty development programs in these institutions had similarities. Most programs had strategic plans, centralized faculty development units with dedicated staff, and institutional funding. In addition, most faculty development programs had evaluation models in which they collected reactionary responses, but little evidence existed that programs were measuring impact on faculty learning, faculty behavior change, or student success.

It was concluded that member institutions in the Florida Faculty Development Consortium were investing in faculty development and providing faculty developers with dedicated time to attend to faculty development responsibilities. Member institutions were evaluating their efforts on strategic, goal-based criteria, but little evidence existed that they were evaluating based on measurable criteria.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, chair of the dissertation committee, who generously shared her expertise, support, and management skills throughout this process. I also want to thank the other three members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Laura Blasi, Dr. Conrad Katzenmeyer, and Dr. Alison Morrison-Shetlar for their wisdom, guidance, and dedication to the study.

I want to thank the members of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium for agreeing to participate in the study and for their commitment to the field of faculty development in higher education institutions. The establishment of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium is a testament to the vision and generosity of these faculty development specialists.

I want to acknowledge my family: Professor Dorothy Ohl, Dr. Ferris Ohl, and Dr. Vicki Ohl. They have been role models for me my entire life through their dedication to teaching and scholarship.

A special thanks goes to my husband, Jerry Ross, and my son, Kevin Ross, for their patience, encouragement, and advice through every step of this process. I could not have completed this work without their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

AAUP   American Association of University Professors

CAO   Chief Academic Officer

CCSSE   Community College Survey of Student Engagement

FFDC   Florida Faculty Development Consortium

GEM   General Evaluation Model

ICUF   Independent Colleges and Universities in Florida

NCES   National Center for Education Statistics

NCSPOD   National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational

                Development

NFLC   New Faculty Learning Community

NSDC   National Staff Development Council

NSSE   National Survey of Student Engagement

OLN   Ohio Learning Network

POD   Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher

                Education

ROI   Return on Investment

SACS   Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Higher education has seen considerable change over the past two decades—increased enrollment, more unprepared students, more diverse student populations, shrinking funds, faculty turnover, public distrust, and accountability demands (Lyons, McIntosh, & Kysilka, 2003; Stolzenberg, 2002; Wallin, 2002; Watts & Hammons, 2002). Amidst these changes, authors and educators have explored ways to respond to these challenges. Tierney (1998) suggested that higher education should reengineer institutions to create responsive, learning organizations that focus on student learning, faculty productivity, and organizational performance. This focus on learning was also voiced by Senge (1990) who defined a learning organization as an institution "where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together" (p. 3). In a learning organization, people engage in reflection using systems thinking, and they see the interconnectedness of actions and problems (Senge, 1990). This continual process of improvement and reflection may prove to be an effective method for addressing the challenges facing institutions; however, changing a traditional higher education institution to a learning organization involves time, effort, and faculty involvement. To create a learning organization, Tierney suggested that common definitions of excellence and quality must be developed through faculty dialogue, and he stated that faculty development programs provided a "way to stimulate thinking about one's own community functions" (Tierney, 1993, p. 82).

As an outgrowth of these visions for the reengineering of higher education, many institutions have invested in the creation of faculty development programs and centers to foster outstanding teaching and improved learning. Cook and Sorcinelli (2002) described an effective faculty development center in terms reminiscent of Senge and Tierney: "An effective teaching center plays a key role in creating a campus culture that values and rewards teaching. It takes a systems approach to being a change agent and provides synergy to campus support activities" (p. 21). These faculty development centers aim to provide ongoing, interrelated professional development rather than "drive-by staff development," a term coined by Joyner (2000).

As a result, the number of centralized faculty development programs has increased significantly in the past 10 to 15 years (Cook & Sorcinelli, 2002). Grant (2000) documented a rise in spending for faculty development at 300 community colleges across the nation (46% received over 1% of their institutional budget) from previous studies that stated only 25% of faculty development programs received over 1% of their institutional budget (Anderson, 1990; Giordano, 1990). In addition, faculty development programs were now more prevalent at 4-year institutions (Cook & Sorcinelli, 2002).

Faculty development programs were created to orient new faculty members, foster collegiality, promote excellence in teaching, reward teaching excellence, and respond to academic needs (Sorcinelli, Eddy, Austin, and Beach, 2006). Stolzenberg (2002) suggested that faculty development was also important to help faculty meet the challenges of a diverse student population, to acquaint faculty with technological advances, and to prevent faculty burnout.

The methods of delivery for these services varied among faculty development programs. Many programs offered workshops, courses, retreats, and online materials on teaching and learning topics (Stolzenberg, 2002). Faculty development programs have also invited speakers to campus, offered consultation and observation services, loaned books and materials, and provided financial support to faculty for updating curriculum, researching, and traveling to conferences (Sorcinelli, Eddy, Austin, & Beach, 2006). Even though many programs were well funded with multiple full-time staff, others were run by one part-time person or sometimes by a voluntary committee (Sorcinelli, Eddy, Austin, & Beach, 2006). At some institutions, the faculty development program was more of a clearinghouse of information about events sponsored across campus (Sorcinelli, Eddy, Austin, & Beach, 2006).

While higher education institutions disagreed on how faculty development should be organized and funded, they also disagreed on how it should be planned and evaluated. Standard evaluation criteria had not been established for faculty development programs, yet previous researchers had often recommended the need for consistent and effective evaluation (Anderson, 1990; Gaff, 1975; Giordano, 1990; Guskey, 1997; Kirkpatrick, 1994; Young, 1987). This lack of systematic evaluation was contradictory to the principles of a learning organization that faculty development programs support. Even as faculty development programs have promoted evaluation and assessment at the course, program, and institutional levels, systematic evaluation may not be occurring in their own programs. This void could prove detrimental to the funding and the existence of faculty

development programs in the future, especially as accountability becomes more prevalent in higher education.

Statement of Problem

A review of literature indicated that effective and consistent evaluation of faculty development programs may not be occurring in higher education institutions even though evaluation has been highly recommended (Anderson, 1990; Gaff, 1975; Giordano, 1990; Kirkpatrick, 1994; Young, 1987). If faculty development has been implemented as a way to promote excellence in teaching and learning, then evaluation plans should be in place to determine if this intervention has been effective. In this study, evaluation models were examined in light of strategic planning, organizational structures, and funding for the purpose of determining the extent that member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium were investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria.

Theoretical Framework

Theorists have expressed the need for continuous evaluation in learning organizations. Senge (1990) emphasized planning and evaluation in learning organizations through constant reflection, shared vision, and systems thinking. He wrote, "A learning organization is a place where people are continually discovering how they create their reality. And how they can change it" (Senge, 1990, p. 13). Tierney (1993) wrote that assessment should be a dialogue about the processes of educational life as much as about the goals. According to Tierney (1993), "assessment is not something

4

done by, or for, an external organization…[Assessment is] constant, active discussion, debate, and redefinition" (p. 46).

Assessment of an educational program is not a new concept, but approaches to program evaluation have evolved over the years (McNeil, K., Newman, I., & Steinhauser, J., 2005). According to Burke (2005), the 1990s brought a shift in assessment from "complying with rules to producing results" (Burke, 2005, p. 216). Through Massey's (2005) research at the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement, seven principles for quality education were developed that exhibited this shift in assessment:

(a) Define education quality in terms of outcomes, (b) Focus on the processes of teaching, learning, and assessment, (c) Strive for coherence across all educational activities, (d) Work collaboratively to achieve mutual involvement and support, (e) Base decisions on evidence whenever possible, (f) Identify and learn from best practice, and (g) Make continuous improvement a high priority (p. 176-177).

These seven principles reflected the qualities of a learning organization.

The learning organization concepts were also reflected in many of the 22 evaluation models that Stufflebeam described and assessed in 2001. While Stufflebeam (2001) favored nine of the evaluation models, the decision/accountability model scored slightly higher than the others. Stufflebeam (2001) stated: "A major advantage of the approach is that it encourages program personnel to use evaluation continuously and systematically to plan and implement programs that meet beneficiaries' targeted needs. It aids decision making at all program levels and stresses improvement" (p. 58). This

model was representative of the continuous improvement approaches recommended by Senge (1990), Tierney (1993, 1998), and Massey (2005).

Posavac and Carey (2003) favored a model of evaluation for program review that focused on continuous improvement, and so did McNeil, Newman, and Steinhauser (2005) when they encouraged the use of the General Evaluation Model (GEM). The GEM was a continuous process of evaluation with five stages: (a) needs assessment, (b) baseline, (c) procedures to achieve objectives, (d) program implementation assessment, and (e) post assessment (McNeil, Newman & Steinhauser, 2005).

Massey (2005) included "identifying and learning from best practices" in the seven principles of quality education (Massey, 2005). According to Laufgraben, Pica, and Swing (2004), "benchmarking" identified best practices among similar higher education institutions; these best practices could then be shared and implemented to encourage change. Higher education has explored benchmarking as a tool for improving quality and staying competitive (Alstete, 1997). The benchmarking approach has been used in national assessment projects, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and others. Benchmarking was an "ongoing, systematic process for measuring and comparing the work processes of one organization to those of another by bringing an external focus to internal activities, functions, or operations" (Alstete, 1997). According to Laufgraben, Pica, and Swing (2004), benchmarking encouraged improvement over a period of time. While outcome-based assessment, benchmarking, and other evaluation models have been

used in higher education, this trend has not been prevalent in its faculty development programs.

For business and industry, Kirkpatrick (1994, 1996) provided the following reasons for evaluating a staff training program: (a) to determine whether the program should continue, (b) to improve the program, and (c) to validate the existence of the training professional. As early as 1959, Kirkpatrick developed his four-level evaluation model for training programs: reaction, learning, behavior, and results (see Table 1).

Level one measured the reactions of participants to the training program. Level two measured whether knowledge was acquired or skills improved. Level three measured the extent that on-the-job behavior changed, and level four measured results caused by the training. For instance, the behavioral changes might result in increased profits in a business environment, or in the case of higher education, improved student success and retention. Paterno (1994) saw commonalities between business training and faculty development in higher education, and he recognized an application for Kirkpatrick's popular business training evaluation model.

According to Kirkpatrick (1996), all four levels were essential even though "evaluation becomes more difficult, complicated, and expensive as it progresses from level 1 to level 4" (Kirkpatrick, 1996). Kirkpatrick (1996) explained that (a) the participants' reaction could be measured through written comments and suggestions after the activity; (b) learning could be measured with pre- and post-tests; (c) behavior changes could be measured with a control group and follow-up surveys although enough time

7

must be allowed for the change in behavior, and (d) results could also evaluated using a

control group and other measurements conducted both before and after the training.

Table 1: Kirkpatrick four-level evaluation

Level	Description
1	Reaction of participants
2	Learning: Extent that participants change attitudes, improve knowledge or increase skills
3	Behavior: Extent that participants change behavior
4	Results that occur because participants attended the training

Note. From *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels,* by Donald Kirkpatrick, 1994, San Francisco: Publishers Group West, p. 21.

In 1978, O'Banion recommended three levels of evaluation in higher education

faculty development programs that were reminiscent of Kirkpatrick's levels from 1959.

O'Banion's first level included the counting and reaction of participants, and the second

level identified any changes in the participants due to the professional development

(O'Banion, 1978). The third level attempted to link faculty development and student

achievement (O'Banion, 1978). O'Banion (1978) recognized that evaluation at the third

level would be difficult because of the number of variables, but he encouraged faculty

development programs to find ways of identifying the link.

Guskey (1998) wrote of staff development in elementary and secondary schools. Recommending that evaluation become an essential aspect of staff development, Guskey (1998) stated, "good evaluations are deliberate and systematic." Guskey (1998) described three purposes for evaluation: planning evaluation, formative evaluation, and summative evaluation. Guskey (1998) stated that too often programs lacked planning evaluation, so they were not goal-driven or results-driven. Programs also lacked formative evaluations in the form of needs assessments and other early warning evaluations. While faculty development often used summative evaluations, it was meaningless without goals in place, and frequently, summative results were simply participants' reactions (Guskey, 1998). Guskey (1998) recommended five levels of staff development evaluation for schools: "(a) participants' reactions, (b) participants' learning, (c) organizational support and change, (d) participants' use of new knowledge and skills, and (e) student learning outcomes." These five levels were adapted from Kirkpatrick's four-level evaluation model. Guskey (1998) also recommended 12 strategies for collecting reliable information.

According to the literature on faculty development in higher education, a systems approach to continuous improvement—like the outcome-based approaches used in some school systems and businesses—has rarely been reported in higher education faculty development programs (Anderson, 1990; Giordano, 1990; Paterno, 1994; Grant, 2000). Studies reported that many faculty development programs have not implemented the most basic planning evaluation elements, such as goals, objectives, and needs assessments surveys (Anderson, 1990; Giordano, 1990; Paterno, 1994; Grant, 2000). Of

course, collegiate programs have operated differently than school systems and businesses (Tierney, 1998). Collegiate programs have certainly been concerned with fiscal responsibility, but their central concerns have been student learning and a strong academic community rather than the bottom line (Tierney, 1998). School systems also focused on student learning but were highly regulated by governmental restrictions, so they were accustomed to reporting in detail on student achievement, student characteristics, and effectiveness (Zumeta, 2005).

According to Burke (2005), the collegiate approach to accountability varied greatly from the governmental and commercial approaches to accountability. Collegiate accountability focused on inputs, processes, consultations, and peer reviews, yet civic and commercial accountability focused on outcomes, responsiveness, and quantitative evidence (Burke, 2005). Understandably, these opposing perspectives could cause strife and distrust as the public and private industry demand accountability from higher education. Higher education has seen civic and commercial accountability as an "intrusion of independence" (Burke, 2005, p. 9), yet if higher education resisted, it appeared to be "covering self-interest to protect special privileges" (Burke, 2005, p. 9). Regardless of these differences, Tierney (1998) stated, "any organization needs self-assessments to gauge progress and goal completion" (p. 137).

According to McClenney (2005), higher education institutions must build a "culture of evidence" to aspire to the concept of a learning college and to take "collective responsibility for student learning" (p. 14). In a 21st century learning college—where faculty development has played a key role—evaluation and continuous improvement

10

should be an essential part of the faculty development program, too. As Tierney (1998) suggested, evaluation should not be shrouded in fear but in encouragement: "The organization's participants ought to focus their attention on improving the culture of faculty life by discussing in depth, honestly, concretely, and personally, how they as faculty…can improve" (p. 114). Faculty development programs have often been the forum for discussions, but they should also be the topic of discussion and evaluation based on established criteria. This focus on evaluation may not only improve faculty development but also provide evidence for sustaining faculty development in the future.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent are member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria?

2. What are the models of evaluation used in faculty development programs?

3. To what extent are there shared organizational characteristics across faculty development programs?

4. What are the sources of funding, the amount invested per faculty member, and the percentage of the total institutional budget spent on faculty development?

Definition of Terms

Activity—An event planned through the faculty development program, such as a workshop, speaker, or consultation

Evaluation—A process or tool that measures the value and impact of faculty development

Faculty developer—Person responsible for planning and organizing faculty development activities on campus

Faculty development activity—Workshop, seminar, speaker or other type of support offered through the faculty development program.

Faculty development center—Location on campus that supports faculty and provides professional development activities

Faculty development program—Professional development for faculty often organized by a faculty developer or committee

Florida Faculty Development Consortium—Organization of people responsible for planning faculty development activities on higher education campuses in Florida

Formative evaluation— Evaluation conducted during projects or during the improvement of a program to ensure continued progress

Higher education institution—Public community colleges, private 4-year colleges, and public universities

Planning evaluation— Process of strategic planning to develop mission statements, goals and objectives for a program. Needs assessments are often used before or during this process. Planning evaluation ensures that criteria are established for formative and summative evaluation.

Summative evaluation— Evaluation at the end of a project or time period. Evaluates whether the program was successful and should continue.

Methodology

Using a purposeful sample of 31 institutions in Florida during the 2005-2006
school year, this mixed method study documented each institution's model for strategic
planning, evaluation, organizational structure, and funding of its faculty development
program. The purpose of the study was to determine the extent that member institutions
of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium were investing in faculty development
based on strategic and measurable criteria.

The population for this study was 31 faculty developers in Florida higher
education institutions that belonged to the Florida Faculty Development Consortium.
This Consortium was recently established in September 2005 to "[provide] leadership
and [foster] excellence in postsecondary teaching and learning" (Florida Faculty
Development Consortium). The Consortium members were responsible for faculty
development at each of their respective institutions in Florida. The 31 institutions in the
Consortium represented 12 of 28 public community colleges, 9 of 11 public universities,
and 8 of 28 Independent Colleges and Universities in Florida (ICUF). ICUF institutions
are non-profit private institutions in Florida, and, like the public institutions, they are
accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). For a list of
Florida Faculty Development Consortium members, see Table 34 in Appendix A.

Delimitations

1. Only Florida higher education institutions were included in this study.

2. The scope of the study was delimited to faculty developers who belong to the Florida Faculty Development Consortium and were willing to participate in the study.

3. The survey relied only on the data collected from the survey.

4. Data were based on the academic year 2005-2006.

Limitations

1. The findings of the study were generalized only to higher education institutions in Florida that belong to the Florida Faculty Development Consortium. The researcher did not attempt to generalize findings to any other population.

2. Faculty developers were self-reporting, so the accuracy of the data depended on the accuracy of the information they provided.

3. The return rate of responses determined the representative nature of the data and the analysis of the data.

Significance of Study

Evaluation has helped to determine if a training program should be improved, how it should be improved, and whether it should be funded (Kirkpatrick, 1996). Previous studies have recommended evaluation procedures in faculty development programs, but these studies have shown that few institutions do more than a superficial evaluation of faculty development programs and activities (Anderson, 1990; Gaff, 1975; Giordano, 1990; Grant, 2000; Paterno, 1994; Taber, 1997; Young, 1987).

This study documented strategic plans, evaluation models, organization, and funding for faculty development to determine if Florida institutions were investing in

faculty development, based on strategic and measurable criteria. It also documented

whether the historical disconnect between the recommendation for evaluation and the

practice of evaluation existed in Florida faculty development programs.

Florida Statute 1008.31 has required that academic programs in state institutions

establish performance measures and cyclical review (Florida Legislature, 2005; Board of

Governors, 2005). In addition, with the recent change in Florida statutes regarding

community college staff and program development (Florida Statute 6A-14.029, 2004),

this study was a timely review of the faculty development budgets to see if the change in

statute had an effect on funding. A previous statute required community colleges to

devote 2% of their total budgets to staff and program development. In other states,

studies have shown an increase in spending for faculty development in community

colleges over the years. Anderson (1990) and Giordano (1990) reported that 25% of

institutions spent more than 1% of the institutional budget on faculty development, yet

Grant (2000) found that 46% of two-year colleges were spending more than 1% on

faculty development. This study attempted to report more exact percentages devoted to

faculty development in Florida community colleges, but also in Florida universities and

ICUF schools. In addition to funding percentages, this study attempted to identify

investments per faculty member annually for faculty development. This figure had not

been identified in any previous studies in Florida, yet it is a figure that could be useful for

faculty developers when requesting budgets for faculty development.

Finally, this study provided baseline data for the newly organized Florida Faculty

Development Consortium. The data informed the members of the current strategic plans,

evaluation models, organizational structures, and funding in Florida faculty development. As the Consortium grows its network of faculty developers, services, and resources, the data from this study provides a point of comparison for any changes the Consortium may effect in the future. Faculty developers in Florida may use the results of this study to compare with their institution's existing evaluation models, organizational structure, and funding for faculty development. The results may help to establish a standard for the improvement of evaluation methods and for the funding and organization of faculty development in Florida.

The Florida Faculty Development Consortium (FFDC) was an example of networking that was so important in 2006. According to Sorcinelli, Eddy, Austin, and Beach (2006), faculty development has entered a new age that they called the "Age of the Network" (p. 4). With the changes in student demographics and technology, the pressure on faculty members, and the increased expectations placed on institutions, faculty developers must approach this new era by networking with "all stakeholders in higher education" (Sorcinelli, Eddy, Austin, & Beach, 2006, p. 5). The FFDC provided an opportunity for faculty developers to exchange ideas, learn from each other, and improve support for faculty. The results of this study provided an opportunity for the Consortium members to discuss whether their institutions were investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria in light of strategic plans, evaluation models, organizational structures, and funding.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Challenges in Higher Education

Higher education institutions have been facing many challenges: (a) increased

enrollments, (b) diverse student populations, (c) unprepared students, (d) shrinking

financial support, and (e) increased demand from the public for accountability (Lyons,

McIntosh, & Kysilka, 2003; Stolzenberg, 2002; Wallin, 2002; Watts & Hammons, 2002).

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2004), enrollment in

undergraduate institutions increased by 17% between 1982 and 1992, then another 15%

between 1998 and 2002. As enrollments increased, demographics changed and student

populations became more diverse (Lyons, McIntosh, & Kysilka, 2003; Watts &

Hammons, 2002). In 1976, 15% of college students were minorities compared to 29%

minorities as reported in 2002 (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES],

"Digest," 2004). In 2003-2004, 33% of undergraduates identified themselves as a race

other than white (Horn & Nevill, 2006).

Increased enrollments also brought more students that were unprepared for

college-level work (Lyons, McIntosh, & Kysilka, 2003; Watts & Hammons, 2002). In 2-

year colleges, 61% of students enrolled in at least one remedial course between 1992 and

2000; at 4-year institutions, 25% enrolled in at least one remedial course (NCES,

"Contexts," 2004). In addition, the average length of time students spent in remediation

increased from 33% to 40% between 1995 and 2000 (NCES, "Student Effort," 2004).

Unfortunately, government appropriations for public institutions did not increase

as rapidly as the enrollments, the diverse populations, and the unprepared students. In

public institutions, government appropriations per student increased just 3% from 1970 to 2000 while tuition and fees per student increased 99% (NCES, 2005). As government financial support for higher education lagged during this time period, the public confidence eroded, declining to 27% in 1995 from 61% in 1966 (Kerr, 1997; Keller, 2001). According to Fowler (2004), not only did public trust wane, but an ideological shift occurred in regard to educational politics during these years: "the focus… shifted from equality to issues relating to excellence, accountability, and choice" (p. 5). Lederman (2006) stated that higher education has felt increasing pressure to prove it was accomplishing its objectives, especially after a recent federal study stated that only 25% of American college graduates were proficient on a set of literacy standards. Beginning in March 2006, higher education unveiled its first national advertising campaign to improve its image (Cohen, 2006). Over 400 colleges and universities contributed to the $4.5 million dollar campaign to convince the public that higher education was "essential to the country's future and should be a state and national funding priority" (Cohen, 2006).

The Faculty

The challenges facing higher education institutions have had an impact on the professoriate. Rising enrollments have caused a hiring boom at the same time when many faculty members were retiring (Evelyn, 2001; Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998). According to Sorcinelli, Eddy, Austin, and Beach (2006), "For the first time in decades, higher education institutions must replace a substantial portion of the professoriate" (p. xvi). Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster (1998) studied the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty in 1993, and reported that professors with fewer than 7 years experience already

constituted one-third of the total full-time faculty, a considerable influx of new instructors. Other estimates suggest that faculty ranks in community colleges may have experienced a 40% turnover at the beginning of the 21st century (Amey, 1999).

Among these ranks of new faculty members were larger numbers of part-time faculty and non-tenure track faculty, primarily due to financial constraints (Rice, Finkelstein, Hall, & Schuster, 2004). Rice, Finkelstein, Hall, and Schuster (2004) reported that half of the million or so faculty in the United States were part-time, and 55.4% of all full-time professors hired in 2001 were hired for non-tenure track positions. In comparison, in 1969, fewer than 2% of full-time faculty members were hired in non-tenure track roles (Rice, Finkelstein, Hall, & Schuster, 2004).

Being a new faculty member has its own set of challenges. Sorcinelli (1994) reported that new faculty members often struggle with (a) heavy workload, (b) the lack of collegial interaction, (c) inadequate feedback, and (d) unrealistic expectations. Boice (1992) conducted research on four successive cohorts of new faculty members at his university. Boice (1992) discovered that collegiality—the support and acceptance of fellow professors—was important to the success of the new faculty member, yet new faculty members consistently reported feeling lonely, isolated, and overworked. Through research, Boice (1992) recognized a number of "quick starters," new faculty who showed signs of early success. They socialized with other faculty by asking for help and advice, and they collaborated with colleagues on research projects. Boice (1992) reported that it took three to four years for most faculty members to feel less stressed and more accepted at the institution.

In addition, new faculty struggled with teaching responsibilities and publishing requirements (Boice, 1992). Boice found that most new professors taught as they were taught, and they had a difficult time balancing the time in their lives for scholarly writing. Many of these higher education faculty members were hired based on their research and had no coursework or experience with teaching and learning theory (Rifkin, 2000). According to Rifkin (2000), "new faculty members report that while in graduate school, they learned virtually nothing about effective teaching, the norms of academia, or being a productive faculty member." To combat these issues facing new faculty, Boice (1992) recommended mentoring, faculty orientation, and development programs to help professors develop basic teaching skills and adjust to the campus.

Experienced faculty members have also faced challenges in higher education. Their student populations have become more diverse, more unprepared, and more accustomed to working with technology. While 15% of U.S. professors were minorities in 2003 (NCES, "Digest," 2004), 33% of the students in the classrooms were from diverse backgrounds (Horn & Nevill, 2006). While the mean age of professors was 49 (NCES, "Background Characteristics," 2001), the mean age of undergraduates was 26, with 47% between the ages of 19 and 23 (Horn & Nevill, 2006). Students born between 1982 and 2000 were considered part of the Millennial Generation, one that varied significantly from the Baby Boomers or Generation X (Lyons, McIntosh, & Kysilka, 2003). The Millennial Generation grew up with standardized testing, technology, and a child-centered society (Lyons, McIntosh, & Kysilka, 2003). According to Lyons, McIntosh, and Kysilka (2003), when teaching students in the Millennial Generation,

faculty must use technology in instruction, incorporate team-based methods of teaching, and reinforce ethics and professional standards. Many experienced professors may not be familiar with these kinds of teaching approaches or with infusing multi-cultural concepts and sensitivity into their syllabi (Lyons, McIntosh, and Kysilka, 2003).

Educational technology has advanced so quickly that it has been difficult for even the most technical professors to stay updated. In 1993, 40% of faculty in the United States reported no or poor access to personal computers (Amey, 1999). By 1998, 78% of full-time faculty members reported that they had Internet at home and work, and that they had used e-mail to communicate with students (Warburton, Chen, & Bradburn, 2002). Forty percent of professors reported using course specific websites in 1998 (Warburton, Chen, & Bradburn, 2002). Professors have increased their technology skills, and faculty development programs have often helped to advance these skills (Stolzenberg, 2002).

Experienced faculty members have also been challenged by the concept of the "learning organization" (O'Banion, 1978; Senge, 1990; Tierney, 1993). The increased emphasis on learning and assessment has resulted in a change in faculty roles and responsibilities (Amey, 1999). Veteran faculty may be more comfortable with lecturing and other traditional teaching methodologies, but they have been encouraged to become "facilitators of learning" and practice the "scholarship of teaching" (Amey, 1999, p. 44). Depending on the speed and extent that these new responsibilities have been implemented, faculty may have experienced an increase in burnout and low morale (Amey, 1999). Stolzenberg (2002) suggested that faculty development could help prevent burnout for veteran professors in these circumstances.

Another change facing veteran faculty has been post-tenure review. Chait (2002) traced the public outcry against tenure, which began in the 1960s and steadily increased. By the 1990s, tenure—once an honor—was now viewed by the public as an undeserved privilege (Chait, 2002). Higher education has reacted to this controversy by increasing the number of non-tenure track positions and part-time positions (Chait, 2002). In addition, the number of states using post-tenure reviews has increased. In 1989, 3 of 46 states surveyed had institutions using post-tenure review, but by 1999, 37 states had institutions using post-tenure review (Chait, 2002). Although the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) condemned the practice in a 1983 statement, by 1997, attitudes had changed, and AAUP published minimum standards for a formal system of post-tenure review (Licata & Morreale, 1999). The AAUP statement suggested that post-tenure review systems should be designed to support professional development of faculty (Licata & Morreale, 1999). While different forms of post-tenure review have been created, professional development activities and plans have often become an integral part of these processes (Licata & Morreale, 1999).

Therefore, to respond to the challenges facing new and veteran faculty in higher education, many institutions have added or expanded faculty development programs. These programs have evolved over the past decades to meet the needs of the faculty, the institutions, and the students. In *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Future,* Sorcinelli, Eddy, Austin, and Beach (2006) provided a brief history of faculty development by identifying five time periods. The first stage, the "Age of the Scholar," described the 1950s and 1960s when faculty

development referred to individual scholarly activities, such as sabbaticals and travel to conferences. In the "Age of the Teacher," during the 1960s and 1970s, the focus turned to the improvement of teaching, and faculty development programs began appearing. The 1980s were the "Age of the Developer" when faculty development programs expanded their offerings and their funding sources. The "Age of the Learner" defined the 1990s with the learning college concept and increased numbers of teaching and learning centers. According to Sorcinelli, Eddy, Austin, and Beach (2006), the new millennium began the "Age of the Network." Faculty developers were no longer remaining in their corner of the campus; they were being called upon to work with administration and other areas of the college to respond to changes and address institutional goals. Networking has become important within the institution but also among institutions to collaborate on complex issues and concerns.

<center>Organizational Characteristics of Faculty Development</center>

Throughout the stages of faculty development, researchers have studied its many characteristics. One of the earliest occurred when Gaff (1975) described the state of faculty development in the 1970s. It was a time when many faculty members were tenured and immobile. The challenge for faculty development during that time period was to keep faculty vital and the campus culture energized. Gaff identified three kinds of instructional improvement programs that were occurring: (a) faculty development (focus on faculty members to acquire knowledge and skills related to teaching), (b) instructional development (focus on curricula to improve student learning), and (c) organizational development (focus on the organization to support effective teaching and learning).

<center>23</center>

In 1990, Giordano examined the organizational characteristics of faculty development in Illinois community colleges. While 80% of the 38 community colleges that responded had faculty development activities, the activities were primarily organized by administrators (Giordano, 1990). The average amount of time these organizers spent on faculty development was 12% of their workload (Giordano, 1990). Giordano stated that Illinois community colleges were more than likely offering "activities for faculty" rather than "faculty development programs" (1990, p. 123).

In Washington, Anderson (1990) reported that approximately one-third of the 23 surveyed community colleges had a designated faculty developer, who was commonly allotted with release time. Anderson also found that regional and statewide coordination of professional development existed in Washington, and that more than half of the community colleges participated in the regional events.

In 1999, Murray conducted a national survey of 250 public two-year colleges. Murray (1999) sent the survey to the chief academic officers who were then asked to forward the survey to those responsible for faculty development. Findings included that 83% of the respondents spent less than 50% of their time on faculty development, and 43% spent less than 10% of their time. These percentages indicated a lack of institutional commitment to faculty development that was reflected in earlier studies (Murray, 1999). Murray also found that colleges were offering random activities for faculty development rather than having a unified plan with clear objectives. These findings were similar to the findings of Giordano (1990) and Anderson (1990).

By 2002, Grant and Keim reported in a national study that 90% of 300 two-year colleges had formal faculty development programs, and more institutions had dedicated staff that organized faculty development. The researchers reported 52% of two-year colleges had a designated faculty developer. These faculty developers were often allotted with release time and frequently held additional positions at the institution. When a faculty developer was not appointed, then the vice president for instruction (53%) or a faculty committee (39%) was usually responsible for faculty development. Program practices centered on professional, personal, curricular, and organizational topics (Grant & Keim, 2002). The addition of personal growth topics was a change from the findings of previous studies.

Wright (2002) indicated that several factors influenced the organizational structure of faculty development at an institution. Institutional characteristics (mission, size, student population) influenced the institutional needs and the responses to those needs. According to Wright, other influences on faculty development structures included faculty needs and the history of faculty development at the institution. The final influence was, of course, availability of resources. The researcher identified four main structures of faculty development: (a) single, campus-wide structure with dedicated staff, (b) multi-campus cooperative program, such as a consortium or state program (c) special purpose center designed to address particular needs like technology training, and (d) faculty development components that were part of academic affairs and supported with limited funds (Wright, 2002).

While Wright (2002) defined four organizational structures, the number of single, campus-wide structures was the growing category. Singer (2002) estimated that over 300 institutions nationwide had teaching and learning centers—a physical location on campus for faculty development. Singer claimed that these centers provided high visibility for faculty development and quality support for faculty. While teaching and learning centers may have begun as places for remediation, she stated that these centers and their staff were now catalysts for leading-edge teaching and for discussions about educational issues (Singer, 2002).

In 2006, one of the most recent studies of faculty development was conducted by Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach. The researchers received surveys from over four hundred faculty developers associated with Professional and Organizational Development in Higher Education (POD Network). Faculty developers participated from 400 institutions in the United States and 31 from Canada. Participants represented research and doctoral universities, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive colleges, and two-year colleges. Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach inquired about faculty development programs, services, the importance of the services, and future challenges. The researchers also classified organizational characteristics into four categories. Of the 400 institutions surveyed, 54% had a centralized teaching and learning center with dedicated staff; 19% had a faculty member or administrator that organized faculty development; 12% had a committee that organized faculty development; and 4% of faculty development programs acted as a clearinghouse for programs and offerings. Another 11% of institutions described their faculty development as "other." In addition, they reported

on the primary titles of those responsible for faculty development: (a) 33% were directors of faculty development, (b) 21% were faculty, and (c) 23% were senior administrators. Seventy percent of participants reported having two titles, with the most common combination being "director" and "faculty" (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach, 2006).

Over the years, the organizational characteristics have changed for faculty development. According to the literature, more institutions were designating faculty developers rather than senior administrators or faculty committees to be responsible for faculty development activities. As a result, the time that faculty developers devoted to professional development activities had also increased. In addition, teaching and learning centers now existed on over 300 college campuses (Singer, 2002). All of these changes indicated a stronger commitment on the part of institutions to support faculty development even though the types of organizational structures varied.

Strategic Planning and Faculty Development

Central to the learning college concept is incorporating the goal of student learning for all entities on campus, including faculty development (Senge, 1990; Tierney, 1993). O'Banion (1978) recommended that faculty development programs develop a statement of philosophy, goals and objectives that tie to the institutional mission of student learning. In addition, O'Banion emphasized the importance of using needs assessment tools to determine administrative support, institutional needs, faculty needs, and resources available.

In 1987, Young called for a goals evaluation of faculty development programs. He stated that a faculty development program must meet its intended goals, but it must

also determine whether the goals are worthwhile. Although Young found evidence in faculty development programs of surveys and a few case studies, he found no evidence of goals based evaluation. Even if programs regularly collected data on the number of faculty served, the impact on teaching, and the effect on student learning, Young stated that it was often not known whether these indicators were the most important in terms of the existing purposes of the program, its resources, the characteristics of the institution, and the experiences of similar programs.

When Giordano (1990) surveyed program administrators about faculty development programs at 38 Illinois community colleges, she found that few (36%) of the programs had formal goals, objectives, and evaluation plans. However, 64.7% conducted needs assessments. Anderson (1990) surveyed 23 community colleges in Washington. She found that needs assessments were used by 43% of the 23 community colleges to determine programming.

Paterno (1994) surveyed chief academic officers and faculty at 52 Texas community colleges to identify the elements and evaluation procedures of faculty development programs. Then he interviewed 36 faculty members at 6 community colleges within the Texas system. The findings revealed that 21 (40%) of chief academic officers said that needs assessments were used to plan programming. However, only ten faculty members (28%) stated that needs assessments had been used. The researcher also reported that 16 chief academic officers (31%) reported that their college had written program goals and objectives for faculty development.

In 1999, Murray prepared a literature review and collected national data on faculty development. The literature review offered a list of elements necessary for effective faculty development plans: (a) institutional support, (b) a structured, goal-oriented program, (c) a connection between faculty development and a reward structure, (d) faculty ownership in the program, (e) colleague support for teaching and learning, and (f) administrative appreciation for good teaching (Murray, 1999). The researcher then administered a survey to the chief academic officers in 250 public two-year colleges. The chief academic officers were instructed to pass along the survey to those responsible for faculty development at their college. Murray found that colleges were offering random activities for faculty development rather than having a unified plan with clear objectives. According to Murray, "the lack of leadership and a formalized, structured program indicated serious detriments to effective faculty development" (p. 65).

A few years later, Murray (2002a) wrote "The Current State of Faculty Development in Two-Year Colleges." In this article, he again reviewed the faculty development literature to explain why "costly efforts have produced only meager results" (p. 89). The author stated that most faculty development programs do not have goals, and even fewer have goals linked to institutional goals. Second, Murray stated that faculty development programs lacked evaluation efforts primarily because they lacked goals and measurable criteria. Finally, the author stated that low faculty participation was another reason for failure of faculty development programs.

Hawley and Valli (1999) also identified a lack of planning and coherence in faculty development activities. They recommended a shift in professional development

for educators, stating: "This new consensus calls for providing collegial opportunities to learn that are linked to solving authentic problems defined by the gaps between goals for student achievement and actual student performance" (Hawley & Valli, 1999, p. 127). Hawley and Valli (1999) suggested that faculty development should be driven by goals and standards for student learning.

In 2002, Wallin emphasized strategic planning as an important part of her four elements necessary for effective faculty development: (a) making faculty development an institutional priority, (b) identifying the faculty development needs, (c) creating a systematic faculty development program that supports institutional goals, and (d) developing a vision for faculty development based on administrative commitment, faculty input, and consistent evaluation. According to Wallin (2002), faculty development of this nature could "build a world of learners" (p. 32).

Sorcinelli (2002) also encouraged strategic planning in her ten principles for creating and sustaining effective teaching and learning centers. Principle five stated that successful faculty development programs establish mission statements and goals for their programs (Sorcinelli, 2002). Sorcinelli suggested that faculty developers should not only establish goals, but they should communicate the goals to the campus and determine how the goals would be assessed. This strategic approach could help plan activities and guide budget decisions (Sorcinelli, 2002).

Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006) surveyed faculty developers from 400 institutions. The researchers did not ask faculty developers if their programs had

articulated goals. However, these developers were asked to identify the goals that guided

their programs. The top three primary goals were:

> (a) Creating or sustaining a culture of teaching excellence (selected by 72% of
>
>   respondents)
>
> (b) Responding to individual faculty members' needs (selected by 56% of
>
>   respondents)
>
> (c) Advancing new initiatives in teaching and learning (selected by 49% of
>
>   respondents)
>
> (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006, p. 43)

According to the authors, these selections indicated a shift in focus from previous studies

that reflected more emphasis on the individual growth of faculty members. These

previous studies included Centra (1976) and Ericson (1986) (as cited in Sorcinelli,

Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). While individual faculty growth still remained an

important goal, it was overshadowed by the focus on teaching excellence, perhaps a

change influenced by the implementation of student learning outcomes (Sorcinelli,

Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006).

When Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006) asked who influenced the

faculty development program goals, the top response was faculty, followed by the faculty

development director and senior-level administrators. According to the researchers, the

primary influence indicated that faculty development programs were listening to faculty

and probably making use of needs assessment tools: faculty interviews, focus groups,

surveys, and advisory committees (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006).

While using strategic planning in faculty development has been highly recommended, studies have revealed that many programs were not articulating their goals and objectives. Previous studies have also indicated that faculty development programs may not be using needs assessments on a regular basis to determine programming.

Evaluation of Faculty Development

Gaff (1975) was one of the first to recognize an absence of evaluation of faculty development programs. Although he excused this trend because most faculty development programs were so new, Gaff was concerned with this lack of evaluation. Not long after, Eble and McKeatchie (1985) were examining evaluation procedures for faculty development. Eble and McKeatchie visited colleges to survey faculty members about their experiences with the Bush Faculty Development Grant. The Bush Foundation began funding professional development with the Bush Faculty Development Grant in 1979. Out of 45 institutions that benefited from the grant, 41 institutions from 3 states participated in the study. One aspect of the research examined the evaluation process at each institution. Although every institution had been required to develop a plan for evaluating effectiveness of the grant, the researchers found that few colleges had much data. There were several reasons for this result. Some colleges were just in the first or second year of a three-year grant. Some relied only on the reactions of the participants or the opinion of an outside consultant. Others were unsure how to approach evaluation (Eble & McKeatchie, 1985).

Eble and McKeatchie (1985) assessed the effectiveness of the institutions' implementation of the Bush Faculty Development Grant by examining these criteria: (a)

faculty involvement in planning and programming, (b) faculty attendance and participation, (c) institutional effects (changes in teaching norms, curricular changes, organizational changes), and (d) individual effects (changes in morale, cognitive learning, publications). The researchers concluded that faculty development programs could be evaluated and could have a positive influence on an institution. They admitted that evaluation could be difficult, particularly evaluations producing quantitative data. However, Eble and McKeatchie recommended multiple evaluation criteria and approaches, such as interviews and questionnaires from faculty, administrators, and external evaluators.

Giordano (1990) surveyed program administrators about faculty development programs at 38 Illinois community colleges, and she found that few of the programs had formal goals, objectives, and evaluation plans. The findings indicated that evaluation of faculty development activities was primarily subjective; only 27.5% had conducted evaluations of activities. However, 64.7% conducted needs assessments. The most frequently used method of needs assessment was the survey method (Giordano, 1990).

Also in 1990, Anderson studied faculty development programs in 23 Washington community colleges. Faculty developers were surveyed on practices, content, coordination, audience, funding, and evaluation. The researcher reported that 3 (13%) of the 23 community colleges had a formal process for evaluation with established criteria.

Paterno (1994) surveyed chief academic officers and faculty at 52 Texas community colleges to identify the elements and evaluation procedures of faculty development programs. Then he interviewed 36 faculty members who participated in

faculty development activities at 6 community colleges. To classify the type of evaluation procedures, Paterno used Kirpatrick's (1994, 1996, 2004) levels of evaluation: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. He found that most programs were evaluating faculty development at a reaction level, based on Kirkpatrick's model (Kirkpatrick, 1994, 1996, 2004). Thirty-five administrators (67%) and 35 faculty members (97%) reported the use of reactionary evaluation tools (level 1). According to the chief academic officers, 48% of institutions were evaluating the knowledge or learning gained through faculty development (level 2). In contrast, only 19% of faculty interviewed stated that their learning levels had been evaluated (level 2). Chief academic officers said that 21% of institutions were evaluating faculty development using student outcomes (level 4), compared to 14% of faculty who felt that student outcomes were used. According to Paterno, evaluation procedures at a behavior level or a results level were used at few community colleges.

Three years later, Taber (1997) surveyed 615 Alabama faculty from two-year colleges to assess the faculty development needs. He reported that the top three development needs were related to instruction, technology, and organizational issues. Based on his findings, Taber recommended a statewide system that tracked the progress of faculty development within each college and region and a statewide system that shared resources. The researcher also recommended the regular use of needs assessments and reward systems in connection with faculty development (Taber, 1997).

Murray (2002b) sent questionnaires to the chief academic officers (CAOs) at 311 two-year colleges in a study he conducted in 2000. The colleges were all accredited by

the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).   The CAOs were asked to forward the survey to the person responsible for faculty development. The participants identified the types of development activities on their campus, how effective the activities were, and how they were evaluated. Participants also identified the tools used for evaluation of faculty development activities on their campuses. All colleges reported the presence of faculty development activities, but Murray noticed that many activities were traditional in nature: sabbaticals, travel to discipline-based conferences, workshops and release times. The researcher also found that evaluation of faculty development activities was rarely based on measurable criteria and was seldom tied to institutional goals. Murray stated that "perception of effectiveness appears to be based more upon intuition and past practices than upon empirical data."

During this same time period, Grant (2000) conducted a study of faculty development in publicly supported two-year colleges throughout the United States. A random sample of 300 two-year colleges was surveyed on faculty development practices, programming, coordination, funding, and evaluation. Of the 300 institutions, 93% had formal faculty development programs. Grant (2000) reported that 47% of the two-year colleges had a formal evaluation process for faculty development. Of colleges that did evaluate, 42% had established criteria for evaluation.

Also in 2000, Sydow reviewed the literature and reported a limited presence of quantitative data on the effectiveness of professional development programs throughout the country. She then conducted a study to report on the progress of the Professional Development Initiative at the Virginia Community College System (VCCS). Sydow

collected data from VCCS faculty to compare to data collected in 1993 before the

Virginia professional development project began.   In the 2,137 returned questionnaires,

VCCS faculty reported increased attendance at professional conferences, increased

experimentation with innovative teaching, and significant revisions of syllabi. Overall,

81% of VCCS faculty said the VCCS Professional Development Initiative had been

successful. This study went beyond measuring participants' reactions (level 1); it

measured behavioral changes in faculty, which was Kirkpatrick's level-three analysis.

Although 24% of VCCS faculty claimed the program had enhanced student learning

(level 4), no verification was made on this claim (Sydow, 2000).

Watts and Hammons (2002) encouraged Kirkpatrick's (1994, 1996, 2004) four-

level approach to evaluation of faculty development. However, the authors stated that

level-three and level-four analyses were rarely used. The fourth level might identify

improvement in student learning resulting from faculty development, a results

measurement encouraged by Guskey (1997), Kirkpatrick (1994, 1996, 2004), and Watts

and Hammons (2002). According to Watts and Hammons, evaluation was one of the

biggest challenges for faculty development programs.

Sorcinelli (2002) recommended evaluation of faculty development programs in

her ten principles for creating and sustaining teaching and learning centers. According to

Sorcinelli, programs should evaluate "faculty participation, satisfaction, changes in

teaching behaviors, student learning outcomes, and changes in the culture for teaching

and learning on campus" (p. 16). She stated that evaluation provided feedback for

improvement and satisfied the demand for accountability. As an example, at Sorcinelli's

institution, annual reports of faculty development were mailed to senior administrators, deans, chairs, and faculty for accountability purposes (Sorcinelli, 2002).

Faculty development programs may not be evaluating for several reasons. In some cases, faculty developers were skeptical of the evaluation methods and the motivation behind the evaluation. According to a study by Welsh and Metcalf (2003), skepticism was one obstacle that stood in the way of effectiveness activities. From 1998 to 2000, Welsh and Metcalf (2003) received survey responses from 386 faculty at institutions being reviewed by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Welsh and Metcalf (2003) suggested that three elements would help cultivate faculty support toward institutional effectiveness activities: (a) the primary motivation for the activities must be improvement not evaluation, (b) faculty must be personally involved in the activities, and (c) activities must promote outcome-based perspectives.

Outside of higher education, other institutions with staff development programs have identified ways to evaluate the effectiveness of staff development and justify its existence. In the primary and secondary school systems, the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) has provided support and education for professional development efforts. The NSDC established Standards for Staff Development in 1994 for the purpose of inspiring improvement and providing guidelines to superintendents, principals, and staff developers (Sparks, 2001). These standards were designed with three categories: (a) the content learned by teachers, (b) the process for learning, and (c) the context—or organizational culture—for learning (Sparks, 2001) (see Appendix B). According to NSDC, staff development programs must provide well-designed evaluation that addresses

37

two purposes: "(a) improving the quality of staff development and (b) determining the results of staff development based on intended outcomes" (National Staff Development Council). Effective evaluation should assess the following: "(a) initial collection of data on participants' reactions, (b) teachers' acquisition of knowledge and skills, (c) how the learning affects teaching, (d) how new teaching practices affect student learning, and (e) how staff development has affected school culture" (National Staff Development Council).

While the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) would like to prove that staff development in the schools increases student learning outcomes, it has acknowledged that the proof does not exist and that staff development alone would not produce this change. "To produce greater results for students, professional learning must be embedded into a system of comprehensive reform" (Killion, 2002, p. 9). The NSDC has advocated that every school become a learning organization where educators frequently collaborate to promote continuous improvement.

Guskey (1997) prepared a literature review of evaluation procedures for staff development in the elementary and secondary school systems. He stated, "We're still not sure precisely which elements contribute most to effective professional development, what formats or specific practices are most efficacious, or precisely how professional development contributes to improved teaching and learning." According to Guskey, researchers of staff development programs had not agreed on evaluation criteria. He stated that staff development had been measured in different ways: (a) identifying the participants' reaction to staff development, (b) measuring the knowledge acquired, (c)

measuring the application of knowledge, and (d) measuring the effect on student learning. These evaluation methods were certainly reflective of Kirkpatrick's (1994, 1996, 2004) four-level evaluation model. Guskey also stated that both quantitative and qualitative indicators of effectiveness were important. He suggested an identification and measurement of staff development efforts that resulted in increased student learning in multiple cases (Guskey, 1997).

In 2002, the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) followed Guskey's 1997 recommendation and published *What Works in the Elementary School: Results-Based Staff Development* (Killion, 2002). NSDC identified 32 staff development programs that were linked to increased student learning. The NSDC was careful not to claim the programs caused student learning but that a positive correlation existed between staff development and student learning. To select the 32 programs, four criteria were used: "(a) evidence of student improvement, (b) well-defined professional development programs, (c) content-specific professional development programs, and (d) programs that were used at multiple schools or districts" (Killion, 2002, p. 29). In particular, researchers looked for programs that were relevant, in-depth, and coherent (Killion, 2002). To measure the impact of staff development on student achievement, researchers used quasi-experimental methods (Killion, 2002). Students were not randomly assigned to treatment and control groups, but some adjustments were made to allow for differences between control and treatment groups. In addition, the data were provided from single-year rather than multi-year studies. Even though the evaluation designs did not provide proof of a causal connection between staff development and student learning, the NSDC

stated that the research did provide evidence that staff development was related to student achievement (Killion, 2002).

Shaha, Lewis, O'Donnell, and Brown (2004) also created a model for evaluating professional development in elementary and secondary schools. Encouraging a multi-dimensional approach, the authors recommended measuring learning impacts, attitudinal impacts, and resource impacts with teacher learning and student learning. In the case study, the experimental group included teachers receiving professional development for reading instruction, and the control group included teachers who received no professional development for reading instruction. Both teacher groups were measured for learning and attitudinal impacts. Student achievements and attitudes were also measured. The control group included 262 students, and the experimental group had 479 students. In both comparisons, the experimental groups of teachers and students scored higher in achievement and attitude. While the study was unable to collect resource impacts, the previous findings indicated that the less expensive professional development materials were just as effective as the more expensive materials, so the school system in the study saved over $100,000.00 by purchasing the less expensive materials (Shaha, Lewis, O'Donnell, and Brown, 2004).

Business and industry has also focused on the evaluation of staff training. For staff training programs in business and industry, Kirkpatrick (1994, 1996, 2004) advocated a four-level, systematic model of evaluation that focused on reaction, learning, behavioral change, and impact on the organization. Kirkpatrick (1994) also listed the following factors necessary for an effective training program:

1. Determining needs

2. Setting objectives

3. Determining subject content

4. Selecting participants

5. Determining the best schedule

6. Selecting appropriate facilities

7. Selecting appropriate instructors

8. Selecting and preparing audiovisual aids

9. Coordinating the program

10. Evaluating the program (Kirkpatrick, 1994, p. 3)

Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2005) adopted Kirkpatrick's four-level evaluation in conjunction with a balanced scorecard to create a management system in the business world. All managers in a company using this system received monthly, one-page scorecards that reported key data related to the company strategy. An important feature of the monthly scorecards by Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2005) was the display of the four training evaluation levels. As a result, every manager knew how and when training generated results. Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2005) stated, "The key to [transferring learning into behavior] depends on the balance of two forces, support and accountability" (p. 64).

A number of theorists have built on Kirkpatrick's model, including Phillips and Stone (2002). Phillips and Stone (2002) expanded Kirkpatrick's (1994) four-level evaluation plan by adding a fifth level: return on investment (ROI). Like Kirkpatrick

(1994), Phillips and Stone (2002) wrote from the perspective of training in business and industry, and they recognized the difficulties behind evaluating training programs. Even in business and industry, Phillips and Stone (2002) saw that evaluation was often limited to "participant-reaction smile sheets and self-reported learning, which are easy to complete and tend to reflect positive results" (p. xiv). Trainers and managers have thought that more meaningful training results could not be measured because evaluation was too difficult or too expensive and that training results could not be isolated from other influences (Phillips & Stone, 2002). To address these concerns, Phillips and Stone (2002) developed a systematic approach to training evaluation, using eight steps: (a) develop training objectives, (b) develop evaluation plans and baseline data, (c) collect data during training (levels 1 and 2), (d) collect data after training (levels 3 and 4), (e) isolate the effects of training, (f) convert data to monetary data, (g) identify costs of training, and (h) calculate the return on investment (level 5) (Phillips & Stone, 2002, pp. 23-26). Levels 3, 4, and 5 were more difficult and expensive to incorporate into an evaluation plan, but they could be used less frequently by incorporating sampling methods (Phillips & Stone, 2002).

Lansing Community College in Lansing, Michigan, was the first higher education institution to incorporate ROI principles (Cardenas, 2006). According to Cardenas, the college is working closely with Phillips and the ROI Institute to incorporate the methodology and increase accountability for many of its processes. All eight steps were not conducted for every educational procedure; the full impact studies were reserved for highly visible, expensive, or political endeavors (Cardenas, 2006). For example, full

impact studies were conducted on the registration process and the grievance process.

Cardenas reported that it cost her college $525.00 to register each student and $6500.00

per sexual harassment grievance. Although not every process can be converted to a

monetary value, Cardenas (2006) reported that the approach has inspired a continuous

improvement system with objective results. The ROI methodology has not yet been

applied to faculty development at Lansing Community College (J. Cardenas, personal

communication, June 18, 2006).

Although studies rarely report empirical data measuring the effectiveness of

faculty development in higher education, there has been anecdotal evidence that a few

colleges were conducting thorough evaluations of their programs. For example, at The

Community College of Baltimore County, where Learning Communities were organized

for new faculty members, an assessment tool was developed that was reminiscent of

Kirkpatrick's four levels (Ebersole & Mince, 2006). According to Ebersole and Mince,

the New Faculty Learning Community (NFLC) measured its success in multiple ways.

First of all, an open-ended survey was distributed to record the participants' reaction to

the program (level 1). Secondly, the program coordinators conducted a pre and post

survey of the learning college principles for the participants in the NFLC (level 2).

Third, to determine teaching effectiveness and application of learning college principles,

The Community College of Baltimore County used a national survey—SIR II—for their

students' perception of instruction. A comparison of SIR II means was conducted

between participants in NFLC and non-participants (level 3). Finally, actual student

outcomes were compared between classes of participant professors and classes of non-

participant professors (level 4). Students were given pre and post tests to compare the amount of increased learning in the control and experimental groups (Ebersole & Mince, 2006).

The literature review on the evaluation of faculty development revealed limited established criteria or quantitative data on the effectiveness of these programs. While the reactions of faculty were often collected (summative evaluation), data on faculty learning, organizational change, faculty behavior change or student learning rarely was collected or reported. In addition, few studies reported the frequent use of planning evaluation or formative evaluation through the use of needs assessments or goals, especially goals tied to institutional goals. Anecdotal evidence existed that some colleges were evaluating faculty development in a meaningful way based on established criteria, but studies did not reveal this was a common phenomenon.

<div align="center">Funding of Faculty Development</div>

According to Murray (2002), "The increasing calls by the public for accountability in higher education means that colleges may be called to account for their use of public funds for faculty development. The absence of demonstrable effects on student learning could in fact lead to reduced funding from state governing boards" (p. 93). According to Kirkpatrick (1996), most supervisors do not interfere with training programs unless budgets are tight. During those times, training programs may be deemed expendable if trainers do not have proof of program effectiveness (Kirkpatrick, 1996). Unfortunately, budgets in higher education institutions have already been restricted for many faculty development programs (Gaff, 1975; Anderson, 1990; Giordano, 1990).

According to Giordano (1990) and Grant (2000), in 1988, the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCSPOD) recommended that 2% to 5% of an institution's budget should be devoted to faculty development, but the following studies indicate the recommendation has not been followed.

Back in the 1970s, Gaff (1975) examined funding and found that most faculty development centers were funded by the institution although seldom for more that .5% of the total institutional budget. Individual activities, such as sabbaticals, travel money, and research support were more costly. Gaff applauded the Department of Education in Florida for its groundbreaking Staff and Program Development support system. This system, which was founded in 1968, required that 2% of all community college budgets must be devoted to professional development.

Florida was an exception to the faculty development funding formula. Most states dedicated few resources to faculty development in the 1970s and 1980s. In 1978, O'Banion recognized the fiscal constraints on institutions, but still recommended that a full-time coordinator be designated for faculty development programs. He encouraged institutions to assess the money already devoted to professional development and explore creative solutions for funding programs. He suggested that faculty development activities be offered as college credit courses, thereby being eligible for state reimbursement. O'Banion also recommended that colleges form consortia that could share the funding of faculty development events.

In 1983, Honaker surveyed staff development programs in the southeastern United States. Forty community colleges with staff development programs completed a

checklist; then the researcher interviewed one college from each of the fourteen states. Honaker reported that most colleges were spending 1% or less on staff development. Per staff member, colleges were spending from $50.00 to $600 with a mean of $179.00. The spending for full-time professional staff members—including faculty—averaged $312.41 per year (Honaker, 1983).

Both Anderson (1990) and Giordano (1990) concluded that faculty development programs were under funded in Washington and Illinois community colleges. While Anderson (1990) and Giordano (1990) reported that only 25% of institutions spent more than 1% of the institutional budget on faculty development, Grant (2000) found that 46% of two-year colleges were spending more than 1% on faculty development. Grant's national study indicated that funding may be rising for faculty development in community colleges.

In Florida, state funding was becoming more limited in higher education and may be more closely tied to evaluation, according to Sanchez-Penley, Martinez, and Nodine (1997). In addition, Florida statutes have recently changed regarding the funding of faculty development when the state eliminated the mandate for community colleges to devote 2% of their budgets to professional development, a support system that Gaff praised in 1975. According to Florida Statute 6A-14.029, enacted in 2004, each institution now determines the amount of funding and source of funding for professional development. Deregulation has been a trend in Florida's system of higher education (Sanchez-Penley, Y., Martinez, M. C., & Nodine, T., 1997).

Gaff (1975) reported that many private foundations, such as the Kellogg Foundation and the Lilly Endowment, funded faculty development, but in a few states, funding and/or directives for faculty development came from the state level. In Anderson's study of 23 Washington community colleges, she determined that state funding and federal vocational funds were the most common sources of funding for faculty development (1990). Giordano (1990) reported the following sources of funding in Illinois community colleges: institutional funds (81%), state grant funds (13%), federal grant funds (3%), grants from outside sources (1%), and other (3%). When Grant (2000) surveyed 300 two-year colleges across the country, most of these colleges (93%) did have funding for faculty development programs, but from multiple sources. The following percentages indicated that institutions were often funded by more than one source: 76% reported using state funding, grant funding (43%), institutional operating budget (35%), federal funds (22%), endowments (11%), and business and industry (8%). Grant and Keim (2002) reported that differences in funding sources varied among accreditation regions. In the Middle States colleges, 48% used state funding for faculty development. In the Western States region, colleges rarely provided funding for faculty development, and in Northwestern colleges, funding was generous with 35% reporting the allocation of funds for part-time faculty (Grant & Keim, 2002).

Sorcinelli (2002) addressed funding concerns in her ten principles for creating and sustaining teaching and learning centers. She recommended that institutions fund faculty development from the operating budget. While external funding could be acquired

through grants, the grants for teaching and learning were competitive, so the time devoted

to writing the grants may not produce the required funding (Sorcinelli, 2002).

Wright (2002) stated that the sources of funding often depended on the

organizational structure of the faculty development program. Single, campus-wide

centers with dedicated staff usually operated with institutional funding, but some of these

centers also had grant funding. Multi-campus cooperative programs, such as faculty

development consortiums or state programs were often begun with grant funding but

shifted to system funding at the expiration of the grant. Special purpose centers, such as

technology training centers, were supported with grant funding or institutional funding.

These centers were sometimes funded by business and industry or income from external

clientele (Wright, 2002).

Wallin (2003) confirmed that sources of funding for faculty development varied

widely. Wallin (2003) surveyed community college presidents in three states for their

perceptions of faculty development characteristics, needs, and importance. The section

of the study on resources clearly showed a difference in funding sources between the

three states. In North Carolina, the funding for faculty development came from the state.

In South Carolina, funding came from the college and individual departments. In

Georgia, the state shared expenses for faculty development with business and industry.

In all three states, it was evident that external funding, often from private foundations,

was becoming more prevalent (Wallin, 2003).

Some states wanted to provide the guidelines for professional development but

not the funding. The Connecticut State Board of Trustees of Community-Technical

48

Colleges (1999) developed a plan to evaluate faculty performance that included

professional development. Although the committee recommended a systematic plan of

professional development with guidelines to follow, it did not provide funding for this

initiative. The Connecticut State Board of Trustees of Community-Technical Colleges

(1999) stated that faculty should be responsible for their own professional development

by creating individual development plans.

Other states provided funding for faculty development but were now re-thinking

that decision. In California, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

(2000) approved the use of state funds in 1989 for California Community Colleges to

develop faculty development activities. Ten years later, a survey revealed some concerns

with the system, including the process for allocating funds and lack of faculty

participation in development activities. Recommendations for improvement included the

addition of needs assessment tools, the search for additional funding sources, and more

evaluation of activities (Academic Senate, 2000).

Sydow (2000) described the organized efforts of Virginia Community College

System's Professional Development Initiative. The Virginia Community College System

(VCCS) had 23 colleges and 39 campuses (Sydow, 2000). In 1993, the State Board for

Community Colleges implemented a statewide plan for professional development. From

1993 to 1999, VCCS provided $500,000 per year to professional development for a total

of $3.5 million.   The money primarily funded research grants and peer group

conferences. While this program won national recognition—the Hesburgh Certificate of

Excellence and the National Bellwether Award—$500,000 divided among 23 colleges

was approximately $20,000 per college per year, which was a small percentage of each institution's budget. It was not reported whether these institutions had other sources for professional development.

In another state project, Hansen, et.al. (2004) described Ohio's funding of faculty learning communities to enhance teaching and learning. The Ohio Learning Network (OLN) collaborated with 23 college campuses to build faculty learning communities. Colleges applied and were selected for a $3000 readiness grant to develop their project plans. Once colleges completed their readiness plans, they could apply for another $25,000 to enrich faculty knowledge and expand digital learning resources (Hansen, et. al., 2004).

Singer (2002) reported on the funding that established some of the teaching and learning centers that now exist. According to Singer, the Danforth Foundation helped to establish centers at five institutions in the 1970s: Empire State College of the State University of New York, Harvard, Northwestern, Spelman, and Stanford. The Bush Foundation and private funds contributed to the creation of Carleton College's Perlman Center for Learning and Teaching in 1992. Mellon grants have also provided funding to several institutions to meet the needs of faculty (Singer, 2002).

Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006) reported that a number of foundations and higher education associations have devoted funding to faculty professional development. For instance, the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning was established in the 1990s. Other organizations such as the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), the American Association of Colleges and

Universities (AACU), and the American Council on Education (ACE) have funded some faculty development projects. The Carnegie Academy for the Advancement of Teaching, the National Science Foundation, and the Woodrow Wilson Foundation have also contributed funding to faculty development and faculty rewards (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach, 2006).

While funding for faculty development may be rising slightly, studies indicated that programs were still under funded, often below 2% of institutional budgets. The sources of funding varied widely from state to state and institution to institution, but the literature review indicated that multiple sources were being used to fund faculty development programs. In the most recent study on funding that Grant (2000) conducted on 300 community colleges nationwide, 93% of faculty development programs were funded. Faculty development programs relied most heavily on state funding, then grants, then the institutional budgets, and then federal money (Grant, 2000).

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The literature review revealed major schools of thought supporting the need for

evaluation and the desire for accountability in higher education. With the changes in

public opinion and the onset of the learning college concept, the movement toward

assessment and accountability was more evident in higher education, especially as

funding sources were limited. However, systematic evaluation with established criteria

was not evident in the literature about faculty development programs or centers, even

though faculty development was an integral tool of the learning college concept. Studies

revealed that faculty development programs often lacked planning evaluation, formative

evaluation, and meaningful summative evaluation. Businesses and schools had more

evidence in the literature for the evaluation of their staff development training. The

methodology of this study was designed to collect data on the member institutions of the

Florida Faculty Development Consortium to report their strategic plans, evaluation plans,

organizational structures, and funding.

Statement of the Problem

A review of literature indicated that effective and consistent evaluation of faculty

development programs may not be occurring in higher education institutions even though

evaluation has been highly recommended (Anderson, 1990; Gaff, 1975; Giordano, 1990;

Guskey, 2003; Kirkpatrick, 1994; Phillips & Stone, 2002; Young, 1987). In this study,

evaluation models were being examined in light of strategic plans, organizational

structures and funding for the purpose of determining if member institutions of the

Florida Faculty Development Consortium were investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent are member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium investing in faculty development based on strategic planning and measurable criteria?

2. What are the models of evaluation used in faculty development programs?

3. To what extent are there shared organizational characteristics across faculty development programs?

4. What are the sources of funding, the amount invested per faculty member, and the percentage of the total institutional budget spent on faculty development?

Population

The strategic planning, evaluation models, organizational structures, and funding for member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium were examined in this dissertation study. Using a purposeful sample of 31 institutions in Florida during the 2005-2006 school year, this mixed method study aimed to document each institution's model for strategic planning, evaluation, organizational structure, and funding of its faculty development program.

The population for this study was 31 faculty developers in Florida higher education institutions that belonged to the Florida Faculty Development Consortium. This Consortium was recently established in September 2005 to "[provide] leadership

and [foster] excellence in postsecondary teaching and learning" (Florida Faculty Development Consortium). The Consortium members were responsible for faculty development at each of their respective institutions in Florida. The 31 institutions in the Consortium represented 14 of 28 public community colleges, 9 of 11 public universities, and 8 of 28 Independent Colleges and Universities in Florida (ICUF). ICUF institutions were non-profit private institutions in Florida, and, like the public institutions, they were accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). For a list of Florida Faculty Development Consortium members, see Appendix B.

Instrumentation

The research design was an electronic, self-administered survey, created by the researcher. This electronic research design provided a quick distribution of the survey to faculty developers across Florida and a convenient method for the participants to return the survey. SurveyMonkey.com, a survey software, was used to design the format and to deliver the self-administered survey. The self-administered survey allowed respondents the time to ponder the questions and consult their records before answering (Fowler, 2002). The survey contained both quantitative and qualitative questions: 23 questions had multiple choice formats, and 11 of the 34 questions were open-ended.

The survey for this study was titled "Survey of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium: Evaluation Models, Organization, and Funding" (see Appendix C). Prior to developing the survey, the researcher discussed the issues with a member of the study population, the chair of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium. The 34-item survey was then designed using several questions, with permission, from "Envisioning

54

the Future of Faculty Development: A Survey of Faculty Development Professionals"
(Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). These borrowed questions focused on the
goals and organizational characteristics of faculty development programs and on the
institutional types. The remaining questions were created based on the review of
previous surveys developed by Giordano (1990), Anderson (1990), Paterno (1994), and
Grant (2000).

The survey was divided into five sections: evaluation of faculty development
activities, program mission and goals, evaluation of faculty development program,
funding of faculty development, and organizational characteristics. In section one, the
questions asked participants about evaluation of faculty development activities. The
questions in this section were designed to identify the level of evaluation used after each
activity, based on Kirkpatrick's four-level analysis (Kirkpatrick, 1994, 1996). Section
two asked participants to indicate whether their faculty development program had a stated
mission statement and goals. It also asked what type of goals or influences guided their
decisions. Section three asked participants whether they conducted needs assessments to
determine programming. Questions in this section also asked the extent that formal
evaluations of their faculty development program were conducted. Section four collected
information on institutional funding, faculty development funding, sources of funding for
faculty development, and numbers of faculty at their institutions. The final section asked
participants about their type of institution, faculty development structure, and faculty
development leadership. The participants were also asked to report their length and

percentage of involvement in faculty development. See Table 2 for the relationship

between research questions and the survey questions.

Table 2: Research questions and data source

_____

Research Questions	Data Source: Survey of Florida Faculty Development Consortium
1. Strategic Planning	B1, B2, B3, B4, C1, C2
2. Models of Evaluation and Measurable Criteria	A1, A2, A3, A4, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9
3. Organization	E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6, E7, E8
4. Funding	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8

Before the pilot survey was distributed, cognitive interviews were conducted with

two higher education professionals to evaluate wording in and design of the survey

(Fowler, 2002). Slight wording changes were made to the survey based on comments

made during the cognitive interviews. The pilot survey was a self-administered

electronic questionnaire sent via e-mail to five faculty developers in the study population,

the Florida Faculty Development Consortium. The researcher recruited pilot participants

through phone calls. The participants for the pilot study were chosen from institutions

with multiple faculty developers so that all 31 member institutions could still be involved

in the study. Participants in the pilot were not included in the survey administration. The

pilot survey had as its purpose content readability, and ease of comprehension for each of

the items. An e-mail accompanied the pilot survey to explain its purposes. When the

participants completed the pilot surveys, they were asked a few additional questions

about the length of time required to complete the survey and if they had difficulty

understanding the questions. The researcher tabulated the distributions of answers to

identify problems with the survey. Slight changes were then made to the survey in the

funding section. One question was deleted that asked for the percentage of institutional

dollars spent on faculty development because it was a percentage that the pilot

participants did not know. Two questions were added that asked participants to reveal

the sources they consulted before reporting the faculty development budget and the

institutional budget. It was hoped these questions would help the researcher to analyze

the reliability of these figures.

<p style="text-align:center">Instrumentation Reliability and Validity</p>

The survey for this study was titled "Survey of the Florida Faculty Development

Consortium: Evaluation Models, Organization, and Funding." Seven of thirty-four

questions were borrowed from "Envisioning the Future of Faculty Development: A

Survey of Faculty Development Professionals" (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach,

2006). According to Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006), their survey had been

answered by over 400 faculty developers associated with Professional and Organizational

Development in Higher Education (POD Network). The "Survey of the Florida Faculty

Development Consortium: Evaluation Models, Organization, and Funding" was

<p style="text-align:center">57</p>

evaluated by two higher education professionals in a cognitive interview, and then was

approved by a University of Central Florida doctoral committee and by the University of

Central Florida Institutional Review Board. Then the survey was pilot tested by five

members of the survey population. In addition, Cronbach's Alpha was used to estimate

the reliability of questions surrounding the constructs of strategic planning, evaluation

models, organizational structure, and funding. A perfect correlation (1.000) existed in the

strategic planning construct between two variables indicating the application of mission

statements and goals. The alpha reliability coefficient was also strong (.7597) for

variables that indicated the evidence of mission statements, goals, needs assessments, and

program review (see Table 3). The Cronbach's alpha was low for the remaining

variables and in some cases resulted in a negative coefficient. This low or negative

coefficient was probably the result of multi-dimensional data and the small population

size (Nichols, 1999).

Table 3: Reliability Analysis for Variables Within the Strategic Planning Construct and Evaluation Models Construct

Correlation Matrix for Variables Within the Strategic Planning Construct and Evaluation Models Construct

	Mission	Goals	Needs Assessment	Program Rev
Mission	1.000			
Goals .	1.000	1.000		
Needs Assessment	.0695	.0695	1.000	
Program Rev	.5171	.5171	.4862	1.000

Alpha Coefficient for Mission, Goals, Needs Assessment, Program Rev   . 7597

Note. 1.0 indicates perfect correlation. The accepted range for the alpha coefficient is .7 to 1.0.

Data Collection

The tailored design method of survey research was applied to gain a favorable response rate for data collection (Dilman, 2000). For the timeline of this study and data collection, see Table 35 in Appendix D. The researcher explained the study and its importance at a Florida Faculty Development Consortium meeting on March 9, 2006. On May 15, 2006, an announcement about the survey appeared on the Florida Faculty Development Consortium website (see all correspondence in Appendix E). Also on May 15, 2006, the letter of recruitment, the consent form and the survey were mailed

electronically to one faculty developer (preferably the director or assistant director of faculty development) in each of the 31 institutions in the Florida Faculty Development Consortium.

SurveyMonkey.com was used to send the surveys, track the results, and ensure confidentiality. The list management function on SurveyMonkey.com tracked responses and non-responses. Eleven responses were received after the first e-mail. On May 26, 2006, the researcher sent a second e-mail (identical to the first e-mail) with a link to the survey. In some cases, non-responders were on summer break during the collection of data, as indicated by reply messages to the survey e-mail. Seven more responses were received after the second e-mail. On June 16, 2006, the researcher followed up with telephone calls to the non-responding participants. During a few telephone calls, faculty developers indicated that the survey may have been caught by their institution's spam filter. Another four responses were received after the phone calls. In addition, a reminder about the survey was on the Florida Faculty Development Consortium website from May 15 to June 30, 2006. If a Consortium member did not want to participate in the study, he or she was given the opportunity in the electronic letter of recruitment to opt out of any further correspondence. One member opted out of the survey. In addition, the first question of the survey asked the participants to agree to participate and to grant permission for the responses to be reported anonymously in the final manuscript. The deadline for data collection was June 30, 2006.

Data included 22 responses from 31 member institutions. The response rate was 71%, but 4 surveys were unusable because of missing data, so the final response rate was

58% (n=18). Surveys with missing data were deleted from the list to ensure unbiased

parameters (see Table 4).

Table 4: Responding Institutions from the FFDC Population

FFDC Members	N	Responding Institutions	N
Public Community Colleges	14	Public Community Colleges	10
Public Universities	9	Public Universitites	7
Private Institutions	8	Private Institutions	5
		Responding Total	22 (71%)
		Surveys Missing Data	4
		(4 Community Colleges)	
Total	31	Total	18 (58%)

Data Analysis

Responses to the survey were analyzed according to the research questions to

determine to what extent FFDC member institutions were investing in faculty

development based on strategic and measurable criteria. The researcher used descriptive

statistics to determine the measures of central tendency and variability. The constructs

were strategic plans, evaluation models, funding, and organizational structure. The

variables measured the application of mission statements, program goals, and needs assessments; the evaluation of activities and programs; and funding sources. Cross-tabulation and chi square procedures helped the researcher to explore relationships across institutional types and faculty development organizational structures (Connor-Linton, 2003). Open-ended questions were analyzed and categorized (Fink, 2003). Variables in the study also aimed to measure the percentage of funding being used for faculty development in institutions and the annual institutional investment per faculty member for faculty development. However, only 6 respondents submitted both faculty development budgets and institutional budgets. In the subsequent open-ended questions, participants commented that they did not have this information from the budget, so this funding data could not be reported or analyzed to determine the amount invested per faculty member on faculty development or the percentage of the total institutional budget spent on faculty development.

The scope of the study was delimited to faculty developers who belonged to the Florida Faculty Development Consortium and were willing to participate in the study. Therefore, the findings of this study were generalized only to member institutions of the Consortium. Faculty developers were self-reporting data based on the academic year 2005-2006, and this study relied on only the data collected from the survey.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

A review of literature indicated that higher education institutions may not be evaluating faculty development programs even though evaluation has been highly recommended (Anderson, 1990; Gaff, 1975; Giordano, 1990; Guskey, 2003; Kirkpatrick, 1994; Phillips & Stone, 2002; Young, 1987). In this study, evaluation models were being examined in light of strategic plans, organizational structures and funding for the purpose of determining if member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium were investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria. This study was guided by four research questions.

1. To what extent are member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium investing in faculty development based on strategic planning and measurable criteria?

2. What are the models of evaluation used in faculty development programs?

3. To what extent are there shared organizational characteristics across faculty development programs?

4. What are the sources of funding, the amount invested per faculty member, and the percentage of the total institutional budget spent on faculty development?

These four research questions addressed strategic planning, evaluation models, organizational structure, and funding of faculty development programs. To determine the answers to these research questions, the "Survey of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium: Evaluation Models, Organization, and Funding" was distributed to faculty developers at 31 member institutions. Faculty developers responded from 22 of the 31

Florida Faculty Development Consortium (FFDC) member institutions, but 4 surveys

were not usable due to missing data (n=18; response rate = 58%). Surveys with missing

data were deleted from the list to ensure unbiased parameters. Of the 18 remaining

respondents, 67% were from public institutions and 33% were from private institutions.

According to the 1994 Carnegie Classifications, 22% of respondents identified their

institutions as research/doctoral I or II (n = 4), 17% were liberal arts I or II (n = 3), 28%

were comprehensive I or II (n = 5), 28% were community, junior, or technical colleges (n

= 5), and 6% were identified as "other" (n = 1) (see Table 5). Responding FFDC

institutions varied in size, from 74 full-time instructors to 1195 full-time instructors, with

57% of institutions employing more than 200 full-time faculty members.

Table 5: Responding Institutions and 1994 Carnegie Classifications

1994 Carnegie Classifications	N	Percentage
Comprehensive I or II	5	28%
Community, Junior or Technical	5	28%
Research/Doctoral I or II	4	22%
Liberal Arts I or II	3	17%
Other	1	6%
Total	18	100%

Research Question 1: Strategic Planning

The first research question addressed strategic planning by FFDC member institutions: To what extent are member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium (FFDC) investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria?

To determine whether FFDC member institutions were investing in faculty development, the researcher asked faculty developers if and how their programs were funded. According to responding faculty developers, 100% (n = 18) of their institutions had dedicated funding for faculty development and 78% (n = 14) were using institutional funds as the primary funding source. To identify if these investments were based on strategic criteria, the researcher asked faculty developers additional questions about their programs' use of strategic planning evaluation tools, such as mission statements, goal statements, and needs assessments tools.

The respondents indicated that 83% (n = 15) of their institutions had mission statements and stated goals for their faculty development program or center. According to FFDC faculty developers, needs assessment tools, such as surveys or focus groups, were used by 89% (n = 16) of responding institutions to determine programming for faculty development. Of the 16 institutions that did use needs assessment tools, 12 (67%) conducted needs assessments on an annual basis. In response to an open-ended question, 4 institutions indicated that they conducted needs assessments on a quarterly basis or on a biennial schedule (see Table 6).

Table 6: Reported Use of Mission Statements, Goals, Needs Assessments

Response	Mission	Goals	Needs Assessments
Yes	15 (83%)	15 (83%)	16 (89%)
No	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	1 (6%)
Do Not Know	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
N = 18	18 (100%)	18 (100%)	18 (100%)

To identify the motivating factors behind FFDC faculty development programs, the researcher asked faculty developers to identify three primary goals that guided their faculty development program or center. The top three goals were the following: 13 respondents (72%) identified "responding to individual faculty members' goals for professional development" as a primary goal and 11 respondents (61%) selected "creating a culture of teaching excellence" as a primary goal. Nine institutions (50%) selected "to advance new initiatives in teaching and learning" as a primary goal. This question was borrowed from Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006) (see Table 7).

Table 7: Primary Goals for Faculty Development

Goal	N = 18	Percentage
To support individual faculty members' goals for professional development	13	72%
To create or sustain a culture of teaching excellence	11	61%
To advance new initiatives in teaching and learning	9	50%
To respond to critical needs as defined by the institution	5	28%
To foster collegiality within and among faculty members	4	22%
To support institutional goals and planning	4	22%
To provide recognition and reward excellence in teaching	3	17%
To act as a change agent within the institution	3	17%
To provide support for faculty experiencing difficulties with teaching	3	17%
1To position the institution at the forefront of educational innovation	2	11%

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100% because respondents could select more than one answer.

To determine any other factors contributing to the strategic plans of faculty

development centers, faculty developers were asked to identify three primary factors that

influenced the goals and activities of their program or center. The top three factors were

the following: 14 respondents (78%) identified "faculty interests and concerns" as a

primary factor, and 11 respondents (61%) selected "institutional strategic plan" as a

primary factor. Seven institutions (39%) selected "priorities of senior-level institutional

leaders" as a primary factor. This question was also borrowed from Sorcinelli, Austin,

Eddy, and Beach (2006) (see Table 8).

Table 8: Primary Factors Influencing Faculty Development Activities

Factor	N = 18	Percentage
Faculty interests and concerns	14	78%
Institutional strategic plan	11	61%
Priorities of senior-level institutional leaders	7	39%
Priorities of the director of person leading your faculty development program	6	33%
The faculty development program's strategic plan	6	33%
Immediate organizational issues, concerns, or problems	4	22%
Priorities of faculty supervisors (department chairs, deans)	3	17%
Priorities indicated in the higher education or faculty development literature	3	17%
Grant requirements	0	0%
Do not know	0	0%
Other	0	0%

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100% because respondents could select more than one answer.

Research Question 2: Evaluation Models

The researcher surveyed faculty developers about the components of their evaluation models, such as feedback forms and program review procedures to determine if evaluation models were based on measurable criteria. These survey questions addressed the second research question: What are the models of evaluation used in faculty development programs?

The researcher inquired how frequently feedback forms were given to faculty to evaluate faculty development activities and what types of questions faculty were asked immediately after activities. Seventeen respondents (94%) indicated that they "always" or "often" collected written evaluations after an activity (see Table 9). Sixteen faculty developers (89%) responded that they asked faculty if they experienced an increase in knowledge or skills from the activity. Twelve institutions (67%) indicated that they asked faculty their attitude toward the activity and their intention to apply the new knowledge or skill (see Table 10).

The researcher also inquired whether evaluations took place one week to one year after faculty attendance at a development activity. Of the 7 institutions (39%) that did evaluate after an extended period of time, 3 (17%) asked if faculty applied their newly learned skills or knowledge and 5 (28%) asked if the new knowledge had an impact on student success. Eleven (61%) said they did not evaluate one year to one week after attendance (see Table 11).

The institutions that did not use written faculty responses as an evaluation tool for activities provided these explanations in an open-ended question: (a) one institution had

a small faculty so activities were discussed at faculty meetings, (b) two institutions

examined whether faculty implemented the specific content into their courses, and (c)

one institution examined whether scores increased on student evaluations.

Table 9: Frequency that Faculty Developers Collect Written Evaluations

Frequency	N	Percentage
Always	10	55%
Often	7	39%
Rarely	1	6%
Never	0	0%
Total	18	100%

Table 10: Activity Evaluation Questions

Question	N	Percentage
If they experienced an increase in their knowledge or skill	16	89%
Their attitude toward an activity	12	67%
Their intention to apply the new knowledge or skill	12	67%
Other	5	28%
Faculty are not asked to evaluate immediately after attendance	2	11%

Table 11: Evaluation Questions One Week to One Year After Activity

Question	N	Percentage
Faculty are not asked to evaluate one week to one year after attendance	11	61%
If the new knowledge had an impact on student success	5	28%
If they applied the new knowledge or skill	3	17%
Other	2	11%

The researcher inquired about annual program reviews as components of evaluation plans at FFDC institutions. Eleven of eighteen faculty development programs or centers (61%) were conducting program reviews annually. The researcher identified a positive correlation between the use of program reviews and the use of mission statements that was statistically significant using a value of $p < .05$ (chi square = 13.00, df = 4, $p = .011$). A statistically significant correlation also existed between the use of program reviews and goals using a value of $p < .05$ (chi square = 13.00, df = 4, $p = .011$). In addition, a similar pattern was evident between program review and needs assessments (chi square = 8.906, df = 4, $p = .063$).

The specific components of the program reviews varied, but two criteria were measured quite consistently: 10 of 11 institutions (91%) conducting program reviews counted the number of faculty who participated in faculty development, and they

evaluated faculty responses to development programs. The next most measured element

was the fulfillment of the faculty development program's mission, goals, and objectives

(n = 8, 73%) (see Table 12). Of the 11 institutions that conducted program reviews, 6

(54%) were conducted by the person responsible for faculty development.

Administrators, faculty members, institutional committees, and external evaluators were

responsible for conducting program reviews at the other institutions (see Table 13).

Table 12: Components Measured in Program Reviews

Program Review Component	N=11	Percent
Number of faculty who participate	10	91%
Faculty responses	10	91%
Fulfillment of faculty development mission and goals	8	73%
Fulfillment of needs assessments	6	54%
Fulfillment of institutional mission and goals	5	45%%
Increase in faculty knowledge or skill	4	36%
Impact on student learning	4	36%
Faculty's intention to apply new knowledge or skill	3	27%
Faculty's use of new knowledge or skills	3	27%
Fulfillment of priorities of administration	3	27%
Fulfillment of grant requirements	1	9%
Do not know	1	9%
Other	0	0%

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100% because respondents could select more than one answer.

Table 13: Persons Conducting Program Review

Persons Conducting Program Review	N=11	Percent
Person responsible for faculty development	6	54%
Administrator	3	27%
Faculty	2	18%
External evaluator	1	9%
Institutional committee	1	9%
Other	1	9%
Do not know	0	0%
Institutional evaluator	0	0%

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100% because respondents could select more than one answer.

Of the 11 institutions conducting program reviews of faculty development, 7 (64%) indicated that the finished program review was distributed to a senior-level administrator for review. Four institutions distributed the finished report to other faculty developers at the institution. In addition, institutions responded that the report was sometimes posted on the faculty development web page or distributed to a college

learning council comprised of faculty, supervisors, and senior-level administrators (see

Table 14).

Table 14: Audience for Program Review

Audience for Program Review	N=11	Percent
Senior-level administrators	7	64%
Faculty developers at the institution	4	36%
Other	4	36%
It is not distributed	1	9%
Deans and Chairs	0	0%
External Reviewer	0	0%
Faculty	0	0%
Faculty developers at other institutions	0	0%
Do not know	0	0%

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100% because respondents could select more than one answer.

When recommendations were made in a program review, changes were

implemented by 8 of 11 institutions (73%), indicating that most of faculty development

programs using program review were attempting to use the process for improvement.

Two institutions selected "other" and commented that their program review procedure

was undergoing a restructuring and another indicated it was their first year of evaluation.

(see Table 15).

Table 15: Implementation of Program Review Suggestions

Suggestions Implemented	N=11	Percent
Yes	8	73%
Other	2	18%
Changes were recommended but have not been made	1	9%
No changes were recommended	0	0%
Do not know	0	0%

For the seven institutions that did not conduct formal program reviews of faculty

development (39%), respondents indicated that evaluation was informal or based on the

number of attendees at events. Other programs were just getting established or just

getting a new director, so program reviews were not yet in place.

Research Question 3: Organizational Characteristics

The third research question guiding this study was: To what extent are there

shared characteristics across faculty development programs? To answer this question, the

researcher inquired about organizational structures, leadership, age, and scope of the

FFDC faculty development programs. The categories for organizational structure were

borrowed from Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006). Eleven respondents (61%)

indicated that the institution had a "centralized unit with a dedicated staff that offered a

range of faculty development programs." Two institutions (11%) had a "committee

charged with supporting faulty development," and two institutions (11%) had an

"individual faculty member or administrator charged with supporting faculty

development." One of programs (6%) was structured as a "clearinghouse for programs

and offerings that are sponsored across the institutions, but offering few programs itself."

Another two (11%) defined their structure as "other." These other institutions were either

in transition or they indicated that each department organized its own faculty

development (see Table 16).

Table 16: Organizational Structures

Structure	N	Percent
Centralized Unit with Staff	11	61%
Committee	2	11%
Individual faculty or administrator	2	11%
Other	2	11%
Clearinghouse	1	6%
Total	18	100%

The age of faculty development programs in the Florida Faculty Development
Consortium ranged from 0 years to 20 years (mean 9 years) (see Table 36 in Appendix
F). These faculty development programs or centers conducted an average of 67% of all
faculty development conducted at their institutions. Fifty percent of programs (n = 9)
were conducting between 61% and 80% of faculty development activities at their
institutions (see Table 37 in Appendix G).

The findings also revealed that 13 respondents (72%) held the title of director of
faculty development and 8 of those responsible for faculty development (44%) held at
least two or more titles. The most common combination of titles was director and faculty
member (n = 5, 28%). Other titles held by respondents included college-wide director,

department chair, and a position responsible for faculty recruitment and data management (see Table 17).

Faculty developers in FFDC member institutions reported that they devoted an average of 61% of their workload to faculty development responsibilities, with the largest percentage (n = 6, 35%) devoting 61% to 80% of their time to faculty development (see Table 18).

Table 17: Titles for Individuals Responsible for Faculty Development

Title	N=18	Response Percentage
Director	13	72%
Faculty Member	7	39%
Other	4	22%
Senior-Level Administrator	3	17%
Instructional Coordinator	1	6%
Coordinator	0	0%
Assistant/Associate Director	0	0%
Technology Coordinator	0	0%

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100% because respondents could select more than one answer.

Table 18: Percentage of Faculty Developer Workload Devoted to Faculty Development
Activities

Workload Percentage	N	Percent
1 to 20%	1	6%
21 to 40%	5	29%
41 to 60%	1	6%
61 to 80%	6	33%
81 to 100%	4	22%
Total	17	96%
Not applicable	1	6%
Total	18	100%

The number of years that respondents had held a position of responsibility for

faculty development ranged from 1 year to 26 years (mean 7 years) (see Table 38 in

Appendix H). A large group of FFDC faculty developers (n = 8, 44%) had five or fewer

years of experience (see Table 19).

Table 19: Years of Responsibility for Faculty Development

Years of Responsibility	N=18	Percent
< or = 5 years	8	44%
6 to 10 years	5	28%
11 to 14 years	3	17%
15+ years	1	6%
Total	17	95%
Not applicable	1	6%
Total	18	100%

Research Question 4: Funding

The fourth research question guiding this study was: What are the sources of funding, the amount invested per faculty member, and the percentage of the total institutional budget spent on faculty development? All responding FFDC institutions (n = 18, 100%) indicated that they had dedicated funding for their faculty development program or center. Fourteen FFDC programs (78%) relied on institutional funds as their primary funding source (see Table 20). Other funding sources were also being used for at least a portion of support at some institutions: three respondents (17%) indicated that a

federal grant provided funding; two institutions used state funding (11%); three

respondents used grants from non-governmental sources (17%); one program had forged

a business partnership (5.5%); and one respondent did not know (5.5%) (see Table 39 in

Appendix I). In an open-ended question, one respondent indicated that the faculty

development center had its own endowment fund.

Table 20: Primary Funding Sources

Primary Source	N	Percentage
Institutional funds	14	78%
Other	2	11%
Do not know	1	5.5%
Federal grant	1	5.5%
Business partnerships	0	0%
Non-governmental grant	0	0%
State funds	0	0%
No funding	0	0%
Total	18	100%

Although money often has influence, no significant relationship was identified

between the source of primary funding and faculty development goals or influences

through chi square procedures. For instance, when the primary source was institutional

funding, faculty development programs indicated that they were not influenced by

administrative priorities and institutional plans. In addition, no relationship existed

between primary funding sources and the use of strategic planning tools.

However, a positive correlation did exist between the primary sources of funding

and the percentage of faculty developer workload dedicated to faculty development (chi

square value = 35.79, df = 12, p = .000). The chi square exceeded the critical value of

21.0261 on the Percentage Points of the Chi Square Distribution Table (Lomax, 2001).

Therefore, it could be concluded that a positive correlation existed based on $p < .05$.

Faculty development programs receiving institutional funding reported more dedicated

time for their faculty developers than expected in the cross-tabulation analysis (see Table

21).

Eleven FFDC respondents provided budget information for their faculty

development programs. These faculty development budgets reflected a range of $38,000

per year for a small, private liberal arts college to $1,500,000 for a large, public

institution. Because only 6 respondents submitted both faculty development budgets and

institutional budgets, the researcher was unable to report or analyze this funding data to

determine the amount invested per faculty member on faculty development or the

percentage of the total institutional budget spent on faculty development. However, the

researcher could identify the sources of funding for faculty development in the Florida

Faculty Development Consortium in response to the fourth research question.

Table 21: Primary Source of Funding and Faculty Developer Workload

	Percentage of Workload				
Primary Source of Funding	0 - 20	21 – 40	41 – 60	61- 80	81 -100
Federal Grant					
Observed Count	0	0	1	0	0
Expected Count	.1	.3	.1	.4	.2
%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Institutional Funds					
Observed Count	0	4	0	6	3
Expected Count	.8	3.8	.8	4.6	3.1
%	0%	80%	0%	100%	75%
Do not know					
Observed Count	1	0	0	0	0
Expected Count	.1	.3	.1	.4	.2
%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other					
Observed Count	0	1	0	0	1
Expected Count	.1	.6	.1	.7	.5
%	0%	20%	0%	0%	25%
Total					
Observed Count	1	5	1	6	4
Expected Count	1	5	1	6	4
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Relationships by Organizational Characteristics

With regard to the application of strategic planning tools, faculty development

programs organized as a centralized unit consistently used mission statements, goal

86

statements, and needs assessments tools. In addition, only the faculty development

programs with centralized units reported that they conducted program reviews as a

component of the evaluation model (see Table 22). These correlations were revealed

through chi square procedures.

Table 22: Strategic Planning and Evaluation Tools by Organizational Structure

Structure	N	Mission	Goals	Needs As.	Program Rev.
Centralized Unit	11				
Observed Count		11 (73%)	11(73%)	11(69%)	11 (100%)
Expected Count		9.2	9.2	9.8	6.7
Clearinghouse	1				
Observed Count		0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Expected Count		.8	.8	.9	.6
Committee	2				
Observed Count		2 (13%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)
Expected Count		1.7	1.7	1.8	1.2
Individual	2				
Observed Count		0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Expected Count		1.7	1.7	1.8	1.2
Other	2				
Observed Count		2 (13%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Expected Count		1.7	1.7	1.8	1.2
Total Count	18				
Observed Count		15	15	16	11
Expected Count		15	15	16	11
Chi Square		36.00	36.00	16.88	36.00
p		.000	.000	.031	.000
df		8	8	8	8

Positive correlations were identified for the independent variable of

organizational structure and the following dependent variables: mission statements,

goals, needs assessments, and program review. With $p < .05$, a statistically significant

relationship existed between organizational structures and mission statements (chi square

value = 36.00, df = 8, p = .000), and between organizational structures and goals (chi

square value = 36.00, df = 8, p = .000). Findings also indicated a statistically significant

relationship between organizational structures and needs assessments (chi square value =

16.88, df = 8, p = .031), and between organizational structures and program review (chi

square value = 36.00, df = 8, p = .000). In all four cross-tabulations, the chi square value

exceeded the critical value of 15.5073 (df = 8, $p < .05$) on the Percentage Points of the

Chi Square Distribution Table (Lomax, 2001). Therefore, independence between the

variables could be rejected and statistical significance could be concluded.

A cross-tabulation analysis also revealed a statistically significant relationship

existed between the organizational structure and the primary funding source for the

faculty development program. The chi square (25.364) exceeded the critical value of

21.0261 (df = 12, p = .013) on the Percentage Points of the Chi Square Distribution Table

(Lomax, 2001). Therefore, it can be concluded that a positive relationship existed based

on $p < .05$ (see Table 23).

An examination of organizational structures revealed differences in means

between workload percentages for faculty developers. On average, faculty developers

from centralized units reported more time dedicated specifically to faculty development

responsibilities than in other organizational structures. Not surprisingly, programs run by

committees devoted the least amount of time to faculty development (see Table 24).

Table 23: Organizational Structure and Primary Funding

Structures	Fed grant	Institutional funds	Do not know	Other
Centralized Unit:				
Observed Count	0	10	0	1
Expected Count	.6	8.6	.6	1.2
Clearinghouse :				
Observed Count	0	0	0	1
Expected Count	.1	.8	.1	.1
Committee:				
Observed Count	1	1	0	0
Expected Count	.1	1.6	.1	.2
Individual faculty or administrator:				
Observed Count	0	2	0	0
Expected Count	.1	1.6	.1	.2
Other:				
Observed Count	0	1	1	0
Expected Count	.1	1.6	.1	.2
Chi Square	25.36			
p	.013			
df	12			

Table 24: Percentage of Workload for Faculty Developers by Structure

Structure	N	Mean Workload Percentage	Std. Deviation
Centralized Unit	11	78%	22.59
Individual	1	40%	--
Other	2	35%	42.42
Clearinghouse	1	25%	--
Committee	2	14%	15.56
Total	17	61%	33.61

Relationships by Institutional Type

Differences in the use of strategic planning and evaluation tools existed across institutional types (1994 Carnegie Classifications). While research/doctoral institutions consistently reported the use of mission statements, goals, needs assessments, and program reviews, the rest of the categories did not show the same consistency. Chi square procedures indicated strong relationships between institution type and the use of these strategic and evaluative tools, but no statistically significant relationships ($p < .05$) (see Table 25).

Table 25: Strategic Planning Tools by Carnegie Classification

Carnegie Class.	N	Mission	Goals	Needs As.	Program Rev
Research/Doctoral I or II	4				
Observed Count		4	4	4	4
Expected Count		3.3	3.3	3.6	2.4
Liberal Arts I or II	3				
Observed Count		2	2	3	0
Expected Count		2.5	2.5	2.7	1.8
Comprehensive I or II	5				
Observed Count		4	4	3	3
Expected Count		4.2	4.2	4.4	3.1
Community, Junior or Technical	5				
Observed Count		4	4	5	3
Expected Count		4.2	4.2	4.4	3.1
Other	1				
Observed Count		1	1	1	1
Expected Count		.8	.8	.9	.6
Total	18				
Observed Count		15	15	16	11
Expected Count		15	15	16	11
Chi Square		5.68	5.68	5.85	8.27
p		.683	.683	.664	.407
df		8	8	8	8

An examination of institution types revealed differences in findings for the percentage of workload that FFDC faculty developers devoted to faculty development responsibilities. On average, the faculty developers at research/doctoral institutions reported more dedicated time for their responsibilities than those at other institution types. The faculty developers at liberal arts institutions reported the least amount of their workload devoted to faculty development responsibilities (see Table 26).

Table 26: Percentage of Workload for Faculty Developers by Carnegie Classification

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean Workload Percentage	Std. Deviation
Research/Doctoral I or II	4	89%	13.15
Other	1	70%	--
Comprehensive I or II	4	69%	29.55
Community, Junior or Technical	5	52%	39.44
Liberal Arts I or II	3	23%	17.56
Total	17	61%	33

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

Faculty development programs have grown in number and importance over the past years due to the challenges facing professors and higher education institutions, such as increased enrollments, diverse student populations, academically unprepared students, and faculty turnover. As an answer to these challenges, higher education institutions have invested in faculty development to support new and experienced professors and to increase student success. However, little evidence existed in the literature indicating that these faculty development efforts have been successful. Evidence did not exist because effective and consistent evaluation of faculty development programs has not been occurring even though evaluation has been highly recommended in the past (Anderson, 1990; Gaff, 1975; Giordano, 1990; Kirkpatrick, 1994; O'Banion, 1978; Young, 1987).

The literature review revealed major schools of thought supporting the need for evaluation and accountability in higher education (Burke, 2005; Massey, 2005; McClenney, 2005). Due to the changes in public opinion toward higher education and the onset of the learning college concept, the movement toward assessment and accountability has been growing in higher education, especially as funding sources have become more limited (Fowler, 2004; Murray, 2002b; Tierney, 1998). However, systematic evaluation was not evident in the literature on faculty development programs or centers, even though faculty development has been an integral tool of the learning college concept. The literature revealed that faculty development programs often lacked planning evaluation, formative evaluation, and meaningful summative evaluation. Businesses and schools had more evidence in the literature for the evaluation of their staff

development training. In this study, evaluation models were examined in light of strategic planning, organizational structures, and funding for the purpose of determining the extent that member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium (FFDC) were investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria. The FFDC was studied as a population because (a) it was a new organization that needed baseline information, (b) the member institutions were all from Florida, a state known for its accountability measures, and (c) the FFDC represented a unique cross-section of public and private institutions. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent are member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria?

2. What are the models of evaluation used in faculty development programs?

3. To what extent are there shared organizational characteristics across faculty development programs?

4. What are the sources of funding, the amount invested per faculty member, and the percentage of the total institutional budget spent on faculty development?

<div align="center">Research Question 1: Strategic Planning</div>

Data collected on strategic planning and funding helped to address the first research question: To what extent are member institutions of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria? For a summary of the data used to answer this question, see Table 27.

<div align="center">94</div>

Table 27: Data for Research Question 1

Question	Data	Answer
To what extent are member institutions investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria?	100% had funding 78% institutional funding 83% mission statements 83% goals 89% needs assessments 73% conducting program review assessed fulfillment of faculty development goals (8 of 11) 100% collected reactionary evaluations Little indication of evaluation based on measurable criteria	Institutions were investing in faculty development based on strategic, goal-based criteria, but not on measurable, outcome-based criteria.

As reported in the Chapter 4 findings, all responding FFDC faculty development programs had designated funding, and most programs were supported with institutional funding (see Table 20). The data also revealed that the majority of member institutions were using mission statements, goals, and needs assessments for strategic planning and evaluation (see Table 6). In fact, all faculty development programs structured as centralized units used these strategic planning tools (see Table 22).

These findings provided baseline research for the member institutions in the recently formed Florida Faculty Development Consortium (FFDC). In addition, these findings revealed a significant change from what has been reported in the literature. Previous studies of faculty development programs reported a much smaller percentage of

institutions using strategic planning tools, such as goals or needs assessments (Anderson, 1990; Giordano, 1990; Murray, 2002a; Paterno, 1994). Strategic planning tools were prevalent in FFDC faculty development programs, as encouraged by O'Banion (1978) when he suggested that programs develop statements of philosophy, goals and objectives. Young (1987) also emphasized the implementation of goals in faculty development, and he called for a goals evaluation of faculty development programs.

In this study, FFDC institutions used goals more frequently than groups of faculty development programs studied previously. Findings revealed that 83% (n = 15) of FFDC programs reported the use of stated faculty development goals while Giordano (1990) found 36% of Illinois community colleges and Paterno (1994) found 31% of Texas community colleges using goals for faculty development. The reasons for this contradiction may include the organizational structures of FFDC faculty development programs. Many FFDC institutions had centralized faculty development centers with dedicated staff who had the time and resources to conduct strategic planning (see Table 16.) Also, more emphasis may have been placed on planning and accountability in Florida compared to other states. Florida has a statute that required academic programs in state institutions to establish performance measures and cyclical review (Florida Legislature, 2005; Board of Governors, 2005). Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) has also encouraged strategic planning and program review for institutions in this accreditation region.

A higher percentage of FFDC institutions also reported using needs assessments compared to groups of faculty development programs studied previously. Studies

conducted by Anderson (1990), Giordano (1990), and Paterno (1994) reported between 40% and 67% of institutions in their studies using needs assessments while 89% of FFDC institutions used these tools (n = 16 of 18). O'Banion (1978) emphasized the importance of using needs assessment tools to determine administrative support, institutional needs, faculty needs, and resources available.

While the use of strategic planning has been recommended for faculty development, the motivation behind and the content of the strategic planning goals have also been reviewed in literature. Young (1987) stated the importance of linking faculty development goals with institutional goals, and O'Banion (1978) recommended that faculty development goals be tied to student learning. Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy and Beach (2006) stated that faculty development goals have evolved over the decades, from goals that focused on advancing scholarly research in the 1960s to improving teaching and learning in the 1990s and supporting an organizational culture in the 21st century.

To identify the motivating factors behind FFDC faculty development programs, the researcher asked faculty developers to identify three primary goals that guided their faculty development program or center. Interestingly, FFDC members selected the same three primary goals as faculty developers in the national study conducted by Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006). However, the order of the top two priorities was reversed. FFDC members identified "responding to individual faculty members' goals for professional development" as the primary goal while faculty developers from the nationwide study selected "creating a culture of teaching excellence" as the central goal (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006)

97

stated that their results reflected "a dramatic recognition of the proactive organizational role that faculty development can play in creating an institutional environment supportive of teaching and learning" (p. 43).

While FFDC results also indicated the importance of supporting this teaching and learning culture, more FFDC faculty developers selected the growth of the individual faculty member as a primary goal (see Table 28). It was concluded that FFDC institutions were driven by many of the same objectives as other faculty development programs nationwide; however, more FFDC institutions were concerned with the needs of the individual faculty member rather than the goal of creating a culture of teaching excellence. Further research would need to be conducted to determine why this was the case.

Table 28: Primary FFDC Goals Compared to a Nationwide Study

Goals	FFDC Percent	Nationwide Percent
1. To respond to and support individual faculty member's goals for professional development	72% (n=13)	56%
2. To create or sustain a culture of teaching excellence	61% (n=11)	72%
3. To advance new initiatives in teaching and learning	50% (n=9)	49%

Note. From *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present,* by Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach, 2006, p. 43.

Research Question 2: Evaluation Models

The second research question was: What are the models of evaluation used in faculty development programs? For a summary of the data used to answer this question, see Table 29. The data collected provided baseline information on evaluation models for FFDC member institutions.

Table 29: Data for Research Question 2

Question	Data	Answer
What are the models of evaluation used in faculty development programs?	100% used feedback forms 39% followed up with faculty after an extended time 61% conducted program reviews Of the 11 conducting program review, 10 evaluated attendance and faculty responses (91%)	All programs had an evaluation model. Most were measuring faculty reaction, rather than faculty learning, behavioral change, or impact on student learning.

Findings revealed that all FFDC institutions had some sort of evaluation model in place for their faculty development program. Similar to previous studies in the literature review, FFDC faculty development programs were collecting written feedback forms after events, but these evaluations were primarily at the reactionary level (see Table 9 and

10). This finding was consistent with other state and national studies that reported the use of reactionary evaluation in faculty development programs rather than evaluation based on measurable criteria (Grant, 2000; Murray, 2002b; Paterno, 1994; Phillips & Stone, 2002; Sydow, 2000; Watts & Hammons, 2002). Kirkpatrick (1994) stated that most evaluations of staff development programs occurred immediately after the event and were primarily reactionary, yet he recommended that staff development also be evaluated at the learning, behavioral, and results levels. While 16 of 18 FFDC institutions (89%) said they asked faculty about an increase in knowledge or skill (level 2) and 12 of 18 (67%) said they asked faculty their intention to apply the knowledge (level 3), much of the data collected would still be considered reactionary (level 1) because they were self-reported by faculty immediately after the activity (Kirkpatrick, 1994).

Some responses did suggest, however, that FFDC institutions were following up with faculty after an extended period. Seven of eighteen respondents (39%) indicated that faculty evaluated development activities one week to one year later. In response to an open-ended question, two respondents said they evaluated whether faculty had implemented specific content into their courses, and one respondent said scores on student perception forms were examined. These responses indicated that a few FFDC institutions were using empirical evidence of behavioral changes (level 3) and impact on student learning (level 4) compared to using only faculty self-reporting methods. An improvement in this study would have been to interview those institutions about their follow-up methods and the data they collected.

Evaluation at four levels can be difficult and costly, as recognized by Eble and McKeatchie (1985), Watts and Hammons (2002), and others. Variables must be isolated and follow-up evaluations must be conducted to arrive at conclusions (Phillips & Stone, 2002). However, if faculty development programs would conduct thorough (level 1 to 4) evaluations on just selected activities per year, these studies would add much needed research to the knowledge base and would provide the empirical data that may be necessary for accountability. The Florida Faculty Development Consortium would be an ideal forum for sharing evaluation models and results among institutions in an effort to establish an outcomes-based approach to faculty development evaluation.

Efforts had been made by several institutions to evaluate their faculty development programs on an annual basis. However, only the FFDC faculty development programs that were organized as centralized units were conducting these annual program reviews (see Table 22). In these program reviews, institutions were counting the number of attendees at faculty development events and evaluating faculty responses, but again, few programs were using program reviews to verify the attendees' increase in knowledge, change in behavior, or the impact on students (see Table 12).

Although not many FFDC programs were conducting empirical, outcome-based evaluations, FFDC institutions were conducting goal-based evaluations. Eight of eleven (73%) faculty development programs that conducted program reviews said they were evaluating the fulfillment of the faculty development mission and goals. In addition, a strong relationship existed between programs influenced by faculty development strategic plans and those that evaluated the fulfillment of faculty development strategic plans in

their program review (chi square = 3.44, df = 1, p = .064). This finding contradicted the literature, which did not reveal a strong presence of strategic planning or goal assessment in faculty development programs. Many FFDC institutions were creating and using their strategic planning tools, as encouraged by Murray (2002a) and Sorcinelli (2002). Sorcinelli (2002) had suggested that faculty developers should not only establish goals but determine how the goals would be assessed. It was concluded that many FFDC institutions were conducting goals-based evaluation of their faculty development programs, but few were sharing those evaluations with faculty, leading to the conclusion that faculty developers may not have believed they were accountable to the faculty for services provided.

Fewer respondents indicated that they assessed the fulfillment of institutional mission statements and goals in their program reviews (n = 5 of 11, 45%) (see Table 12). This practice was contradictory to the advice of several authors in the literature who stressed the importance of connecting faculty development goals to institutional goals (Hawley & Valli, 1999; O'Banion, 1978; Sorcinelli, 2002; Wallin, 2002; Young, 1987). Although 11 of 18 FFDC institutions (61%) indicated that the institutional strategic plan was a primary influence on their faculty development program, few programs evaluated their performance based on institutional objectives even though this strategy would be consistent with the principles of the learning organization concept described by Senge (1990) and Tierney (1998). This lack of connection between faculty development goals and institutional goals may be one reason that more FFDC institutions were focused on the growth of individual faculty members rather than creating an environment for

103

excellence in teaching and learning (see Table 28). This connection between faculty

development goals and institutional goals should be enhanced in FFDC programs to

further the learning organization concept and ultimately to increase student success.

<center>Research Question 3: Organizational Characteristics</center>

The third research question was: To what extent are there shared characteristics

across faculty development programs? For a summary of data collected for this question,

see Table 30. The data collected provided baseline knowledge about organizational

characteristics of programs in the Florida Faculty Development Consortium.

Table 30: Data Collected for Research Question 3

Question	Data	Answer
To what extent are there shared characteristics across faculty development programs?	61% Centralized Units Most programs were 9 years or younger Most conducted 61%- 80% of faculty development on campus. 44% of faculty developers had <5 years experience 44% of faculty developers had 2 or more titles Average workload for faculty developers was 61% 72% had title of director	Even though institutions were public, private, two-year and four-year, programs shared similarities in structure, age, leadership, and scope.

The researcher concluded the programs shared many characteristics even though FFDC membership included public universities, public community colleges, and private institutions. For instance, most programs were organized as a centralized unit with dedicated staff (see Table 16). This organizational structure was consistent with the national trend toward teaching and learning centers, as cited in the literature (Grant & Keim, 2002; Singer, 2002). In comparison to a 2006 national survey conducted by Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, a slightly larger percentage of FFDC institutions had a centralized unit for faculty development: 61% (n = 11 of 18) compared to 54% nationwide (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). Other percentages were also quite similar as shown in Table 31.

Table 31: Faculty Development Structures Compared to Nationwide Study

Structure	FFDC Percent	Nationwide Percent
Centralized Unit	61% (n=11)	54%
Committee	11% (n=2)	12%
Individual	11% (n=2)	19%
Other	11% (n=2)	11%
Clearinghouse	6% (n=1)	4%

Note. From *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present,* by Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach, 2006, p. 37.

The leadership of FFDC faculty development programs also shared characteristics with those described in the literature. Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006) found that 43% of faculty developers held a position of responsibility for faculty development for five or fewer years. Similarly, 44% of FFDC faculty developers (n = 8 of 18) had five or fewer years of experience. This percentage was not surprising because FFDC faculty development programs were relatively young in age (mean age = 9 years).

Table 32: Titles of Respondents Compared to Nationwide Study

Titles of Respondents	N	FFDC Percent	Nationwide Percent
Director	13	72%	33%
Faculty Member	7	39%	21%
Other	4	22%	1%
Senior-Level Administrator	3	17%	14%
Instructional Design Consultant	1	6%	5%
Program Coordinator	0	0%	14%
Assistant/Associate Director	0	0%	9%
Technology Coordinator	0	0%	1%

Note. From *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present,* by Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach, 2006, p. 32.

A contradiction to the literature appeared with several items concerning the position of the faculty developer. A larger percentage of FFDC responders held the title of director (72%, n = 13) compared to the 2006 national study reporting 33% responders with the title of director (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). In addition, the 2006 national study indicated that 70% of faculty developers held two or more position titles compared to 44% (n = 8) in the Florida Faculty Development Consortium (see Table 32).

Faculty developers in the FFDC member institutions devoted an average of 61% of their workload to faculty development responsibilities. This workload percentage was

much higher than the mean 12% workload reported in Giordano's 1990 study of Illinois community colleges. The FFDC percentage also exceeded the mean workload percentage reported in Murray's 1999 national study of two-year colleges. Murray found the majority of faculty developers spent less than 50% of their time on faculty development. With these contradictions to the literature, it was concluded that FFDC institutions provided more commitment to faculty development than institutions studied previously. Despite these findings, the workload average of 61% for faculty developers may still be too low for the role that the faculty developers have been or will be expected to fulfill. The future may bring even more responsibilities to faculty developers if FFDC institutions follow the national trend described by Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy and Beach (2006), who suggest that faculty developers will take a more active role in fulfilling institutional goals, supporting new teaching initiatives, and networking with campus leaders to support the concept of a learning organization. Further research should be conducted on the role, workload, and compensation of faculty developers.

An interesting finding from the study was that FFDC faculty development programs were not responsible for 100% of faculty development on their campuses (see Table 37 in Appendix G). Most programs were conducting between 61% to 80% of faculty development activities at their institution. Similar data was not available in previous studies, so it is unknown if this was true in other states. Future studies should investigate what offices or programs were conducting the remaining faculty development—perhaps academic departments, technology support centers, or human resources—and why funding and resources were not combined into one office.

Research Question 4: Funding

The fourth research question guiding this study was: What are the sources of

funding, the amount invested per faculty member, and the percentage of the total

institutional budget spent on faculty development? The last two parts of the question

could not be answered because many of the responding FFDC faculty developers did not

have the necessary financial information. For a summary of the data collected for

research question 4, see Table 33.

Table 33: Data Collected for Research Question 4

Question	Data	Answer
What are the sources of funding, the amount invested per faculty member, and the percentage of the total institutional budget spent on faculty development?	100% had funding 78% institutional funding Other sources included federal grants, non-governmental grants, state funds, business partnerships, and endowment funds.	Programs were primarily funded by institutional funds, but other sources were identified. Not enough data was was collected to determine invest- ment per faculty member or percentage of the institutional budget devoted to faculty development.

This study could have been improved if the chief financial officers at FFDC

institutions were asked to provide information on faculty development budgets and

institutional budgets. However, the data collected indicated that all responding FFDC institutions (n=18, 100%) had funding dedicated to faculty development, and that the primary source was institutional funding (see Table 20). FFDC institutions indicated that a small percentage of faculty development funding also came from other sources, such as federal grants, state funding, non-governmental grants, and business partnerships. Funding from multiple sources was consistent with the literature, but FFDC institutions reported a stronger reliance on institutional funding compared to institutions in previous studies (Anderson, 1990; Giordano, 1990; Grant, 2000; Grant & Keim, 2002; Wallin, 2003). In addition, more FFDC institutions with centralized units reported institutional funding (see Table 23). This strong reliance on institutional funding rather than other "soft money" sources represented more permanence for FFDC programs. Sorcinelli (2002) strongly recommended institutional funding for faculty development for this very reason.

The institutional funding did not seem to taint the faculty development goals in any way. FFDC developers said their programs were influenced by faculty interests and faculty growth rather than by institutional goals, administrative priorities, or organizational issues (see Table 8). While this autonomy may have been important to maintain the trust of the faculty members and address their needs, some coordination with the institutional goals of student learning, student retention, and student success would be beneficial to all involved (Hawley & Valli, 1999; O'Banion, 1978; Sorcinelli, 2002; Wallin, 2002; Young, 1987).

Implications for Faculty Developers

This study has direct implications for faculty developers. These implications could impact faculty development programs, faculty performance, and ultimately student outcomes. The findings and analysis of survey data revealed five implications:

1. Continue with goals-based evaluation methods in faculty development programs, but connect faculty development goals with institutional goals for the purpose of increasing student learning, retention, and success.

2. Develop outcome-based evaluation models for faculty development activities and programs. These faculty development evaluation models should measure faculty reaction, learning, behavioral changes, and impact on student learning. Faculty reaction could be measured from feedback forms, and faculty learning could be measured with pre-tests and post-tests. A measurement of behavioral changes in faculty could be drawn from the examination of syllabi or teaching methods implemented after a training. While more difficult to measure, the faculty development impact on student learning could be evaluated by pre-testing and post-testing students whose professors have implemented strategies based on faculty development training, compared to those who have not. Faculty developers could also examine student retention rates and completion rates for faculty completing certain trainings; however, variables would have to be carefully isolated. To conserve time and expense, these outcome-based studies should be conducted on selected activities throughout the year rather than on every activity. Bringing in an external evaluator or consultant to help with the development of outcome-

based evaluation should be considered, and most importantly, the effective outcome-based evaluation models should be shared among institutions and published.

3. Identify the percentage of the institutional budget devoted to faculty development and the amount invested per faculty member. Such research could lead to a standardized measure for institutional investment in faculty development. Encourage institutional investment in faculty development as opposed to less permanent funding sources.

4. Continue to support or add faculty development programs that are centralized units with dedicated staff. These FFDC faculty development structures most consistently used mission statements, goals, needs assessments, and program review to plan and evaluate events, thereby creating more cohesive faculty development programs.

5. Create a client responsive evaluation system with accountability to faculty receiving the services.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Alternative approaches to evaluation of faculty development programs should be explored by interviewing faculty developers and faculty.

2. Outcome-based studies should be conducted on faculty development activities to measure effectiveness. The research and methodology from these studies should be shared and published.

3. The responsibilities, workload percentages, and compensation of faculty developers should be researched in more depth.

4. Chief Financial Officers should be interviewed or surveyed to determine the percentage of institutional funds used for faculty development and the amount invested per faculty member.

5. Chief Academic Officers should be interviewed to explore why faculty development programs are not conducting 100% of faculty development and to identify what other offices or departments are conducting faculty development and why.

Implementing these recommendations for future practice and research could have a significant impact on the evaluation, organization, and funding of faculty development programs. The field of faculty development needs evidence of its successes and failures so that it can improve its services to faculty and create a culture of teaching and learning excellence. Evidence would also provide support for faculty development funding and sustainability. Perhaps through the help of this study, goal-based evaluation will increase in faculty development, and outcome-based models of evaluation will be established. The results and methodologies of these studies should be shared with faculty and other institutions.

The ultimate goal of faculty development should be student success, yet it is so much easier to measure faculty attendance and faculty reactions. Faculty developers should embrace the challenge to connect faculty development to institutional goals and to measure what kind of impact their programs are having on faculty learning, faculty behavior in the classroom, and ultimately student success, especially at a time when collaborative efforts in higher education could be essential.

APPENDIX A:
FLORIDA FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUM
MEMBER LIST 2005-2006

Table 34: Florida Faculty Development Consortium Member List 2005-2006

Member Institutions	Individual Members
Brevard Community College	Don Astrab
	Beverly Slaughter
Broward Community College	Russ Adkins
	Trish Joyce
	Patricial Senior
Daytona Beach Community College	Margaret Overbey
Florida Community College Jacksonville	Victoria McGlone
	Deborah Morris
Indian River Community College	Henri Sue Bynam
	Fontley Corrodus
	Lorraine Coughlin
	Christina Hart
	Brook Long
Manatee Community College	Susan Finley
	Darlene Wedler Johnson
Miami Dade Community College	Marie Nock
Pasco-Hernando Community College	Cheryl Sandoe
Polk Community College	Charles Fox
Santa Fe Community College	Kris Williams
South Florida Community College	Rebecca Rousch
	Mike McLeod
Seminole Community College	Laura Ross
	Jeff Smith
Tallahassee Community College	Karinda Barrett
Valencia Community College	Kira Bishop
	Helen Clark
	Emily Hooker
	David Hosman
	Patrick Nellis
	Daryl Peterson
	Ann Puyana
Eckerd College	Kathryn Watson
Edison College	Lori Bronder
	Pat Gordin
Embry Riddle	Mike Wiggins
Flagler College	Felix Livingston
	Paula Miller

Florida Faculty Development Consortium 2005-2006

Member Institutions, con't.	Individual Members, con't
Florida Tech	Bob Fronk
	Wade Shaw
	Carol Shehadeh
Kaplan	Jeffery King
Rollins College	Sandra Blossey
St. Leo	Deana King
	Carol Walker
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	Deloris Harpool
Florida Gulf Coast University	Nancy Edwards
Florida International University	Jeffery Knapp
Florida State University	Cadence Kidwell
	Carole Hayes
	Walt Wager
University of Central Florida	Tace Crouse
	Eric Main
	Alison Morrison-Shetlar
	Kevin Yee
University of Florida	David Bloomquist
University of North Florida	Jace Hargis
	Deborah Miller
	Erin Soles
University of South Florida	Diane Williams
University of West Florida	Barbara Lyman

APPENDIX B:
NSDC STANDARDS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

NSDC STANDARDS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

(Revised, 2001)

Context Standards

Staff development that improves the learning of all students:

- Organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district. (Learning Communities
- Requires skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement. (Leadership)
- Requires resources to support adult learning and collaboration. (Resources)

Process Standards

Staff development that improves the learning of all students:

- Uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement. (Data Driven)
- Uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Evaluation)
- Prepares educators to apply research to decision making. (Research-Based)
- Uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. (Design)
- Applies knowledge about human learning and change. (Learning)
- Provides educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate. (Collaboration)

Content Standards

Staff development that improves the learning of all students:

- Prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement. (Equity)
- Deepens educators' content knowledge, provides them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and prepares them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately. (Quality teaching)
- Provides educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately. (Family Involvement) (Sparks, 2001)

APPENDIX C:
SURVEY OF THE FLORIDA FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUM:
EVALUATION MODELS, ORGANIZATION, AND FUNDING

Survey of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium: Evaluation Models, Organization, and Funding

SECTION A: EVALUATION OF ACTIVITIES

Please check the most appropriate answers for your institution.

A1. Do you collect <u>written evaluations</u> at any point after an <u>activity</u> (workshop, speaker, consultation) offered through your faculty development program/center? Check one answer.

     _____Always

     _____Often

     _____Rarely

     _____Never

If you selected NEVER, skip to question A4.

A2. What do you ask <u>faculty members</u> to evaluate <u>immediately after</u> they attend an activity offered through your faculty development program/center? Check all that apply.

     _____Their attitude toward the activity

     _____If they experienced an increase in their knowledge or skills

     _____Their intention to apply the new knowledge or skill

     _____Other (please specify)_____

A3. What do you ask <u>faculty members</u> to evaluate <u>one week to one year after</u> their attendance at an activity offered through your faculty development program/center? Check all that apply.

_____If they applied the new knowledge or skill

_____If the new knowledge or skill had an impact on student success

_____Other (please specify)_____

_____Faculty are not asked to evaluate one week to one year after attendance

A4. If you do <u>not</u> collect written evaluations from faculty at any time after faculty development activities, please explain how you evaluate the activities.

SECTION B: PROGRAM MISSION AND GOALS

B1. Does your faculty development program/center have a <u>stated mission statement</u>? Check one answer.

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____Do Not Know

B2. Does your faculty development program/center have <u>stated goals</u>? Check one answer.

_____Yes

_____No

_____Do not know

B3. On the following list of possibilities, Please check <u>the three primary goals</u> that guide your faculty development program.

_____To respond to and support individual faculty member's goals for professional

   development

_____To foster collegiality within and among faculty members

_____To provide recognition and reward excellence in teaching

_____To create or sustain a culture of teaching excellence

_____To advance new initiatives in teaching and learning

_____To act as a change agent within the institution

_____To respond to critical needs as defined by the institution

_____To provide support for faculty experiencing difficulties with teaching

_____To support institutional goals and planning

_____To position the institution at the forefront of educational innovation

_____To meet grant requirements

_____Do Not Know

_____Other (please specify)_____

B4. Faculty development programs/centers may be influenced by a variety of factors. Please indicate three primary factors that influence the goals and activities of your program/center.

_____Faculty interests and concerns

_____Priorities of faculty supervisors (department chairs, deans)

_____Priorities of senior-level institutional leaders

_____Priorities of the director or person leading your faculty development program

_____Immediate organizational issues, concerns, or problems

_____Institutional strategic plan

_____The faculty development program's strategic plan

_____Priorities indicated in the higher education or faculty development literature

_____Grant requirements

_____Do Not Know

_____Other (please specify)_____

SECTION C: EVALUATION OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

C1. Do you conduct formal needs assessments (surveys, focus groups) to determine faculty development programming?

_____Yes

_____No

_____Do Not Know

If NO or DO NOT KNOW, skip to question C3.

C2. If YES, how <u>frequently</u> do you conduct formal <u>needs assessments</u>? Check one answer.

     _____Monthly

     _____Every 6 months

     _____Annually

     _____Other (please specify)_____

C3. Do you conduct <u>evaluations</u> (program reviews) of the <u>faculty development program/center</u>? Check one answer.

     _____Yes

     _____No

     _____Do not know

If NO, skip to question C9.

C4. <u>Who</u> conducts the evaluation (program review) of your faculty development program/center? Check all that apply.

     _____ Administrator(s)

     _____ External evaluator

     _____ Faculty

     _____Institutional committee

     _____ Institutional evaluator

     _____ Person(s) responsible for faculty development

     _____Other (please specify)_____

     _____Do not know

C5. How <u>frequently</u> do you conduct an <u>evaluation</u> (program review) of the faculty development program/center? Check one answer.

    _____Monthly

    _____Every 6 months

    _____Annually

    _____Other (please specify)_____

    _____Do not know

C6. What <u>components</u> do you include in an <u>evaluation</u> (program review) of the faculty development program/center? Check all that apply.

    _____Number of faculty who participate

    _____Faculty responses

    _____Increase in faculty knowledge or skills

    _____Faculty's intention to apply new knowledge or skills

    _____Faculty's use of new knowledge or skills

    _____Impact on student learning

    _____Fulfillment of faculty development program's mission, goals, and objectives

    _____Fulfillment of institutional mission, goals, and objectives

    _____Fulfillment of priorities of the administration

    _____Fulfillment of grant requirements

    _____Fulfillment of needs assessment

    _____Other (please specify)_____

    _____Do not know

C7. Who receives a <u>copy</u> of the faculty development program/center evaluation (program review)? Check all that apply.

     _____It is not distributed

     _____Faculty

     _____Faculty Supervisors (deans, department chairs)

     _____Senior-level administrator(s)

     _____External reviewer (federal or state government, funding organization)

     _____Faculty developers at the institution

     _____Faculty developers at other institutions

     _____Other (please specify)_____

     _____Do not know

C8. Were <u>changes</u> implemented after your last evaluation (program review) of the faculty development program/center? Check one answer.

     _____Yes

     _____No changes were recommended

     _____Changes were recommended but none have been made

     _____Other (please specify)_____

     _____Do not know

C9. If an evaluation (program review) of the faculty development program/center is not conducted, please explain how you evaluate the program.

SECTION D: FUNDING

D1. What is the total budget (personnel, expenses, grants) for your faculty development center (or committee, division) during the 2005-2006 academic year.

$_____

D2. What source (if any) did you use to answer the previous financial question?

_____

D3. What is your institution's total budget (personnel, expenses, grants) for the 2005-2006 academic year? Record the dollar amount.

$_____

D4. What source (if any) did you use to answer the previous financial question?

_____

D5. What are the <u>sources</u> of funding for your institution's faculty development program/center? Check all that apply.

_____ business partnerships

_____ federal grant

_____ grants from non-governmental sources

_____ institutional funds

_____state grant

_____other (please specify)_____

_____no funding

_____do not know

D6. Indicate the <u>primary source</u> of funding for faculty development at your institution. Check one answer.

    _____ business partnerships

    _____ federal grant

    _____ grants from non-governmental sources

    _____ institutional funds

    _____state grant

    _____other (please specify)_____

    _____no funding

    _____do not know

SECTION E: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

E1. How many <u>full-time faculty</u> are employed at your institution during the 2005-2006

academic year? _____

E2. How many <u>part-time faculty</u> are employed at your institution during the 2005-2006

academic year?_____

E3. Check the answer that best describes your institution.

     _____Public

     _____Private

E4. What is your institution's (1994) Carnegie Classification?

     _____Research/Doctoral I or II

     _____Liberal Arts I or II

     _____Comprehensive I or II

     _____Community, Junior, or Technical College

     _____Other (please specify)_____

E5. What best describes your institution's faculty development structure? Check one answer.

     _____A centralized unit with dedicated staff that offers a range of faculty development programs

     _____A "clearinghouse" for programs and offerings that are sponsored across the institution, but offering few programs itself

     _____ A committee charged with supporting faculty development

     _____ An individual faculty member or administrator charged with supporting faculty development

     _____ Other (please describe)_____

E6. Estimate the percentage of all faculty development conducted at your institution that is developed and administered through your center (or committee, division)?_____

E7. Please check all titles or roles that apply to you.

_____Director

_____Program Coordinator

_____ Senior –Level Administrator

_____ Assistant/Associate Director

_____ Technology Coordinator

_____ Instructional Development Consultant

_____ Faculty Member

_____ Other (please specify):_____

E8. What percentage of your workload do you devote to faculty development responsibilities? _____%

E9. Indicate how long you have held a position of responsibility in faculty development.

_____Years—total

_____Years—at this institution

E10. Indicate how many years your faculty development program/center has been in existence.

_____

Thank you for your time. A summary of the findings will be shared with members of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium.

APPENDIX D:
TIMELINE OF DATA COLLECTION

Table 35: Timeline of Data Collection

Date	Procedure
March 9, 2006	Announcement of Study at FFDC Meeting
March 22, 2006	Cognitive Interviews on the Instrument
March 25, 2006	Doctoral Committee Approval of the Study and Instrument
April 12, 2006	Pilot Survey Initiated
April 17, 2006	Pilot Survey Completed
May 4, 2006	IRB Approval Received
May 15, 2006 to July 3, 2006	Announcement Posted on the FFDC Website
May 15, 2006	First E-mail Sent to Distribute Survey
May 26, 2006	Second E-mail Sent to Non-responders
June 16, 2006	Phone Calls to Non-responders
July 1, 2006	Analysis Initiated

APPENDIX E:
CORRESPONDENCE

May 2006

Dear Faculty Developer:

I am a member of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium and a graduate student at the University of Central Florida. As part of my dissertation and in preparation for our September Consortium meeting, I am conducting a survey, the purpose of which is to examine evaluation plans, organizational structures, and funding for faculty development in Florida's higher education institutions. I am asking you to participate in this survey because you are a faculty developer and a member of the Florida Faculty Development Consortium. Your name and email address were acquired through the Florida Faculty Development Consortium Member List. As a participant in this study, you will be asked to complete a survey lasting no longer than 20 minutes. You will not have to answer any question you do not wish to answer. Your identity will be kept confidential and will not be revealed in the final manuscript. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.

There are no anticipated risks, compensation or other direct benefits to you as a participant in this survey. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate and may discontinue your participation in the survey at any time without consequence.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact me at (407) 708-2062. My faculty supervisor, Dr. Rosemarye Taylor may be contacted at (407) 823-1469 or by email at **rtaylor@mail.ucf.edu**. Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to the IRB Coordinator, Institutional Review Board (IRB), University of Central Florida (UCF), 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246. The telephone number is
(407) 823-2901.

Thanks so much for your time. If I do not receive a completed survey from you in two weeks, I will have two reminders, first by email and then by telephone. Once the data is collected, I will provide a summary of the findings to the Consortium members at our September 2006 meeting. The data will help document whether Florida higher education institutions are investing in faculty development based on strategic and measurable criteria.

Here is a link to the survey:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?A=127358579E54432

Thanks for your participation,

Laura Ross

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click on the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/r.asp?A=127358579E54432

Informed Consent:

The first question on the survey asks for the participant's consent:

Please indicate below if you agree to participate in this survey. By clicking on "agree," you also give me permission to report your responses anonymously in the final manuscript to be submitted to my faculty supervisor as part of my course work.

 Agree

 Disagree

APPENDIX F:
AGES OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Table 36: Ages of Faculty Development Programs

Years of Age	N=18	Percent
0	1	5%
2	3	17%
6	2	11%
7	1	5%
9	2	11%
10	3	17%
11	1	5%
12	1	5%
14	1	5%
15	1	5%
17	1	5%
20	1	5%

APPENDIX G:

PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CONDUCTED BY PROGRAMS

Table 37: Percentage of Faculty Development Conducted by Programs

Percentage of Faculty Development Conducted	N=18	Percent
0 to 20	2	11%
21 to 40	0	0%
41 to 60	1	5%
61 to 80	9	51%
81 to 100	1	5%
Missing	5	28
Total	18	100%

APPENDIX H:
EXPERIENCE OF FACULTY DEVELOPERS

Table 38: Experience of Faculty Developers

Years of Experience	N=18	Percentage
0	2	11%
1	2	11%
2	2	11%
4	3	17%
8	3	17%
9	1	5%
10	1	5%
12	1	5%
13	1	5%
14	1	5%
26	1	5%

APPENDIX I:
FUNDING SOURCES

Table 39: Funding Sources

Funding Source	N=18	Percent
Business Partnerships	1	5%
Federal Grant	3	17%
Non-Governmental Grant	3	17%
Institutional Funds	14	78%
State Funds	2	11%
No Funding	0	0%
Do not Know	1	5%
Other	3	17%

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100% because respondents could select more than one answer.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2000). *Faculty development: A senate issue.* Sacramento: Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED445755)

Alstete, J. W. (1997). Benchmarking in higher education: Adapting best practices to improve quality. [ERIC Digest]. Retrieved June 27, 2006 from http://www.ericdigests.org/1997-3/bench.html

Amey, M. J. (1999). Faculty development: Looking towards the 21st century. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College, 7,* 39-48.

Anderson, S. E. (1990). The status of faculty development programs in community colleges in the state of Washington. *Dissertation Abstracts International,51* (03), 720A. (UMI No. 746616851)

Board of Governors, State University System of Florida (2005). Academic program review. Florida Department of Education. Retrieved on March 10, 2006, from http://www.fldcu.org/academic_programs/academic_program_review/

Burke, J. C. (Ed.). (2005). *Achieving accountability in higher education: Balancing public, academic, and market demands.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cardenas, J. (2006, June). *Return on Investment: A winning strategy.* Paper presented at the League of Innovation Learning College Summit, St. Louis, MO.

Chait, R. P. (2002). Why tenure? Why now? In R. P. Chait (Ed.), *The questions of tenure* (pp. 6-31). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cohen, J. S. (2006, March 15). Ad blitz will give it old college try. *Chicago Tribune.*

Retrieved March 15, 2006, from www.chicagotribune.com.

Connecticut State Board of Trustees of Community-Technical Colleges. (1999).

Connecticut Community-Technical Colleges faculty development and review plan

(FDRP). Hartford: Connecticut State Board of Trustees of Community-Technical

Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED434715)

Connor-Linton, J. (2003). *Chi Square Tutorial.* Retrieved from Georgetown Linguistics

Web site: http://www.georgetown.edu/faculty/ballc/webtools/web_chi_tut.html

Cook, E. C. & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2002, April 26). The value of a teaching center. *The*

Chronicle of Higher Education, 48, B21.

Dillman (2000). *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method.* New York,

NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Ebersole, T. & Mince, R. (2006). *Learning communities for faculty: Connecting*

teaching, learning, leadership, renewal, succession. Paper presented at the

League of Innovation Learning College Summit, St. Louis, MO.

Eble, K. E. & McKeachie, W. J. (1985). *Improving undergraduate education through*

faculty development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Eveyln, J. (2001, June 15). The hiring boom at 2-year colleges. [Electronic version]. *The*

Chronicle of Higher Education, 47, B1.

Fink, A. (2003). *How to manage, analyze, and interpret survey data* (2nd ed.). Thousand

Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

146

Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K., & Schuster, J. H. (1998). *The New Academic Generation: A Profession in Transformation.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Florida Faculty Development Consortium (2005). Retrieved January 23, 2006, from http://www.fctl.ucf.edu/consortium/

Florida Legislature (2005). *The 2005 Florida Statutes.* Retrieved March 16, 2006, from http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm

Fowler, F. C. (2004). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Pearson.

Fowler, F. J. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Gaff, J. G. (1975). *Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty, instructional, and organizational development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Giordano, M. M. (1990). Full-time faculty development programs in Illinois community colleges: 1988. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 50* (12), 3806A. (UMI No. 745612531)

Grant, M. R. (2000). Faculty development in publicly supported two-year colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(08), 3008A. (UMI No. 9982068)

Grant, M. R. & Keim, M. C. (2002). Faculty development in publicly supported two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26,* 793-807.

Guskey, T. R. (1997). Research needs to link professional development and student

    learning. *Journal of Staff Development, 18.* Retrieved January 26, 2004, from

    National Staff Development Council Web site:

    http://nscd.org/library/publications/jsd/jsdgusk.cfm

Guskey, T. R. (1998). The age of our accountability: Evaluation must become an integral

    part of staff development. *Journal of Staff Development, 19.* Retrieved May 19,

    2006, from http://www.nsdc.org

Hansen, S., Kalish, A., Hall, W. E., Gynn, C. M., Holly, M. L., Madigan, D. (2004).

    Developing a statewide faculty learning community program. *New Directions for*

    Teaching and Learning, 97, 71-80.

Hawley, W. D. & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development.

    In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession:*

    Handbook of Policy and Practice (pp. 127-150). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Honaker, E. J. (1983). Outstanding community/junior college staff development

    programs in the southeastern United States. Abstract retrieved June 28, 2006,

    from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database.

Horn, L. & Nevill, S. (2006). *Profiles of undergraduates in U.S. postsecondary education*

    institutions: 2003-2004 with a special analysis of community college students.

    National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved June 28, 2006, from

    http://nces.ed.gov/

Joyner, E. T. (2000). No more "drive-by staff development." *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education.* Senge, P., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., & Kleiner (Eds.). (pp. 385-394). New York: Doubleday.

Keller, G. (2001). The new demographics of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 24,* 219-235.

Kerr, C. (1997). Speculations about the increasingly indeterminate future of higher education in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education, 20.4,* 345-356.

Killion, J. (2002). *What works in the elementary school results-based staff development*. National Staff Development Council and National Education Association. Retrieved May 19, 2006, from www.nsdc.org

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels.* San Francisco: Publishers Group West.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1996). Great ideas revisited: Revisiting Kirkpatrick's four-level model. *Training & Development, 50.* 54-57. Retrieved January 14, 2006, from ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (2004). A *T & D* classic: How to start an objective evaluation of your training program. *T & D, 58.* 16-18. Retrieved January 14, 2006, from ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2005). *Transferring learning to behavior: Using the four levels to improve performance.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Laufgraben, J. L., Pica, J. A., & Swing, R. L. (2004). How benchmarking can help us improve what we do. *About Campus,* 4-11.

Lederman, D. (2006, February 15). No college left behind? *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved February 15, 2006, from http://insidehighered.com/news/2006/02/15/testing

Licata, C. M. & Morreale, J. C. (1999). Post-tenure review: National trends, questions, and concerns. *Innovative Higher Education, 24,* 5-15.

Lomax, R. G. (2001). *An introduction to statistical concepts for education and behavioral sciences.* Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Lyons, R. E., McIntosh, M. & Kysilka, M. L. (2003). *Teaching in an Age of Accountability.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McClenney, K. M. (2004). Keeping America's promise: Challenges for community college. *Keeping America's promise: A report on the future of the community college.*

McNeil, K., Newman, I. & Steinhauser, J. (2005). *How to be involved in program evaluation: What every administrator needs to know.* Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.

Murray, J. P. (1999). Faculty development in a national sample of community colleges. *Community College Review, 37,* 18-23.

Murray, J. P. (2002a). The current state of faculty development in two-year colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 118,* 89-97.

Murray, J. P. (2002b). Faculty development in SACS-accredited community colleges. *Community College Review, 29,* 50-66. Retrieved June 27, 2006, from Wilson Web database.

National Center for Education Statistics (2001). Background characteristics, work activities, and compensation of faculty and instructional staff in postsecondary institutions: Fall 1998. Retrieved June 29, 2006,from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2001152

National Center for Education Statistics (2004). Digest of education statistics, 2004. Retrieved February 14, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/do4/ch_3.asp

National Center for Education Statistics (2004). The condition of education: Contexts of postsecondary education. Retrieved February 14, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/list/index.asp

National Center for Education Statistics (2004). The condition of education: Student effort and educational progress. Retrieved February 14, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/list/index.asp

National Center for Education Statistics (2005). The condition of education: Societal support for learning. Retrieved February 14, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2005/section5/indicator40.asp

National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development. (2006)

http://www.ncspod.org

National Staff Development Council. *Evaluation.* Retrieved May 19, 2006, from

http://www.nsdc.org.

Nichols, D. P. (1999). My coefficient a is negative! Retrieved August 27, 2006, from

http://www.atc.ucla.edu/STAT/SPSS/library/negalpha.htm

O'Banion, T. (1978). *Organizing staff development programs that work.* Washington, D.

C.: American Association of Community and Junior colleges.

Palomba, C. A. & Banta, T. (1999). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and*

improving assessment in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Publishers.

Paterno, D. L. (1994). Elements of faculty development programs and their evaluation at

Texas community colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55* (05), 1202A.

(UMI No. 747033551)

Phillips, J. J. & Stone, R. D. (2002) *How to measure training results: A practical guide to*

tracking the six key indicators. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Posavac, E. J. & Carey, R. G. (2003). *Program evaluation methods and case studies* (6th

ed.). Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education. (2006)

http://www.podnetwork.org

Rice, E. R., Finkelstein, M. J., Hall, S., Schuster, J. H. (2004, March/April). The future of

    the American faculty. *Change, 36,* 26-36. Retrieved January 22, 2006, from

    Academic Search Premier.

Rifkin, T. (2000) *Public community college faculty* (American Association of

    Community Colleges New Expedition Issue Paper). Retrieved March 11, 2005,

    from www.aacc.nche.edu

Sanchez-Penley, Y., Martinez, M. C., & Nodine, T. (1997). Florida: Protecting access

    and anticipating growth. In Callan, P. M., Finney, J. E., Bracco, K. R., & Doyle,

    W. R. (Eds.), *Public and private financing of higher education: Shaping public*

    policy for the future (pp. 106-136). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Shaha, S. H., Lewis V. K., O'Donnell, T. J., and Brown, D. H. (2004). *Evaluating*

    professional development: An approach to verifying program impact on teachers

    and students. Retrieved May 19, 2006, from the National Staff Development

    Council http://www.nsdc.org

Singer, S. R. (2002). Learning and teaching centers: Hubs of educational reform. *New*

    Directions for Higher Education, 119, 59-64.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of*

    Counseling and Development, 72, 474-479.

Sorcinelli, M. D., (2002) Ten principles of good practice in creating and sustaining

    teaching and learning centers. In K. H. Gillespie (Ed.), *A Guide to Faculty*

    Development: Practical Advice, Examples, and Resources (pp. 9-23). Bolton,

    MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., and Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future*

    of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present.

    Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Sparks, D. NSDC revises staff development standards. National Staff Development

    Council. Retrieved May 19, 2006, from www.nsdc.org

Stolzenberg, E. B. (2002). Sources and information: Professional development in

    community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 120,* 85-95.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation models. *New Directions for Evaluation, 89,* San

    Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sydow, D. (2000). Long-term investment in professional development: Real dividends in

    teaching and learning. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 25.*

    Retrieved June 15, 2006, from Academic Search Premier database.

Taber, L. S. (1997). A report on the faculty and staff development needs and preferences

    of Alabama's two-year employees. Tuscaloosa: Tuscaloosa Department of Higher

    Education, Alabama University (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No.

    ED 407993)

Tierney, W. G. (1993). *Building communities of difference: Higher education in the twenty-first century.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Tierney, W. G. (1998). *Building the responsive campus: Creating high performance colleges and universities.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Wallin, D. (2002). Faculty professional development: Building a world of learners. *Community College Journal, 75,* 32-35.

Wallin, D. L. (2003). Motivation and faculty development: A three-state study of presidential perceptions of faculty professional development needs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 27,* 317-335.

Warburton, E. C., Chen, X., & Bradburn, E. M. (2002). *Teaching with technology: Use of telecommunications technology by postsecondary instructional faculty and staff in fall 1998.* National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved June 29, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002161

Watts, G. E. & Hammons, J. O. (2002). Professional development: Setting the context. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 120,* 5-10.

Welsch, J. F. & Metcalf, J. (2003). Cultivating faculty support for institutional effectiveness activities: Benchmarking best practices. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28,* 33-45.

Wright, D. L. (2002). Program types and prototypes. In K. H. Gillespie (Ed.), *A Guide to Faculty Development: Practical Advice, Examples, and Resources* (pp. 24-34). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Young, R. E. (1987). Evaluating faculty development programs: Programs goals first. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 56,* 71-82.

Zumeta, W. M. (2005). Accountability and the private sector: State and federal perspectives. In J. C. Burke (Ed.) *Achieving accountability in higher education: Balancing public, academic, and market demands* (pp. 25-54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.