1989

Part II: Building Successful Faculty Development Programs

Part II

Building Successful Faculty Development Programs

Starting a new faculty development program, redirecting an existing one, and approaching the daunting task of evaluating one — these are the issues discussed in the articles included in the section that follows. In "The Words Made Fresh: Transforming the Language and Context of Faculty Development," Marie Wunsch describes a model program that defines itself in terms of developing the faculty support system, as opposed to developing faculty members themselves, and that includes activities aimed at nurturing the sense of academic community among faculty members and students. These emphases, she argues, along with careful attention to the "language" of development, have removed any stigma of "remediation" from the program and helped to attract enthusiastic faculty participation. Harry G. Lang and James J. DeCaro in their article, "Support from the Administration: A Case Study in the Implementation of a Grassroots Faculty Development Program," describe how a centralized, administration-controlled faculty development program evolved into a decentralized, faculty-controlled program. The new program is less expensive and attracts considerably more faculty participation than its more traditionally structured predecessor.

Both of these articles make the case that attention to faculty interests and needs is a key ingredient of a successful development program. Another key ingredient is periodic evaluation. Robert J. Menges and Marilla Svinicki, in their article on "Designing Program Evaluations: A Circular Model," propose an alternative to conventional rationalist and naturalistic evaluation approaches. Their "circular model" combines ele-

ments of rationalist, naturalistic, and other models, uses a variety of data collection methods, and is accessible even to inexperienced evaluators.