Spring 1979

The Future of Faculty Development

David O. Justice

The Future of Faculty Development*

DAVID O. JUSTICE

Reading the future is a risky business for the most thoughtful and prescient minds. I was therefore surprised to be asked to address the future of faculty development in view of the fact that I already have a record of predictions. I predicted, for example, 'Richard Nixon will never resign'; 'The Cardinals will stick with an Italian-Pope' and 'there will be a cabinet level Department of Education in 1978'.

With this record behind me, I will nonetheless turn my talents to faculty development and present my thoughts about its future. I should point out that I use the term faculty development in its most inclusive sense. I call most efforts by colleges, universities and outside agencies to positively change or improve faculty, in any of its roles, faculty development. Thus the most widespread and prominent faculty development program in higher education has been the provision of sabbatical leaves.

Taking as a temporal perspective the three decades between 1960 and 1990, one can usefully characterize the 1960's as a decade of student development. The 1970's I will call the decade of Faculty Development. And the 1980's I will argue will be a decade of Institutional Development.

Driven by new high enrollments, a result of the baby boom and a revolution in access to postsecondary education, new institutions, new programs, and a proliferation of curricular offerings characterized the growth of postsecondary education in the 1960's. The economic and ethnic diversity of students entering postsecondary education as well as the large number of first generation college attenders stimulated a range of programs aimed at the "new student," the "non-traditional" student, and the "underprepared" student.

With the advent of the 1970's upward enrollment pressures began to slacken, but the diversity of students entering postsecondary education continued. The entry of increasing numbers of adults, turning or returning to education after years in the work force, maintained the pressure on postsecondary education to adapt its offerings to a new set of needs.

Curricular change and the expansion of the catalogue were inadequate responses to the problems. Furthermore, changing enrollment patterns left colleges and universities with too many faculty in some areas, too few in others. Institutions which had raised standards for admission in response to faculty demands for selectivity now found themselves accepting students less well prepared, but with a faculty unable or unwilling to meet these students' learning needs.

In addition, increased pressure to restrict budgets in a range of institutions caused many administrators to look more carefully at the allocation of human resources, the largest part of all institutional budgets.

Faculty Development as a movement responded to all of these concerns. It was a means of bringing about change within institutions which could potentially address the need for flexibility, efficiency and effectiveness. It was a technology, if you will, for reordering priorities within a department or across an entire institution.

There are, in fact, a range of programs, activities, and practices which travel under the title "faculty development." The following is one attempt to categorize them.

Training

To attack the problems which faculty development addresses, training programs have been mounted to train in a variety of specific skills relating to better teaching, including learning contracts, the Personalized System of Instruction, and management of simulation and gaming programs. In addition, a number of training approaches focused on more generic skills. These have been useful in changing faculty roles and allowing faculty members to function more effectively in their institutional settings. Training in interpersonal skills, empathy training, and small group dynamics have been used to develop a setting and an atmosphere as well as a process for introducing and implementing change.

Evaluation

A major effort was made at a number of colleges and universities in the early 70's to develop and improve various techniques of student evaluation of faculty teaching. For the most part these efforts were based on the assumption that a better system of accountability for teaching would increase the attention paid to outstanding teaching in the distribution of rewards. At a second level the evaluation systems were developed in an attempt to diagnose the nature and extent of problems teachers had in reaching students.

Some of the most notable and widely used systems have been those developed for this diagnostic responsibility. The Cafeteria system developed at Purdue University and the IDEA system from Kansas State University both provide the individual faculty member with detailed feedback on how students rate various aspects of the teacher's performance.

The Southern Regional Education Board in Atlanta has gone beyond student evaluations in an effort to develop in 30 of its member institutions comprehensive systems of evaluation which examine the faculty member's performance in the range of roles performed by him or her. And, at the University of Illinois, a program evaluation process has been developed which measures the comprehensive effectiveness of programs within the University.

In all of the efforts the underlying assumption has been that an improvement in evaluation techniques can have an impact on the quality of education through its effects on the incentive and reward system, and through improved practice via the formative feedback to the individuals involved.

Technical Assistance

Often in close association with evaluation efforts faculty development centers or programs have tried to have an impact on faculty by providing a variety of services and resources. Audio-visual capacities, curricular materials, videotaping for micro-teaching exercises and a library of materials on teaching are frequently available to faculty members. For the most part these centers rely on faculty to initiate contact and view their intervention as responding to needs identified by the faculty member.

In an extension of this basic model a number of centers also provide more direct intervention in the form of instructional design. In these programs the emphasis is placed on the course unit rather than

the faculty member and the results are more frequently measured in terms of student learning or satisfaction. Consultants from a center work with subject matter specialists (faculty members) to design or redesign a curriculum, and the mode in which it is presented to the student. In effect, the center takes on a shared responsibility for the success of the class and hence intrudes subtly on the control of the faculty member over his/her course.

Consulting

Frequently, colleges not ready to establish a permanent program in faculty development have looked for ways of initiating improvement in teaching with limited or temporary costs. A number of such institutions have used teaching faculty to function as peer consultants to their colleagues. In these cases, one or more faculty members become familiar with the relevant literature in faculty development and offer their expertise discretely to their peers. Most important in these programs is the stature of the consultant among his/her colleagues.

At Earlham College in Indiana a professor of Chemistry serves his colleagues as a resource, an expert in teaching, and an easy listener to a range of academic laments. In the State University of New York at Stony Brook, faculty members are taking on the role of "Master Learners," modeling good learning behavior for students in the classrooms of their peers while providing sound feedback to their peers on what is and is not getting through to learners.

Counseling

Increasingly in recent years and, I believe, in the future, counseling will become a major vehicle for achieving faculty development. As the role of responsibilities for faculty change and as the employment prospects tighten and mobility slackens, faculty dissatisfaction with themselves, their jobs and their prospects will increase. Intelligent programs providing a range of personal and professional counseling to assist faculty members in making important life and work decisions will provide one solution to the changed circumstances.

At Loyola University in Chicago a small program has been initiated which offers faculty members opportunities in family and personal counseling, financial management and exchanges with

business, government and other departments within the University. The Pennsylvania State Colleges now have a program to assist faculty in exploring, identifying, and securing alternative careers.

Uses of Faculty Development

If these are a fair categorization of the dominant modes of faculty development, what are the uses to which it has been put and where has it been successful?

IMPROVING TEACHING

More than any other goal, faculty development has been aimed at improving teaching. To make good teachers better and poor teachers less inadequate has been the objective of most faculty development programs. The results in this department are scattered and not wholly reliable, but there is at least enough testimonial evidence to support the increasing resources devoted to such programs. Changes in student ratings have at least shown some improvement as a consequence of faculty development activities at Kansas State University and at the University of Rhode Island. Other measures of increased faculty innovation in teaching as a result of faculty development activities are also encouraging, although show no evidence of improved learning.

PERSONAL GROWTH

A second, and in the minds of many, closely related application of faculty development has been the personal growth and development of faculty members. Here evidence is more direct—self reporting. And the confidence that something valuable can be done is also higher. Indeed the sense of personal improvement obtained from faculty development activities is the most widespread and commonly reported effect. It is more difficult to learn how long lasting and significant in behavorial terms this personal growth has been.

STIMULATING CHANGE

For many institutions faculty development programs have been useful in preparing the whole institution for change by unfreezing people from beliefs, behaviors and attitudes which would otherwise have blocked change. Faculty development then functions to ex-

pand horizons, raise hopes, and change perspectives. The changes which result may be major curricular innovations or simply the modification of individual faculty member's courses. The initiation of change processes seems to be better understood than the problem of the long distance survival of more radical departures from traditional practices. In the latter instances, the power of faculty development technologies is not yet proven.

IMPROVING MANAGEMENT

Increasingly in recent years, faculty development programs and approaches have been applied to management and organizational problems. Training of administrators in sound management techniques, acquainting faculty directly with the managerial constraints of the institution, and developing the context and framework for better decision making at all levels of the institution have been among the recent application of faculty development programs.

Two variations of management improvement have evolved. Training of Deans, Department Chairs, Vice Presidents, Registrars and the like in better business practices has been delivered through workshops, seminars, reading assignments and simulation exercises. Goals of more profound institutional changes involving curricular or organizational change have also been pursued through programs aimed at administrators. But in these programs the effort is to train managers in more sophisticated and complex behaviors, including conflict management, dispersed decision-making models, and new theories of institutional functioning.

Problems Which Faculty Development Addresses

Faculty Development has grown in response to a range of problems which emerged in intensity in the late sixties and which continue in altered forms to the present. The increase in total enrollments brought on first by the baby boom, and maintained and extended through the national commitment to a mass system of postsecondary education has forced many adjustments to the system. The resulting increase in the diversity of learners seeking education extended the need for change. An expanded domain of knowledge deemed appropriate for postsecondary education has created further specialization along with needs for new integration.

Changing patterns of work within society has called for alterna-

tive arrangements for learning. And changing life styles and pat-
terns, particularly the expanded number of women in the work
force and in education, has presented education with the challenge
of new, more appropriate, programs and the need to address the
problem of equity within the academic professions.

Finally there has been a reassessment of the definition and role
of higher education. We now speak of postsecondary education, of
lifelong learning and of a "learning society." Credit is now routinely
awarded for learning which has occurred outside the walls of formal
classrooms. Changed assumptions about what constitutes education
and how one may legitimately obtain it have altered many of the
traditional assumptions about the proper roles of faculty members.

There is less confidence that the credential which education
brings will result in high status or income, but a greater acceptance
of the wider range of issues and problems to which education can
make a contribution.

In the 60's, faculty development was confined largely to contrib-
uting to the creation of more knowledge and the redefinition of the
categories of knowledge. Remember area studies programs, Black
studies programs, ethnic studies, interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary
and the like.

In the 70's, faculty development programs were initiated in in-
creasing numbers to respond to the various pressures created by the
inclusion of new students, women, minorities, underprepared and
adult learners. In the 80's, I believe all of these issues will be brought
together as faculty development responds to the needs for Excel-
lence, Equity and Efficiency.

Faculty Development in the 1980's

Although some have predicted the demise of faculty development
activities in the 1980's, I foresee continued expansion of both faculty
development technologies and of applications of faculty develop-
ment programs. Faculty development, as it has been used in the
1970's, has attended largely to extending and enhancing the skills,
knowledge and understanding of faculty members as teachers. In
the 1980's faculty development programs will be asked to function
more holistically to attend to problems of *excellence, equity* and
efficiency.

Programs in faculty development can look beyond the role of

the individual faculty member and use its techniques to enhance the overall functioning of programs. In particular, the myriad programs spawned in the 60's and 70's to address the special needs of new clienteles will be required in the 80's to meet new and tougher standards of excellence. The pressures of slow growth or retrenchment will mean that programs must gain and maintain a high standard of quality to survive.

Faculty development programs can be a powerful force in determining which programs succeed. By applying the techniques of faculty development in the service of the programs' overall goals, the quality of these new offerings can be substantially enhanced. By encouraging a closer identity between the goals and interests of faculty members and those of the new educational programs, faculty development can contribute to their stability and their value to the educational community and to society.

There is, of course, a further need which will be tested in the 1980's—postsecondary education's commitment to equity. The revolution of access has brought large numbers of heretofore underrepresented clientele into postsecondary institutions. The quality and usefulness of the educational opportunities they have received, however, have not always fulfilled the national commitment to equality of educational opportunity. Faculty development can be instrumental in allowing institutions to realize this commitment.

But there is another, more direct role for faculty development— the recruitment, promotion and tenure of minority group faculty members and women. Both to assure that the quality of the institution's offerings are as high as possible and to maintain an institution which fully reflects the diversity of race and sex of its clientele, faculty development programs can help call upon the untapped talents and resources in the underrepresented populations.

Finally, in the 1980's, there will be an irresistible pressure for postsecondary education to increase the efficiency of its operation. Much has already been done, of course, to control expenses in many areas. But real savings can only be realized in postsecondary education when some attention is given to the 80% of the budget which pays for instruction. Thoughtful applications of what we know about faculty role specialization, judicious use of new counseling and advising programs, individualized instruction and contract learning all offer opportunities to increase efficiency without

sacrificing quality. Their implementation and use, however, re-
quires a wider consideration than merely cost-cutting on the one
hand or program reductions on the other. Here again it will be the
role of faculty development programs to identify the interests of the
program with the interests of the faculty member. Here too the pur-
pose of improving efficiency is not simply to satisfy cost-cutting
demands of federal and state legislative bodies, or boards of trus-
tees, but rather to be able to realize this society's commitment to a
postsecondary educational system open to all who can benefit from
it. Only by reducing per student costs can the goal that "more will
be able to learn better" be achieved.

Much of what we have proposed about faculty development in
the 80's has assumed a role for faculty development which is rather
different from what it is today. Begun in a time in which faculty
were in need of help, programs in faculty development will have to
adjust to a period in which institutions are in need of help. The
success of faculty development programs in the next decade will
depend on their capacity to translate the technologies developed in
response to faculty problems and apply them in a more compre-
hensive, institutional context. They will have to be able to mold the
personal and professional concerns of faculty members, with the
altered roles of institutions. In some cases this will mean constricted
roles; in some, expanded. Faculty development programs will be
asked not only to help faculty members enhance the quality of
teaching, but also to bring them a better understanding of and
capacity to participate actively in the management of a larger learn-
ing community. They will need to know the constraints as well as
the opportunities which confront their institution and postsecondary
education more broadly.

Faculty development has tackled many difficult problems in its
recent history. And it has evolved a number of potent technologies
for effecting change. In the decade of the 1980's the collective force
of these technologies will be tested in their capacity to bring about
improvements in the management, organization, and operation of
postsecondary educational institutions.

Enrollments will, for the most part, remain constant or decline.
At the same time demographers predict that there will be a shortage
of people in the work force. In the past this condition has tended to
draw students away from education. Thus, if education is going to

continue to serve a diversity of clients it will need to adapt programs for other than the full time student, including the adaptation of the time and place of learning as well as the content and pedagogy employed.

There is not likely to be much increase in funding either at the federal or state levels for higher education and hence improvements, if they are to come, must emerge from the institutions. Given the traditions and habits of higher education, that has to mean from the faculty. If the demands of a decade of restraint and constraint are still to be a decade of improvement to a quality system of post-secondary education, faculty development will have to make a major contribution.