DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 881 IR 002 591

AUTHOR DeBloois, Mike
TITLE Reflections on Instructional Development at Utah State University. Candid Comments on an ID Center's Beginnings.
INSTITUTION Utah State Univ., Logan. Merrill Library and Learning Resources Program.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 15p.; For related document see IR 002 590 and 592

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; College Faculty; *College Instruction; Effective Teaching; Higher Education; Incentive Systems; *Instructional Improvement; Models; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Program Planning; Question Answer Interviews; Released Time; Resource Centers; State Universities; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Instructional Development; Minigrants; Utah State University

ABSTRACT

An on-going evaluation is being made of Utah State University's instructional development endeavor; this paper has emerged from a question answer interview with the Director of the program by an external evaluator. The Director describes the Instructional Development Program which is designed to improve the teaching/learning process by developing in professors an interest in learning theory, team teaching, computer-assisted instruction, simulations, seminars, the lecture, and self-paced instruction. The model chosen for implementing the instructional improvement program consists of three stages: (1) awareness level, for which the literature on instructional renewal was surveyed and pertinent information sent to the professor; (2) initiative level, for which minigrants were awarded to professors who wanted to develop a new teaching strategy; and (3) the instructional development level where participating faculty members are released full time for one quarter to work on a project of their own choosing. The Director concludes that the model has enjoyed modest success, that they are in the process of modifying it, and that they are pleased that it is making some contribution toward improving teaching and learning at a small university. (KKC)

Instructional Development

Candid Comments on an ID Center's Beginnings

utah state university

REFLECTIONS ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY*

EVALUATOR: I am interested in finding out how the Utah State Instructional Development model came into being. Could you describe that for me?

DIRECTOR: Five years ago a new President, Glen Taggart, arrived at USU. Early in his administration he charged a faculty/student committee to undertake the task of assessing the status of undergraduate education. On the basis of long discussions in the early stages and after examining the efforts of similar projects at other institutions, the committee decided against a formal written report on their study; instead they turned to the approach of action research. They divided up into task groups; one studied the question of general education, another delved into the problem of dormitories, another worked on the issue of undergraduate research, another examined the lectures and lyceum series. A final group began to question what was happening in instruction at Utah State; asking whether something could improve the teaching/learning process.

EVALUATOR: Was that final group the basis for the Instructional Development?

DIRECTOR: Yes, initially that teaching improvement subcommittee had a limited vision about some kind of self-help agency. Fortunately, the committee had some funds which enabled its members to go about the country and see what else was being done. They didn't realize until they began to travel, that a new discipline called Instructional Development was being born in the United States. They visited Michigan State, Indiana, the Teaching Research Center in Oregon, the Instructional Resources Program at Brigham Young University, and finally Florida State. Instructional developers at each institution were interviewed and a variety of approaches to improving university teaching were discussed.

At the same time the new President, and especially his Provost, initiated a study to coordinate the media production agencies on the campus. There were several: Television, Photography, Printing, Radio--but they were all separate agencies, located at diverse corners of the campus, making it difficult for faculty members to use them for undergraduate instruction. To resolve the problem, the Provost appointed a consultant to develop a proposal for improved organization of the media services. A third effort, going on independently at the same time, was aimed at producing a master plan for the future of the library. A systems analyst was working with the library staff to create new efficiencies and design a way to help a modest library become adequate for a university.

---

*This paper has emerged from an interview with an external evaluator as part of the on-going evaluation of USU's Instructional Development endeavor.

EVALUATOR: What did these groups have in common?

DIRECTOR: At first, very little. As the three groups gradually became aware of each other, they began interacting, eventually coalescing into one blue ribbon committee. Out of this interaction came a lengthy proposal which was sent to the Faculty Senate and then to the President. It proposed the creation of a Learning Resources Program which would include the library, add to it all the media production agencies, and then create a small division to deal with the question of improving instruction.

EVALUATOR: How did your efforts relate to other instructional development programs on other campuses?

DIRECTOR: The section of that proposal that dealt with the improvement of college instruction reported what had been discovered about the new instructional development movement. This movement was based on principles of general systems theory, as practiced in industry and at NASA. The new centers were impressed with training programs which had been produced for the military and industry. The Vice-Provost at Michigan State went to industry, found people with Ph.D.'s in educational psychology who had been in the business of developing training materials and enticed them to the university to help faculty develop instructional materials. They brought their systems management concepts with them to the arena of higher education. In another part of the country, Syracuse University leaders were talking about improving college instruction; they turned instead to instructional media training programs for some solutions: So at least two active alternatives were available.

EVALUATOR: These two alternatives were a systems approach vs. one from instructional media. Which did you choose?

DIRECTOR: The USU faculty, through a committee composed primarily of individuals with humane interest in improving instruction, soon saw that they were jumping into a pool containing disciplines about which they knew very little. Thus they advised beginning with a very modest program that had elements of both options. The resulting Learning Resources Program created a division where instruction could be systematically designed and the division would also relate to the media production services that were located in the other divisions.

The concept of the comprehensive Learning Resources Program is illustrated in the attached chart and shows how the program can provide any size or format of learning materials, whether it be print or film, fiche or tape, that faculty and students need for learning and teaching. Where those materials are not obtainable, the program attempts to produce it in such alternatives as radio, television, printing, graphics, or audiovisual media.

EVALUATOR: Would you describe how you settled on the instructional development model you are using.

DIRECTOR: In the early stages we may have felt that we had some answers about what professors should do to improve their instruction, but it didn't take long for us to see that we had to be pretty careful about telling people, "This is what you ought to do."

One alternative we entertained initially was advocacy; we could have promoted specific approaches such as a blanket requirement for course performance objectives or a specific instructional media usage. For example, all the faculty are supposed to file a syllabus for each course they teach. One idea would be to require them to write solid course syllabi with behavioral objectives; this would cause them to do more rigorous planning. It was quickly obvious that such a requirement would engender more opposition than results. The resistance would likely be so intensive that it would destroy the whole program. In those first visionary days we might have responded to that opposition by claiming that critics were uninformed, and they really needed the requirement most of all. Had we taken such a stance, we would certainly have encountered able faculty members who could sabotage the concept of an instructional development program because there are some academic as well as tactical vulnerabilities in the use of educational technology principles. It didn't take too long to discover that instructional technology applications were in themselves still very tenuous.

EVALUATOR: Can you give an example of a "hard sell" approach?

DIRECTOR: Yes, the new college president at a sister institution followed the approach we rejected. He was committed to the idea of self-pacing; he thought he could sell the legislature of the state on a way of saving money, so he announced that all multiple section courses would be cancelled and would be taught in individual, self-pacing modules. He devoted a portion of the budget to the creation of learning modules, but he ran into hefty opposition. Fortunately, our President wouldn't even entertain the idea of using such coercion; but we might have made that mistake if the power had been available. Its absence forced us to examine our environment more reflectively; we concluded that cajoling the faculty is self-defeating in the academic atmosphere.

EVALUATOR: What other options did you consider as an alternative?

DIRECTOR: There was another option we considered which was exemplified by the Teaching Research Center at Monmouth, Oregon, the Learning Resources Program at Brigham Young University, the British Open University, and the Federal Regional Laboratories. At such research and development centers a large staff of trained instructional designers produce learning materials on the basis of an explicit design model and with major investment of professional time and materials. Once completed, these learning materials are said to be "validated." At these centers professional instructional developers produce projects which they then make available for faculty adoption.

That was the most highly respected route at the time because of the claim that the learning materials emerging from these laboratories could be validated, guaranteeing student learning. Besides the fact that we didn't have massive amounts of money necessary to go that way, there are some philosophical problems with that approach. It puts the developer and the learner in the center of the process while the teacher invests very little. Because the professor is only minimally involved in the development of the validated materials, he often does not adopt them. This caused us to reconsider whether the research and development model is appropriate for the university.

EVALUATOR: If the industrial or the coercive approaches have drawbacks for the university setting, where do you turn?

DIRECTOR: It is obvious that there is a substantial difference between the university and both the research and development laboratories and the industrial atmosphere where the systems development models, such as the NASA systems, emerged. Much of the applied research that has been done on instruction has been for the military and industrial environment or for the public schools. The university has its own powerful environment and set of values. The university places its major premium upon the professors and the students, not on the administration or learning theory. Its product is not tangible, such as those in the space or defense industries. Academic institutions do not have a hierarchial organization which set policies and tells people what to do. On the contrary, the faculty functions on the assumption that they are their own experts.

The university is a pretty good example of a Theory Y organization, using Douglas McGregor's words, where the institution pays a high price for the most talented people it can get and then leaves them to set their own objectives, design their own work, implement it, and evaluate it. The administration doesn't supervise professors extensively; scholars don't punch a clock and the administration assumes that faculty members desire to be productive. The administrator's job is to enable the faculty to work. Since this kind of power structure drives the university, we had to decide whether to confront the model and change it or to accept it and build an improvement strategy which finds energy in the model.

EVALUATOR: And exactly how did you propose to do that?

DIRECTOR: As we looked at that model of the university, some serious liabilities surfaced in conjunction with teaching. In many cases the university professor's perception of teaching is that instruction is a by-product of scholarship. This view assumes that the prerequisite for being a teacher is knowledge. Obtaining a research degree is considered to be appropriate preparation in becoming a teacher. Then, as a scholar goes before students he can merely draw upon his personality and humanity, which will enable him to communicate his knowledge to students. The idea that a scholar should learn how to teach or that he should design learning materials has not been very seriously considered. Scholars have seldom felt that professional literature on teaching and learning is important

for them. Instead they prepare each lesson by gathering information which they then transmit to students. That limited view of teaching is the liability of the model of allowing the professor to be sovereign. Nonetheless, we have concluded that the model is so firmly entrenched that we ought to work within the model rather than to reject it. When viewed across time, the success of the basic university model and its Theory Y dimensions engender respect for its worth.

EVALUATOR: How can an instructional design team work with that much flexibility and a "hands off" feeling?

DIRECTOR: What we would like to do is to find a way to interest the professor in initiating the improvement of instruction rather than us intervening in the model to disrupt it. We would like to find some way of stimulating the professor's interests into learning theory and into instructional design. We are hoping that the professor can be encouraged either by an existing reward structure, or some visibility on campus or through power of research information or by student feedback. If the professor can be encouraged to make an initiative of his own, then we can support that initiative to produce an improved learning-teaching experience. Our basic approach is to accept the professor's autonomy as the basis for interaction and to direct the strength of the base, through appropriate intervention into meaningful improvement activities.

EVALUATOR: Aren't there some drawbacks to that approach?

DIRECTOR: There is a lot of vulnerability in starting with the teacher. A critic could say that we should begin with the student as the basis for insturctional development. There is soundness in that. Another could say that we should take the learning process as the basis. Critics will also suggest that if the professor is the center of the learning design, the product is likely to be limited to his abilities and his willingness. We recognize the strengths of these views, nonetheless we have consciously chosen to consider the teacher first. Since it is he who controls the selection and presentation of learning activities to students, he becomes the gate keeper to instructional improvement.

EVALUATOR: With the faculty member chosen as the starting point, what are the advantages you see?

DIRECTOR: In addition to accepting the professor as basis, we were convinced that the implementation of the learning improvement has to be considered right from the beginning. The liability of the research and development approach is that it often fails to get a product implemented once it has been produced. We respect the research and development approach, but it consumes quantities of money that cannot even be entertained by most universities and starts from an assumption that does not link with the academic world, in our estimation. That's how we settled on our modest approach. We are now in the process of evaluating whether it has merit.

EVALUATOR: Did you find any allies in the faculty?

DIRECTOR: We soon discovered that not all university professors were resistant to using a team approach for improving their instruction; some are ready and willing. These professors already had considerable knowledge about learning design. On our campus they tended to be in some concentrated fields like Business Administration, Educational Psychology, Business Education, Industrial Technology, Special Education, Communications, and Instructional Media. Those people had had experiences in graduate school which opened up the world of learning theory or educational systems and were just waiting for money to be made available to undertake innovations. Not only did we offer these people our modest services but we invited some of them to be our consultants; in this way we have developed a panel of experts who have been very helpful. How did we get them involved? One of the first things we did was to troubleshoot for them! They needed a little money or some space, so we helped them on these managerial matters. That was a very modest thing.

EVALUATOR: Can you be specific now and describe how you actually use your approach with the general faculty?

DIRECTOR: The mainstream problem was how to interest faculty members who have good will about improving teaching, but are somewhat resistant in trying new things: Often they have heavey commitments to research or are loaded with many students and don't have the time to spend on course development. Sometimes they are apprehensive about trying something without a guarantee that it will work. We have settled on a three-step approach which proceeds incrementally as the professor takes an initiative. First we sensed that a general awareness program was essential for letting faculty members know what they might initiate. We certainly didn't intend to sit in the office and wait for people to come and propose something, though there were some who would do that. We surveyed the literature of institutional renewal, and when we found something that fit exactly into a specific field, we sent it off to the faculty member. After we had gone through scores of articles, we decided to prepare our own little introductory handbook on teaching and package it with lots of "bizazz" to make it seem palatable. We sent that out to faculty and it began to stir interest. We also conducted regular seminars, each devoted to a specific teaching approach such as computer-assisted instruction, simulations, the seminar, the lecture, self-paced instruction.

EVALUATOR: Where do the next steps fit with the awareness ones?

DIRECTOR: Next we tried to find a way to encourage professors who could take the initiative themselves. We weren't the slightest bit original in choosing our strategy, settling on the concept of the competitive grant as the way to enable faculty members to take an initiative.

The grant has a specific social value in higher education. A person who receives a grant achieves immediate status. At the time he has to commit himself to a certain kind of output. We settled on the idea of making a number of smaller grants available in the amount of two, three, four, or five hundred dollars. We announced these, made them competitive, set guidelines, and established a council that would referee them.

EVALUATOR: Did the competition induce some complications?

DIRECTOR: Rather early in the granting process we established a policy to fund as many proposals as possible. So when a proposal writer called about the grant, we willingly chatted about it and often worked together. At that point the grant writer was hoping to get funded, and he or she was usually rather willing to entertain suggestions. It was also a point where we could begin modest consultant work, which frequently took the form of suggesting that the proposals have learning outcomes as an evaluative criteria. For a $200 mini grant we didn't expect anyone to be able to demonstrate major learning outcomes; it would cost much more than that for the evaluation. But we did encourage the faculty to shift their thinking from what they were going to do in their classes (such as a film or a map or a model) to what they wanted the students to do. We were able to begin shaping the design, yet it was only a modest influence; the main thrust was still left up to the professor. As we met with these scholars on the mini-grant proposals we always tried to get them to think about learning rather than focusing solely on teaching.

So that became what we called our second or initiative level. It worked. Over seventy-five faculty members have applied for mini-grants, and we have invested $200 to $500 in each project. The money has gone exclusively for production--none of it goes for travel or faculty salary. The result is that the faculty invest many hours of work for a few dollars. It is generally something the faculty members wanted to do anyway or a modification of their original idea.

EVALUATOR: How would you judge the success of the mini grant program?

DIRECTOR: Right from the beginning our perception was that the mini grant program was a fairly low-level activity. It enabled some modest improvements of instruction and showed a level of institutional support for teaching improvement, but it did not produce validated learning developments. It was not evaluated extensively. In some instances we may have been "taken for a ride." One of the problems we had with these kinds of grants was that we had to constantly guard against giving people money for things they should normally be paying for with their own department budget. So we had to wrestle with request for travel or for money to buy films. These kinds of things seemed to lack serious faculty involvement. What we were asking for in the mini grant was for the faculty members to invest their time in the design of learning. We would pay for whatever intermediate things were necessary to support their efforts.

Because the mini grants were refereed by a respectable group of faculty, they have had more serious consideration than such things as teaching awards. We feel that teaching awards are ex post facto. They do not cause things to happen. They are not product-oriented. The granting approach is much more effective as an incentive for improvement, and yet it still depends upon faculty awareness and does not seem offensive to the basic model of the university. It is within the spirit of the Theory Y approach.

EVALUATOR: I think I can see the advantages you cite for the mini grant strategy, but you mentioned a third stage. Could you elaborate on that?

DIRECTOR: We hoped to get started on genuine instructional development so as a third level of our strategy, we convinced the administration to offer some Faculty Development Grants which amount to $2500. This enables a faculty member or faculty team to work about a year designing, producing, and evaluating a project. The department must contribute half of the faculty salary for released time one quarter, and we produce the other half. We also contribute $1000 of production support money. The vital feature of the program is, again, that the faculty or department initiates the idea. We provide consultant help, and work in the formative stage with them in writing of the proposal. The proposal goes to faculty panel of referees. Once it is approved we begin the actual development process. The first quarter is spent conceptualizing the project with the scholar so that the desired outcomes are stated explicitly. Then we move into a period of production, during which time the faculty member is given released time, moves out of his or her office, and sets up quarters in our center. This fosters full time work in the atmosphere where they can rub shoulders with our consultants while writing, designing, and producing the learning materials. After that period the professor goes back into the department full time and does a field test of the project with some evaluative help. This is what we call instructional development.

EVALUATOR: Have some avoidable pitfalls become apparent in the instructional development stage?

DIRECTOR: We have made a lot of mistakes with these grants, but also we learned some rather important fundamentals. For example, the mind set we borrowed from the systems designers and the applied educational psychologists has caused us to focus rather heavily on the learning materials product. Now we have concluded that the focus was only half right. To be consistent with our whole view about the nature of the University, we have decided to look much more closely at the environment into which this learning product is to be introduced. Right from the beginning we need to consider the attitudes of the students who will be imposed upon during the field test as well as the attitudes of faculty colleagues who are not included in the development but may be influenced by it or may have attitudes about it which we should consider.

EVALUATOR: What have been the most important things which have been learned from the third stage?

DIRECTOR: Maybe the most important social environment of learning is the set of priorities of the academic department. We have found out that the developer needs to know several things about them. Is the instructional development project running counter to the goals of a department? Is the project going to run into a direct clash with the values of the discipline? What are the implications of changing learning style that the project may bring about? Is it going to be possible to deploy students in a manner required by the project? How much of the project is learning improvement and how much is Hawthorne effect? How much is the success dependent on one person who may not be permanent? Is the project so threatening to the existing system that it will generate excessive opposition or even undermine the endeavor?

EVALUATOR: These sound like major questions to be explored. Aren't these common to all projects?

DIRECTOR: These are some of the environmental issues that are generally raised only after a project is destroyed. Then developers begin to say: "It would have worked if the faculty had not been so defensive." "The project was thoroughly validated but the guy was so sharp that the department couldn't stand to have him around". These and other excuses are used as a defense against the unfortunate fact that the designers did not build these realities into the initial model. When we design a project we have to design change. There are many dimensions of change that, while only ancillary to the learning materials, influence the change process significantly. Here we are considering an aspect of the sociology of institutions.

EVALUATOR: In other words, the outside institutional factors were the long term determinants of success or failure of the project.

DIRECTOR: Well only partly. We had our own internal difficulties too. Gnawing at us all the time were these questions: Where is validated learning improvement? What about the use of design? What about systems? What about evaluation? We had been studying the systems development model used by Indiana, Michigan State, and Brigham Young University. We were somewhat resistant to them because they were too elaborate. The models use jargon extensively; they are often perceived as straightjackets by faculty members if we insist on using them. They seem to be very product oriented, like the production of the rocket; they fit the industrial model more than the academy. We are still giving them serious study, and we have found a modified use.

EVALUATOR: What about evaluating the outcomes?

DIRECTOR: We were similarly uneasy about the lack of evaluation in our program. How does one know what's going to come out of all this activity? Is it going to have any learning outcomes? We were convinced that we needed other expertise in the office. We hired an evaluation and design consultant. This person had had a lot of evaluation experience and some design experience at Florida State. When we hired him we soon saw that we were going to need help in evaluating, but we needed support in design first. So gradually he became our specialist in the creation of instructional materials. Now we have hired another staff member to really devote himself to evaluation.

EVALUATOR: In what direction do you see the model evolving?

DIRECTOR: On the basis of the experience that we've had with mini-grants and the faculty development grants as well as the wisdom we have garnered from other institutions involved in instructional development who are trying the same thing, we are going to begin experimenting with a modification of the model. Up to this point the model has focused on the professor as the basic unit. We are now discovering that there are liabilities which we think can be overcome by working with teams of professors or whole departments. Working with the professor makes the project's authorship very visible as well as vulnerable because a professor may leave, may not get tenure, may engender jealousies, may be using the project for motivations other than they were funded, and so on. Team effort offers the advantages.

of inconspicuous authorship, more longevity and a larger investment of priority by a department. In addition, we are attracted to the general principle that groups tend to be more creative than individuals.

EVALUATOR: Theoretically, yes; but does this happen in practice?

DIRECTOR: When a group of faculty members work together to design a learning project with a learning consultant, the role of consultant changes. Although, as the neutral factor in the group, he becomes more of a process person and referee, he can still raise design questions and have some influence on the group. In the traditional consultant relationship with one faculty member it is rather difficult for the consultant to intervene because the single professor has his own conceptualization; when the consultant intervenes, it sometimes seems like a challenge to that conceptualization, creating a communication barrier between the consultant and the client. When a group is doing the conceptualizing together, the consultant can play a more natural role. In that setting there are several individuals who see their concepts as still formative and welcome the consultant in the process of developing the ideas.

In our first experiences with design groups we are having some encouraging success. We stumbled into this approach by accident when a group of professors asked us if they could have a multiple faculty development grant. We almost said no, because we hesitated to devote a large portion of our resources to one department, but we decided to take the risk and it proved to be a most productive venture. Now we are working with two full departments and consider this to be the most promising experiment on the horizon--a test to see if working with teams of faculty will be more productive than individual projects. We are not going to drop the single professor efforts, but maybe a priority will emerge.

EVALUATOR: Could you describe your staff and its relation to the institution?

DIRECTOR: Initially, the Instructional Development Division was one professor serving half-time in the program and a part-time secretary. He was consciously selected from the Arts and Letters faculty to encourage acceptance of the effort by the whole faculty. After the first year a full-time consultant was added who brought skills of instructional design into the program. Next some graduate students with media production skills were added on a part-time basis. Finally, a part-time evaluation specialist has joined the team.

EVALUATOR: Are there enough people to get the job done?

DIRECTOR: This Division has not been limited to using that very small staff. We have depended upon support from the entire Learning Resources Program, including the library and media services.

Ideally, the staff or that organization are all members of a team. Historically, the various divisions evolved separately and then were put together on the basis of a rationale, but we have had some difficulty in learning how to work together. There have been ups and downs in that relationship; we are on an up at the moment.

EVALUATOR: How do your projects fit in with those of other service organizations on campus?

DIRECTOR: It takes considerable skill to find ways in which our objectives in this Division can support, instead of conflict, with the objectives of the other divisions such as the television service or the library acquisitions department or the library distributions division for example. The projects that have emerged out of our Division of necessity are disseminated outside of our Division--some in the classroom with the professors, some by the Audiovisual Services, and some in other divisions of the program. We put considerable demand upon their services without increasing their resources. That has proved to be a problem. We have had to discuss such requests on a daily basis with the various services to see that we do not unreasonably request their time and resources. Their limitations sometimes put constraints upon what we can design. That's just a simple example of the generalization that we are all competing for a limited set of resources within one budget, each division having its own priorities and trying to find a way to bend the priorities of the other divisions in their direction. Despite these tensions we still maintain that we are ahead by being a part of the Learning Resources Program rather than being a separate agency which would come to these services simply as a customer. We have been able to reallocate space, manpower, and budgets within the overall program to respond to the shifting needs of instructional innovations.

EVALUATOR: I'm still not completely clear on the role of your staff in dealing with the faculty of outside departments.

DIRECTOR: Let's go back to the original question about how our staff relates with the institution. We are naturally in direct contact with the faculty; professors approach us directly for an idea, a service, or a grant, or we meet them in a seminar, faculty meeting, or even informally. We have found that it is essential that we then relate any request they make to their academic environment. We get to the department chairman or dean to find out if we can have their support if we work with this faculty member. That is a crucial matter. We also approach deans and department heads and encourage them to shift their priorities for the benefit of instructional innovation. There are also a whole host of administrative agencies on the campus with which we try to relate, the most important being the chief academic office of the campus, the Provost. We are kind of advocates in that office, pressing for this priority or that priority, asking them to support one program or another. For example, we press the Provost's office to see that the faculty evaluation program is conducted each year or that the faculty development funds be made available to professors who wish to attend institutes on teaching, or we press them for an increase in funds for faculty development grants. Another of our

efforts has been to press the space allocation committee, which works under the Provost's office for improvement of instructional space. So in this way we're sort of an advocacy office, and we see the whole campus, as well as the extension services, as an area where we have a logical role to exert influence on the institution's bureaucracy to help it be responsive to the improvement of instruction.

EVALUATOR: Within the structure of the Merrill Library and Learning Resources Program, where does the Division of Instructional Development fit?

DIRECTOR: On the program's organizational chart is appears to be the division that designs the things that the other divisions either produce or disseminate. In fact, much of the traffic of the other divisions never comes through this one because it was intended as a small consultant service. The requests which come to our Division very often just go through the other divisions for implementation if there is production or dissemination to be done. Occasionally something might come in here and go out produced and never go through the other divisions, but we generally depend on resources available in those other divisions to do the production and dissemination, and we create a good deal of work for them.

EVALUATOR: Does much work get referred from their shops to yours?

DIRECTOR: It is not very common for something from another division to be referred to ours. A look at a model would suggest that to be the case, but generally when a faculty member goes to one of the other divisions he knows what he wants; he likely wants a service that is already being offered there. For example, a College of Education teacher would go to the Instructional Television people and would request to use the micro-teaching laboratories. That is a standard on-going service. Most of the other divisions could be described as having standard on-going services. Our division functions on a different approach. When a person comes he generally brings a problem rather than a service request. The first thing we have to do is to spend a good deal of time deciding what the problem is and what possible solutions might be. Then we create a solution which is probably one we've never specifically done before.

EVALUATOR: What is the relation of the director of this program to other directors; and what kind of status does this department have?

DIRECTOR: All four divisions have associate directors, and we have equal status. We meet weekly in a policy meeting with the director of the program; he is over all four. We go to him for most of our problems and report through him to the rest of the University. In that regard I am pleased because our Division is much smaller than the other divisions, and yet we have equal status as a division. There has been some question of whether our Division ought not to be enlarged by taking some of the services from the other parts and having them report to us. We generally prefer not to become an agency that executes programs but one that designs them; but that question is always in consideration.

EVALUATOR: Could you sum things up that we've talked about today?

DIRECTOR: To conclude, I'd say that our model of awareness, initiative, and development has enjoyed modest success. It emerged from a small program and is appropriate to the limited resources which have been devoted to it. We

are not so committed to it that we cannot change; and in fact, we are starting to modify it. We are pleased that the program has won gradual acceptance by the faculty and that it is making some limited inroads into improving teaching and learning at a small university.