DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 067 HE 007 929

AUTHOR Simerly, Robert G.
TITLE Improving Institutional Accountability Through Faculty Development: Reacting to Conflicting Pressures in Post-Secondary Education.
PUB DATE May 76
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual conference of the Association for Institutional Research (May 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Change; Behavior Development; Changing Attitudes; *Development; *Educational Accountability; Educational Change; *Faculty; Faculty Evaluation; *Higher Education; *Institutional Research; Teaching; Teaching Methods; Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

Within the last several years, between 400 and 500 faculty development programs have been instituted in colleges and universities. However, there is no clear agreement on what faculty development programs should be doing. This paper examines the major approaches to faculty development that institutions can use and the role of institutional researcher in relation to faculty development. The thesis is that the role of the institutional researcher is to create reliable data bases about the institution's faculty members in order to influence the decisionmaking process of power elites in the institution. A taxonomy for creating a data about the personal, professional and organizational dimensions of faculty members is presented to guide the institutional researcher. (Author/JMF)

IMPROVING INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: REACTING TO CONFLICTING PRESSURES IN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Robert G. Simerly, Assistant Director
Office of Extended Campus
103 Waverly Avenue
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210
(315) 423-4696

Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, May 1976.

IMPROVING INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: REACTING TO CONFLICTING PRESSURES IN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Robert G. Simerly, Syracuse University

Three out of every ten people in the United States are directly involved in education. Education has become our nation's largest enterprise. Even though there is evidence to suggest that enrollments in higher education are beginning to stabilize, according to the Digest of Educational Statistics (1974) we have 8.5 million students enrolled in degree-credit programs in higher education. This is the largest enrollment at any time in our history. These 8.5 million students attend 2,792 colleges or universities in the United States. Currently 620,000 faculty members teach in these institutions (p. 136). Thus higher education has its fair share of our nation's largest enterprise.

The Creation of Conflicting Pressures

Since World War II, higher education has expanded at an unprecedented rate in our race to educate our youth and to provide continuing education opportunities for adults. Now that our enrollment appears to have stabilized at the same time we are experiencing diminishing financial resources, we are beginning to examine who pays for education and what we are getting for our expenditures. At private institutions, students bear 65.3 per cent of the costs of their education while 34.7 per cent of the cost comes from other sources. However, at state supported institutions, students contribute only 22.1 per cent of the cost of their education with 77.9 per cent of the cost coming from other sources (p. 112).

We are now facing the conflicting pressure in post-secondary education of providing quality education at the lowest possible cost in an age of tight financial resources when faculty are demanding salary increases and students and taxpayers are raising the issue of consumer rights and accountability.

The Pressure of Being Equalitarian

In addition, we have moved toward an equalitarian view of higher education. American higher education is no longer considered to be the privilege of the few. Thus our image of colleges and universities is changing. Where formerly we tended to view our institutions simply as that of being a community of scholars, we are now beginning to recognize that higher education is big business that employs scholars to produce many of its products and services. And as we have begun to convert to this big business view of education, we have experienced many of the conflicting pressures that business has experienced. We have demands for accountability and reactions to accountability procedures. We have faculty members who, following the big business model, have unionized. Our growing pains are loud and they are painful. The conflicting pressures in post-secondary education have never been greater in the entire history of humankind.

The Role of the Institutional Researcher

One of the ways in which institutional researchers can play a major role in assisting their institutions to react more effectively to conflicting pressures is by creating reliable data bases regarding the myths and the realities of conflicting pressures within their institutions.

The Publish or Perish Pressure

One of the major professional pressures identified by faculty members is the polarized approach to teaching verses research that results in the publish or perish dilemma. However, an examination of the actual research that has been done of the research and publication records of faculty members in higher education shows that the publish or perish controversy is largely a myth. The fact is that most faculty members in higher education engage in little or no research or publishing. This has been noted by Cartter (1966) and Mayhew (1971). In fact Mayhew charges that the faculty "steep themselves in the stale intellectual brew first mixed when they themselves were in college" (p. 496).

One of the best reviews of the research-based literature on the publish or perish controversy has been done by Lewis (1975). Lewis' review of research also confirms the fact that the majority of faculty members in higher education engage in little or no research or publishing. Blackburn (1975) has found evidence to show that time in rank seems to be the only important factor in determining promotion.

In analyzing the publish or perish myth it is interesting to note that practically no one has made an attempt to find out what conditions are necessary to contribute to the development of a publishing scholar. Simerly (1973) found that faculty felt that inadequate available time hindered their overall growth and development. This perception of inadequate available time may be a major psychological block to faculty growth and development when you consider that Blackburn's (1974, p. 77) review of the research on faculty workloads shows that most faculty members work

between 55-60 hours per week.

When faculty members do engage in research and publishing, Blau (1973, p. 111) found that a faculty member's own graduate training did little to promote this research-publishing orientation. Rather he found that the size of an institution affects a faculty member's research output but that even size has only an indirect influence. Large institutions tend to produce more faculty members who actually engage in research and publishing. However, he found that large size must also be combined with affluence and that this in turn allows institutions to develop personnel policies that allow for the recruitment of research-producing faculty. Thus the climate of having superior research-producing colleagues seems to be the major determining factor in facilitating the production of publishing scholars among the entire faculty (p. 239).

Yet the publish-perish myth persists because of the incongruence between the real reward structure of institutions and the perceived reward structures. As the Gaff-Wilson (1971 and 1975) studies found, most faculty members perceive that research and publishing rather than teaching constitutes the major reward systems even in highly diverse institutions.

It is interesting to note that this incongruency in perceptions between real and perceived reward systems also carries over into other aspects of faculty members' perceptions of their world. The Blackburn (1975) study involving administrator, colleague, student, and self-ratings shows that professors also have erroneous perceptions of how others perceive and access them. Faculty members consistently give themselves higher ratings on overall teaching effectiveness than do students

or peers.

The Faculty Work World

Another way in which institutional researchers can better help their institutions more effectively deal with conflicting pressures is to find better ways to conceptualize and report on the work that faculty members do.

The traditional way to deal with faculty work is to talk about it in terms of teaching, research, and service. The traditional expectations associated with this taxonomy are that faculty members should excel in all of these three areas. However, this taxonomy and its resultant expectations developed at a time when change was not so rapid and faculty members did not have so many conflicting demands placed on their time.

In an effort to more accurately study and classify what faculty members actually do and what portion of their time is devoted to various components of their work, Stecklein (1974, p. 11) reports that the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) in connection with the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) developed the following classification for faculty work:

1. Teaching
2. Research, scholarship, and creative work
3. Internal service
4. Public service

This taxonomy represents an improvement over the previous traditional one in that it expands the research dimension to consider creative work by faculty members who can best demonstrate their contributions to the

intellectual community in this manner. In addition, this taxonomy recognizes the difference between internal institutional service that may benefit the institution directly and the more broad area of public service that may only benefit the institution in indirect ways. This taxonomy is used most often to describe faculty work in quantative ways such as per cent of time spent in each described area of activity.

However, because of increased public demands for accountability, it is also necessary to develop ways to evaluate the quality of a faculty member's contribution. For this an even more comprehensive taxonomy such as the one suggested by Miller (1974, p. 16) is appropriate. His categories of faculty activity are:

1. Classroom teaching
2. Advising
3. Faculty service and relations
4. Management (administration)
5. Performing and visual arts
6. Professional services
7. Publications
8. Public service
9. Research

This taxonomy lends itself well to the following institutional uses:

1. Faculty self-reports of workloads.
2. Quantative and qualitative evaluations of faculty performance in each of the categories.
3. Individual, departmental, college, and institutional management

by objectives systems.

4. Long-range planning activities.

The Faculty Development Movement

As institutions begin to consider long-range planning, they try to find better ways to plan for the more effective use of physical, financial, and human resources. For years, we have given attention to planning for the utilization of physical and financial resources; however, it is only recently that higher education has turned its attention to finding more effective ways to plan for the utilization of its human resource of the faculty. Such planning has become known as "faculty development" and within the last four years between 400 and 500 faculty development programs have developed in the United States. However, an analysis of these programs shows that there is no clear agreement about what faculty development programs should be doing.

One of the problems in discussing faculty development is that we are just now beginning to be able to conceptualize faculty development in meaningful ways that consider the complex interaction of person, profession, organization, and consumer. Ebel (1971, 1973) was one of the first to note that we have made few attempts to conceptualize adequately the development process of faculty. As a result, institutions tend to consider faculty development in elementary ways that are related to things that are only basic to the operation of the institution. Recently the most comprehensive and successful attempts to conceptualize faculty development have been done by Gaff (1975) and Bergquist and Phillips (1975).

To date many activities and ideas have been classified as attempts

at faculty development. The following taxonomy provides a useful way to categorize these major approaches to faculty development.

Faculty Development as Individual Freedom--the Lassez-Faire Approach

"My approach to helping faculty members develop," remarked one dean recently, "is to hire self-actualizing people, turn them loose, and leave them alone. They know what they're supposed to do. The tenure-promotion review then separates the good ones from the bad." This is the lassez-faire, hands-off management approach typical of people who see faculty members as simply being a part of a community of scholars.

The assumption behind this approach is that somehow this community of scholars will actively work to define goals that are acceptable to an institution and the multiple publics that it serves. However, as Gross and Grambsch (1974) show in one of the most comprehensive studies that has been done on institutional goals, the top goals of the faculty generally are concerned primarily with preserving the status quo. Faculty members do not take into account the wide variety of concerns being voiced by the multiple publics that institutions must serve in an age of increased emphasis on accountability and consumerism. The top rated institutional goals as perceived by the faculty in the Gross and Grambsch study are to:

1. Protect academic freedom.
2. Ensure confidence of contributors.
3. Maintain top quality in important programs.
4. Increase or maintain prestige.
5. Train students for scholarship/research.

The authors interpret these ranked goals to mean that "the major universities of the United States emphasize support goals over output goals, especially the protection of academic freedom and other goals related to the pursuit of personal faculty careers" (p. 51). Major concern for students, especially undergraduates, comes near the bottom of the list of 47 goals (p. 197).

Faculty Development as Introduction and Initiation

Hollenback (1964), Hibbard (1966), and England (1967) have documented efforts at faculty development that are concerned with orientation activities involved in bringing someone new into the organization. Faculty development as introduction and initiation operates at the formal level of official orientation sessions and at the informal level described by Case (1971) in which faculty members new to an organization sniff out the procedures, practices, and accepted norms that guide behavior.

Faculty Development as Career Development

Gustad (1959), Eble (1971), and Schein (1971) are among those who have studied faculty development from the viewpoint of social psychology in which the faculty member is seen as proceeding along a career path. This method of considering faculty development is typically concerned with such things as tenure-promotion procedures, boundaries among assistant, associate, and full professors and rites of passage through these boundaries.

Faculty Development as Curriculum Reform

The fact that most faculty members know little about the teaching-learning process and about educational technology strategies designed to

facilitate the teaching-learning process has been noted by Powell (1970), Milton (1973), and Bergquist and Phillips (1975). Asking faculty members to focus on restructuring curriculum is an organizational method designed to facilitate change in a system. The implication is that in order to change the curriculum that faculty members themselves must examine and change things that they are doing.

Typical of this approach is that utilized by the Center for Instructional Development staffed by Bob Diamond and his associates at Syracuse University (1975). This office works closely with academic departments in helping them to design effective technologies for improving the instructional process. Increasingly there is good evidence to suggest that this is one of the best entry points for faculty development activities because it is possible to deal concretely with things in which faculty members have expertise--subject matter. Dealing with the subject matter in which faculty members already have expertise provides a psychological support system that begins with confirmation of expertise rather than with negative implications that faculty members themselves need to change. Such things as attitudes and values of faculty members, organizational reward systems, interpersonal skills, and organizational conflict management may or may not be dealt with when utilizing this approach.

Faculty Development as Concept and Construct

This is an attempt to conceptualize faculty development in relation to Argyris' (1964) concept about the need to integrate the individual and the organization so that the goals and objectives of both the individual

and the organization can be met. This move toward a concept and construct of faculty development is a sophisticated move to incorporate all of the previous approaches to faculty development in a generalizing and synthesizing way.

Thus concept, to follow Kerlinger's definition (1973, p. 28), becomes an expression of an abstraction that is formed by generalizing from particulars. As Owens (1970, p. 42) notes, the ideas in a concept don't necessarily have to prove themselves. Rather they are simply what Griffiths describes as terms to which we attach a particular meaning (1959, p. 38). Thus a concept of faculty development evolves from generalizing and synthesizing previously used ways in which we have considered faculty development.

A step beyond a concept is a construct. A construct is also a concept; however, it has an additional meaning that is consciously and deliberately attached to the word for a particular scientific purpose. A major test of a construct according to Kerlinger (p. 29) is that it enters into and relates to theoretical schemes. Thus a construct of faculty development takes into account and relates to a wide variety of theories in the behavioral sciences regarding such things as human motivation, organizational theory, systems theory, and adult life stages.

Within this concept and construct of faculty development, the individual faculty member can be considered in relation to the following three major dimensions:

1. Personal
2. Professional
3. Organizational

None of these is mutually exclusive. Each is equally important and attention is deliberately given to all of these dimensions simultaneously. In addition, both structural and process components of faculty development are considered in these three dimensions. Component parts of these structural and process considerations are listed in the following chart:

COMPONENTS OF A CONSTRUCT OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Conceptual Components

Dimensions of Faculty Development	Structural	Process
Personal	Adult Life Stages	Human motivation Individual growth Change Adaptability Attitudes
Professional	Career Path	Tenure-Promotion Socialization to role Local-cosmopolitan reward orientations Mobility within profession
Organizational	College and University Environment	Organizational mobility Adaptive techniques Real and perceived reward systems Organizational conflict management Curriculum reform

It is at the level of developing concepts and constructs that the institutional researcher can assume a major role in faculty development efforts. At this level, the institutional researcher is the logical person to be called on to create a reliable data base for decision making regarding the most effective use of the human resource of the faculty. Thus through creation of this reliable data base about the personal, professional, and organizational dimensions of faculty members, the institutional researcher can make a major impact. With accurate data about the component parts of both structural and process dimensions that leads to the formulation of a concept and construct of faculty development, the institutional researcher can exercise power on the organizational elites who turn to the institutional researcher for guidance in decision making. Romaine (1971) describes this approach to institutional research as that of being at the "nerve center" of the institution.

Faculty Development as Organizational Metagoal

This is even a step beyond faculty development as concept and construct. This approach moves to the overriding organizational commitment to a metagoal, or generalized overriding goal, that is institutionalized to the point of being abstracted to a process. Thus an organizational metagoal suggested by Bennis (1967) might be to develop a system for constantly detecting new goals. Lippitt (1969) describes this process as organizational renewal. Hefferlin (1969) builds on this and states that a main goal for institutions of higher education should be to develop the capacity to provide for continuous adaptability.

Faculty development as organizational metagoal can be thought of as

creating a reliable organizational data base for the purpose of giving conscious attention to planning, studying, and improving those structures and processes used by faculty to attain their goals as well as the goals of the organization.

Faculty development as organizational metagoal, then, represents a conscious organizational commitment to the complex process of deliberately planning for the most effective use of the human resource of the faculty.

Summary of Institutional Researcher's Role

This, then, is the challenge to the institutional researcher--to create reliable data bases about the institution's faculty members and thus to influence the power elites within the institution to develop a construct of faculty development as a metagoal for the institution. This is action-oriented institutional research that makes a difference.

Bibliography

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

Bennis, Warren. Organizations of the future. Personnel Administration, September/October 1967, 6-19.

Bergquist, William H. and Steven R. Phillips. Components of an effective faculty development program. Journal of Higher Education, March/April 1975, Vol. 46, #2, 177-211.

Blackburn, Robert T. The meaning of work in academia. In James Doi (Ed.), Assessing Faculty Effort. New directions for institutional research, #2, Summer 1974, 75-99, Jossey-Bass.

Blackburn, Robert T. and Mary Jo Clark. An assessment of faculty performance: some correlates between administrator, colleague, student and self-ratings. Sociology of Education 1975, Spring, Vol. 48, 242-256.

Blau, Peter M. The Organization of Academic Work, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Cartter, A. University teaching and excellence, In C. Lee (Ed.), Improving College Teaching. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

Case, Chester E. Beyond Evaluation: The Quality Control Model of Evaluation and the Development Model for Faculty Growth and Evaluation, January 1971, ERIC #ED 047 669.

Diamond, R. M., Eichman, P. E., Kelley, E. F., Holloway, R. E., Vickery, T. R., and Pascarella, E. T. Instructional Development for Individualized Learning in Higher Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1975.

Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/Education Division, 1974.

Eble, Kenneth E. Career Development of the Effective College Teacher, American association of university professors. Washington, D. C., 1971.

Eble, Kenneth E. Professors as Teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

England, Thomas Howard. The Selection, Orientation, and In-Service Education of Department Chairmen in Selected Schools and Colleges of Education. Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Gaff, Jerry G. Toward Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Gaff, Jerry G. and Robert C. Wilson. The teaching environment. AAUP Bulletin, December 1971, Vol. 57, #4, 475-493.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Gross, Edward and Paul V. Grambsch. Changes in University Organization 1964-1971. New York: McGraw Hill, 1974.

Gustad, John W. They march to a different drummer: another look at college teachers. Educational Record, July 1959, Vol. 40, 204-211.

Hefferlin, J. B. Lon. Dynamics of Academic Reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Hibbard, Emerson W. Principles for Administrators Who Are Responsible for Planning the Orientation of New Faculty Members in Higher Education. Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, 1966.

Hollenbach, John W. The administrator's role in faculty development. Liberty Education, December 1964, Vol. 50, 517-525.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1973.

Lewis, Lionel S. Scaling the Ivory Tower. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Comment by Lewis B. Mayhew. Journal of Higher Education, June 1971, Vol. 42, 495-498.

Miller, Richard I. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Milton, Ohmer. Alternatives to the Traditional. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in School. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Powell, Robert S. More than a member. In Fred F. Haveleroad (Ed.), Issues of the Seventies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Romine, Ben H., Jr. Change via a community of inquirers. Educational Records, Fall 1971, Vol. 52, 348-353.

Schein, Edgar H. The individual, the organization, and the career: a conceptual scheme. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1971, Vol. 7, #4, 401-426.

Simerly, Robert G. A Study of Faculty Perceptions of Professional Growth and Development at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, August 1973.

Stecklein, John E. Approaches to measuring workload over the past two decades. In James Doi (Ed.), Assessing Faculty Effort. New directions for institutional research, #2, Summer 1974. Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, Robert C., Jerry G. Gaff, Evelyn R. Dienst, Lynn Wood, and James L. Bavry. College Professors and Their Impact on Students. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.