DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 528   IR 009 615

AUTHOR   Bedient, Douglas
TITLE   Trends in University Instructional Development.
PUB DATE   9 Apr 81
NOTE   10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the
              Association for Educational Communications and
              Technology (Philadelphia, PA, April 9, 1981).

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   College Faculty; Educational Practices; Higher
              Education; Instructional Design; *Instructional
              Development; Interviews; *Programs; Surveys;
              *Universities

ABSTRACT
              A study was conducted of the instructional
development programs of selected universities to identify any trends
evident in these institutions, as well as unique programs. Site
visits were made to 14 institutions in order to interview staff
members and clients to determine reporting arrangements, mission,
public relations activities, physical facilities, and evaluation
methods. The interviews were also concerned with determining how
instructional design programs related to other campus units which
might have responsibility for activities related to faculty
development. Findings are reviewed under the headings of agency
impact, activities which help emphasize teaching, broadening
missions, instructional development teams, interest in
microcomputers, and other agency features. Five references are
listed. (LLS)

Trends in University Instructional Development

by

Douglas Bedient
Learning Resources Service
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale; Illinois 62901

Association for Educational Communications and Technology
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
April 9, 1981

Trends in University Instructional Development

Instructional improvement agencies have been the focus of a number of studies in recent years. (Erickson, Davis, Bratton, Crow, et. al, and Eastmond.) These studies have been concerned with facets such as staffing, organization, funding, mission, activities and clientele. The studies provide a pool of higher education institutions with instructional improvement agencies which have existed for a number of years and are, for the most part, institutionalized. The typical definition of institutionalized includes professional staffing and "hard" funding.

Nine of the institutions in the pool were selected for visitations during 1980. The institutions included the University of Alabama, Brigham Young University, The University of California-Davis, Colorado State, Florida State, Nebraska-Lincoln, Pennsylvania State, Utah State and Virginia Tech. Visitations were made to Kansas State, Oklahoma State, San Jose State, Sacramento State and San Francisco State prior to the sabbatical period.

It was the researcher's intent to investigate topics such as the nature of staff appointments, budgeting, charge structures, if any, client satisfaction with services, types of projects accepted, duration of projects, research interests, and relationship to faculty development services. The programs are so diverse because of varying institutional environments that comparisons were extremely difficult to make. For example, certain institutions appointed the professional staff as faculty and research productivity was assumed for academic rewards. In other institutions, the professional staff hold non-faculty appointments and research productivity was not required. As a result the concerns of the two instructional improvement agencies will vary. For this paper a number of trends have been described and examples of the trend are provided to clarify the trend. The intent of the paper is to provide information which is of utility to instructional

developers in higher education.

Trend 1. Increasing the agency's impact

Budgetary constraints have had considerable impact on the agencies. A concern existed to maximize influence of the agency. A variety of mechanisms were used to accomplish this influence.

The University Division of Instructional Services at Penn State has become involved in studying a mathematics sequence which is restricted to relatively high-ability students. A staff member of UDIS chairs a task force which is investigating why large numbers of students either fail or withdraw from the sequence. The involvement with large enrollment, multi-section courses is one way to broaden the agency's impact. Other agencies were also concerned with trying to solve problems associated with large enrollment courses which had failure or "drop-out" characteristics.

The Center for Educational Technology at Florida State University was involved in establishing a testing center where faculty can place examinations and as a result save time and have good security. The Center provided consultation for developing high quality test items which become part of a system that encourages mastery learning. Attention to large enrollment courses with testing problems was a method to increase the impact of the Center.

Some of the agencies were attempting to guarantee their work was in harmony with institutional priorities. For example, faculty at Brigham Young University may apply for Program Improvement Funds. The applicant's department and dean reviewed the proposals prior to submission to the McKay Institute. This review process helped assure that the McKay projects had institutional support.

It was feasible to have impact by filling a need which arose on a campus. The University of California Regents mandated that each department have a formal plan for training teaching assistants. The Teaching Resources Center at UC-Davis

put effort into organizing programs which departments can use to prepare TAs for their teaching responsibilities.

Some of these activities to broaden impact were consistent with a prediction in Bratton's article (1978, p. 147) that the future work of agencies of this type would be increasingly concerned with department-wide projects rather than individual projects.

Two agencies were engaged in consortium activities which can have impact on several institutions. The McKay Institute on BYU was cooperating with departments from Ricks College and BYU departments in Provo, Salt Lake City and Hawaii. The Northern Rockies Consortium for Higher Education was headquartered at Utah State and was attempting to disseminate instructional development projects across a four-state region.

Trend 2. Activities which help emphasize teaching

The institutions included in this study have missions which include research as well as teaching. A number of the agencies were involved in programs which enhance the visibility of teaching on a campus.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute supported a Summer Teaching Fellowship program. The fellows received summer salary as well as some support funds to engage in accomplishing objectives which were outlined in proposals. The proposal process and the summer stipend help to emphasize the importance of teaching.

The Office of Instructional Services at Colorado State University planned a Professional Development Institute for the mid-semester period. Workshops and seminars were held for three days. Topics included the new or returning adult student, values and ethics in teaching, the international development process, funding sources and proposal writing, interdisciplinary attitudes, activities and models, instructional objectives, emphasizing composition in undergraduate curriculum and continuing education. The attendance at this Institute justified

repeating it in 1981. The Institute was a unique way in this sample to bring attention to teaching. Presenting it during a semester break can bring visibility that may not be as feasible during other periods. However, persons who are away during breaks may be critical of the scheduling.

Numerous institutions sponsored speakers who address topics related to teaching. The Teaching and Learning Center at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the Teaching Resources Center at UC-Davis prepare a series of lectures for the year and publicize the entire series.

These agencies also offered some low-cost programs which helped teaching's visibility., Informal seminars and brown.bag discussions were two common activities.

The importance of leadership in instructional improvement agencies was reported by Davis, (1978, p. 34). The Directors of these agencies tended to hold positions on or chair committees which awarded grants for teaching, recognized good teachers or funded projects. Their presence or access to funds assisted the impact of the agencies. The existence of groups such as VPI's Academy of Teaching Excellence and Nebraska's Teaching Council also brought attention to teaching.

The programs listed in this section were representative of activities which these agencies pursued in order to heighten awareness about teaching in institutions which may emphasize other missions.

Trend 3. Broadening missions

Faculty development has been and remains a popular, if often controversial, concept in higher education. Many of the agencies in this paper have had an instructional development emphasis. Many of the agencies have begun offering programs which are concerned with topics broader than instructional development.

San Jose State used FIPSE funds to produce a series of materials to promote faculty development.

Penn State is producing videotapes which combine exemplary teaching examples

from projects which have been produced over the years. The collection of examples will present numerous models so that clients can view different instructional techniques and methods.

The Professional Development Institute at CSU which was previously mentioned, included topics which were broader than instructional development.

The lecture series such as Nebraska and California-Davis offered include topics in many different areas. They were not restricted to instructional topics.

Faculty development programs or activities were available from other offices at some of these institutions. A spirit of cooperation seemed evident. A general impression seemed to be that there was plenty of work to be done by all of the support agencies.

Trend 4. Instructional development teams

Some of the institutions involved in this study organized teams to complete their projects. The teams varied from one institution to another but one common element was the inclusion of a person with evaluation expertise. Another common team member was a graduate assistant or student who performs certain duties as well as learning from the process.

The teams which BYU formed for some projects were unique in that a writer was assigned to the team. An instructional developer, subject matter specialists, and production personnel were the other members. The use of a writer allowed subject matter specialists to dedicate more time to planning and revision as opposed to struggling with first drafts. The writer was highly valued at BYU.

Trend 5. Growing interest in microcomputers

The interest of these agencies in hardware items varied considerably. In some, there was a concern with hardware and production and in others those tasks were handled by other units. However, in most of these agencies there was considerable interest in microcomputers. The interest ranged from word processing, to

management of data, to CAI applications.

The McKay Institute at BYU had staff who were engaged in interfacing the microcomputer and the video disc. Research and demonstration projects were being pursued at BYU.

Other agency features

Many of these agencies had features which were of interest but were not found in other institutions. There would be no justification to say a trend existed.

Reporting of activities can be an issue in instructional development. The confidentiality regarding a client's work has to be weighed against the need to know what an agency is accomplishing. The Media Center at the University of Alabama had set a price for each activity which it conducted. The activities which the Center performed for each unit were totaled and the "value" of these activities was reported to administrators. Such a system provided for confiden- tiality but also enabled an instructional development agency to report its activities.

The Office of Instructional Services at Colorado State University was engaged in a unique program to provide consultation on instructional development topics. CSU has had a comprehensive media planning and production unit for a long period. In order to provide consultation regarding other teaching problems a number of outstanding teachers were appointed as part-time consultants in Instructional Services. The consultants were paid a summer salary but worked throughout the year. The consultants were working in numerous areas including objectives, organizing lectures and writing evaluation items. The consultants had good rapport with the teaching faculty because of their backgrounds at CSU. The program was success- ful enough it was to be continued for a second year.

The University of Nebraska and Kansas State University offered an instructional improvement course which was taught by a faculty member from the campus instructional

development agency. Graduate students who were serving as teaching assistants and faculty members who were interested in improving teaching and learning were common participants.

Utah State University was not alone in publishing a newsletter and studies related to instructional development. The quality of its publications and its "Teach In" brochure were noteworthy.

Publications at other institutions showed originality. The Learning Resources Center at Virginia Polytechnic Institute distributed information which was printed on a file folder. The inclusion of a campus map on one side made it very useful.

Brigham Young University prepared a directory to campus services which was organized so that common questions were answered. For example, one question might be, "where can I get assistance in writing test items?" A contact person, office, telephone and charges, if any, were listed with each question. The directory was published loose-leaf so updating was feasible.

Visitations to each campus provided useful information for instructional development activities. The trends and features included in this paper were items which provide topics for study at numerous institutions of higher education.

References

Bratton, B. Instructional improvement centers in higher education. In R.K. Bass and D.B. Lumsden (Eds.), Instructional development: the state of the art. Columbus, Ohio: Collegiate Publishing, 1978.

Crow, M.L., Milton, O., Morrow, W.E., & O'Connell, W.R., Jr., (Eds.). Faculty development in southern universities. Atlanta: Southern Region Educational Board, 1976.

Davis, J.A. Instructional improvement--an assessment of programs at sixteen universities. Pullman, Washington: Information Futures, 1978.

Eastmond, N.E. A summary of information regarding instructional development at ten comparison institutions. Unpublished manuscript. Merrill Library and Learning Resources Program, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1980.

Erickson, B.L. A survey of the inservice training needs and interests of instructional improvement centers in higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts), 1975.