DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 005 HE 016 781

AUTHOR Grabowski, Stanley M.
TITLE Administrative Responsibility for Faculty Development: AAUA-ERIC/Higher Education Administrator's Update, Fall 1983.
INSTITUTION American Association of Univ. Administrators, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 83
CONTRACT 400-82-0011
NOTE 8p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of University Administrators, 1133 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005 ($2.00).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)
JOURNAL CIT Administrator's Update; v5 n1 Fall 1983

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility; *College Faculty; Consultation Programs; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Professional Recognition; Program Development; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Conditions

ABSTRACT

The rationale for and obstacles to faculty development are considered, and recommendations for administrators to follow in initiating and implementing programs are offered. Faculty development is needed for at least three important reasons: knowing a subject does not mean an individual can effectively teach it; faculty need to learn how to teach and counsel adult students; and low enrollment and retrenchments result in heavily tenured faculty with few if any new faculty members added. Traditional faculty development has involved instructional development, personal development, and organizational development. Popular current approaches to faculty development include faculty growth contracts, instructional improvement centers focusing on human rather than material resources, and the auditor-consultant program. The following recommendations to administrators who are responsible for faculty development are considered: involving the faculty in planning the program, attaining administrators' support, making the program comprehensive, and establishing a reward system. A comprehensive faculty development program will offer faculty opportunities to improve as teachers, to develop a supportive environment, and to develop personal values as a professional. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

Volume 5
Number 1

ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE

Fall 1983

American Association of
University Administrators

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT - BY STANLEY M. GRABOWSKI, Ph.D.

Volume 5
Number 1

Administrator's Update

Fall
1983

American Association of University Administrators

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

Administrative Responsibility for Faculty Development

By Stanley M. Grabowski, Ph.D.

Among the many challenges facing college and university administrators, the central challenge may very well be to prepare faculty—and by extension administrators—for tomorrow's changed postsecondary setting.

During the first half of the 1970's, many institutions were so concerned with survival that they neglected faculty's needs. Faculty development was given only lip service. But now faculty development is suddenly "in" (Cross 1977) and may already be reaching maturity and middle age (Berquist and Phillips 1981). As with any movement or new trend, the field of faculty development

the field of faculty development may have created a robot, one that is strong and powerful, but is without vision. The faculty development robot sometimes does not seem to know where to go, and hence may wander aimlessly. People ask, 'What are faculty being developed for?' We often do not have adequate answers to this question (Berquist and Phillips 1981, p.306).

may have created a robot, one that is strong and powerful, but is without vision. The faculty development robot sometimes does not seem to know where to go, and hence may wander aimlessly. People ask, "What are faculty being developed for?" We often do not have adequate answers to this question (Berquist and Phillips 1981, p.306). Whatever other purposes it serves, the value of faculty development may ultimately be in administrators' increased awareness of faculty's changing needs and aspirations (Spitz 1977).

Faculty development is urgently needed for at least three compelling reasons. First is an abiding need that has never been fully addressed or met, based on the assumption that an individual who knows a subject can effectively teach it. The truth is that while the majority of college and university faculty members are highly specialized individuals with expertise in a particular discipline, few have any formal training in teaching (Lindquist 1980; O'Bannion 1977).

The second reason for faculty development, even for those professors who have mastered the art of teaching traditional students aged 17 to 22, is the need to learn how to teach and counsel adult students. Higher education has a new clientele—an older population. Not all faculty members are meeting this new clientele's needs successfully. "One cannot assume that the faculty enter an institution prepared to serve the educational needs of the lifelong learner." (Christensen 1977, p. 28).

The third compelling reason arises from the current crunch; low enrollments and retrenchments result in heavily tenured faculties with few if any new faculty members added. Many professors entered the profession in the heavy expansion of the 1950s and 1960s when mobility, advancement, and research monies were at their optimistic best. However, the economic, social, and professional factors of the late 1970s and early 1980s have dramatically altered the traditional attitudes and opportunities of the profession (Bumpus 1981, p. 6). As a result, faculty are not trained to take up the slack.

College and university administrators must use some systematic, comprehensive, and integrated approaches to faculty development to maintain faculty members' interest, motivation, morale, and vitality and to develop new expertise (Gaff 1975; Shulman 1980; Smith 1978).

Nearly 60 percent of all accredited degree-granting institutions of higher education in this country have some type of in-service program for faculty (Centra 1977). Most of these programs are designed for full-time faculty. Part-time faculty, who may need development programs even more, have had very little offered them beyond an hour or two of orientation (Hennessey 1982). In many colleges, [there is] an unwillingness to embrace a philosophical commitment to include part-timers as an integral part of the staff. There has been unwillingness to spend funds on the professional development of faculty who are not tenured and who may be with the institution for a short time period (Elioff 1980, p. 16).

Many professors entered the profession in the heavy expansion of the 1950s and 1960s when mobility, advancement, and research monies were at their optimistic best.

Even though administrators generally agree that faculty development is urgently needed, few can agree as to what form it ought to take. It may well be that no single approach is either suitable or optimal. Indeed, faculty members, whether full-time or part-time, need different kinds of incentives and opportunities (Bevan 1980).

APPROACHES TO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Until recently, most practices under the rubric of "faculty development"—orientation sessions, catalogs and handbooks, and financial help for participation at conferences have been more in the mode of basic employment practices rather than

Stanley M. Grabowski, Ph.D., is affiliated with the School of Education, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

in the development of faculty (Gaff 1975).

Traditional faculty development takes three forms: (1) instructional development, which includes curriculum development, teaching techniques, course design, and learning materials development; (2) personal development, which includes training in interpersonal skills and career counseling; and (3) organizational development, which includes team building, management development, and factors that contribute to the institutional environment for teaching and decision making (Berquist and Phillips 1975; Gaff 1975).

Centra (1976) identifies four characteristics of traditional faculty development: (1) high faculty involvement, including workshops on institutional purposes and assessments by experienced staff faculty; (2) instructional assistance, including methods of instruction and course development, teaching skills and techniques, evaluation of students' performance, and use of audiovisual materials; (3) traditional incentives—teaching awards, sabbatical leaves, grants for travel, and temporarily reduced course loads; and (4) assessment, including techniques to improve instruction (p. 46).

Most of these traditional approaches are familiar to academic administrators and have been reported in the literature in detail (Centra 1976; Gaff 1975). But three relatively new approaches to faculty development have received much attention lately.

The most popular current approach to faculty development involves faculty growth contracts. A faculty growth contract includes a faculty member's profile of his or her own strengths and weaknesses, a statement of goals and objectives for development as a professional and as a member of the institution, and a plan for evaluating the faculty member's performance (Pfnister, Solder, and Verroca, 1979). Generally, the faculty member draws up an annual "contract" with the help of a committee of colleagues within a context of self-determined long-range goals for three to five years (Heie, Sweet, and Carlberg 1979; Pfnister, Solder, and Verroca 1979; Seldin 1977). Growth contracts enable individual faculty members to respond to their own needs, to those of the department, and to those of the institution.

Faculty growth contracts can help solve three common problems: "the need for more individualized faculty roles, the need for more individualized charting of professional growth, and the need for more individualized assessment of teaching performance" (Seldin 1977, p. 5). Despite the theoretical advantages of growth contracts and despite faculties' frequently citing them as "essential to faculty development" (Centra 1976, p. 24), they are but little used.

Some people equate growth contracts with management by objectives (MBO). While the two approaches share many similarities, growth contracts differ from MBO because "the emphasis in the faculty growth contract is more on providing a mutually supportive environment than upon strict accountability for results" (Pfnister, Solder, and Verroca 1979, p. 3). Centra (1976) suggests additionally that faculty growth contracts are less threatening to faculty members than some other approaches to faculty development.

In many colleges, [there is] an unwillingness to embrace a philosophical commitment to include part-timers as an integral part of the staff.

The second innovative approach to faculty development involves instructional improvement centers, whose focus is on human rather than material resources (Gaff 1975; Shucard 1978). Instructional improvement centers can be structured within a single institution or as a function of a consortium, a state system, or a professional association. Usually such centers operate with a staff, a program, and a budget. Most have some kind of advisory or policy committee to oversee operations. One important dimension of centers located within an institution is that they are independent of any formal mechanism for promotion and tenure within the institution (Gaff 1975).

On the basis of his extensive review of instructional improvement centers, Gaff (1975) suggests the following plan for starting a center:

- Develop an outreach program.
- Start small and prove yourself.
- Keep a low profile.
- Start where the faculty are.
- Be eclectic in approach.
- Start with a small group of volunteers who will "sell" the program to colleges.
- Go with winners at the outset.
- Administer a small instructional improvement fund (pp. 123-125).

The third "new" approach, the auditor-consultant program, is an old idea gaining favor with younger faculty members. The program consists of a mutual tutorship between two faculty members, who tutor each other about trends in their own fields of expertise and audit each other's courses. This arrangement works well in institutions of any size (Green and Mink 1973). A variation of the auditor-consultant approach is the use of academic mentors, a buddy system where a senior colleague assists a young faculty member in career development and in coping with institutional politics (Lazarus and Tolpin 1979).

OBSTACLES TO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

While administrators present an obstacle to faculty development in their failure to look at development from the viewpoint of faculty members' needs, faculty present an obstacle in their failure to take complete responsibility for their development (Reddick 1979). Three major obstacles—lack of time, financial constraints, and lack of interest—apply to administrators and faculty, whether full time or part time (Moe 1977).

Administrators are overwhelmed with budgets and with pushing bureaucratic paper, while faculty are busy with research projects, endless committee meetings, and compiling vitae for promotion and tenure. No one has time to formulate or participate in a faculty development program.

Whatever meager funds go into faculty development, 70 percent come from the institution (Centra 1976). Most faculty development programs are subsidized not by direct line items in the budget, but through indirect support in the form of sabbaticals, outside speakers, funds to attend conferences and meetings, and similar traditional lines (Mahy, Ellis, and Abrams 1969). Most of the remaining amount (27 percent according to Centra 1976) comes from governmental and foundation grants, many of which are beginning to dry up. Outside funding, while helpful, is not necessary to mount and conduct effective faculty development programs (Heie, Sweet, and Carlberg 1979). In most instances, outside money for faculty development is used as seed money.

A lack of interest or motivation can also be attributed to both administration and faculty. Academic administrators "do not have the skills or even the interest in faculty development precisely because they were selected for their financial and administrative skills and inclinations" (Berquist and Phillips 1981, p. 11). Faculty participate in the programs if they perceive that there is something in it for them—praise, recog-

nition, or rewards for improvement (Bevan 1980; Noonan 1974; Sanford, 1971).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A SUCCESSFUL FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The literature on faculty development clearly indicates a number of specific recommendations for administrators to follow in initiating and implementing programs. Those recommendations generally include involving the faculty, attaining administrators' support, making the program comprehensive, and establishing a reward system.

Faculty Involvement

Experts on the subject agree unanimously that faculty members must be involved directly and explicitly in all aspects of planning and mounting faculty development programs. Control by faculty is necessary for their acceptance of and trust in the programs (Chait and Gueths 1981; Gaff 1975; Sanders 1978). One way to ensure faculty members' acceptance is to have faculty advisory groups establish policies and implement programs (Elioff 1980; Gaff 1975). Indeed, it is highly recommended, at least for instructional improvement programs, that a respected faculty member head the program (Gaff 1975). A good way to kill a faculty development program, especially one that centers around growth contracts, is to impose a full blown program on the faculty from above, either through the administration or an external agency . . . You have the greatest chance of success if your program is developed and run by the faculty, with suitable external input to insure that institutional needs and requirements will be met" (Heie, Sweet, and Carlberg 1979, p. 28).

A good way to kill a faculty development program, especially one that centers around growth contracts, is to impose a full blown program on the faculty from above, either through the administration or an external agency. . .

Administrative Support

While faculty involvement is critical, administrative leadership and support are also indispensable (Koffman and Thornell 1980; Nelsen 1979). In fact, some argue that an administrative leader ought to devote 20 percent of his or her time to the program (Heie, Sweet, and Carlberg 1979).

The salient reason for administrative involvement in faculty development, lacking other reasons, is to link faculty development to the institution's goals (Elioff 1980). The administrator has the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that faculty development programs reflect the institution and all the constraints upon it (Heie, Sweet, and Carlberg 1979).

Administrative support becomes apparent in the economics of faculty development. It is up to the administration to allocate funds in the budget because doing so allows for a substantive program and shows the institution's commitment to faculty development (Chait and Gueths 1981; Gaff 1975).

Furthermore, administrators ought to ensure that faculty development is a component of the institution's organizational structure, not a departmental or divisional structure (Chait and Gueths 1981; Elioff 1980). This kind of arrangement can accommodate shifting resources and interinstitutional activities, and can allow for uniform criteria (Chait and Gueths, 1981).

Administrators need to create a climate of openness and trust conducive to and supportive of faculty development (Gaff 1975; Lindquist 1980; O'Bannion 1977). The programs will have a better chance of success if faculty members are comfortable with the approaches and techniques used in faculty development (Baldwin 1979). Above all, the administration must not threaten the faculty in any way (Gaff 1975).

The main emphasis of faculty development should be to help faculty not to evaluate them. "If your program is viewed by faculty as just another clever way for administrators or external agencies to judge performances for salary and/or advancement purposes, then it probably won't get off the ground, and maybe it shouldn't" (Heie, Sweet, and Carlberg 1979, p. 26).

A Comprehensive Program

Writers generally agree that a comprehensive, integrated, and holistic program of faculty development has a greater chance of success than a unidimensional one (Berquist and Phillips 1975; Gaff 1975; Reddick 1979).

Regardless of what kind of program is established, flexible policies and practices are imperative to meet faculty members' diverse needs (Baldwin 1979; Hennessey 1982). Faculty members at different stages of their life cycles, their career cycles, and their institutional roles will have different needs and interests in development. Consequently, "not every faculty member needs to be involved in any one program for it to be successful. . . . Every program will appeal to some, and no program will appeal to all" (Gaff 1975, p. 18).

A comprehensive program of faculty development will offer faculty opportunities to improve as teachers, to develop an environment that will be supportive within the institution, and to develop personal values as a professional. In other words, it provides for instructional development for organizational development, and for personal development (Berquist and Phillips 1975). While all three dimensions ought to be included, the logical entry point for embryonic faculty development programs is instructional development (Berquist and Phillips 1977).

The focus on and support of professional roles and activities normally associated with faculty status should serve as the basis for a career development program and a constructive rather than a remedial rationale (Berquist and Phillips 1981; Chait and Gueths 1981; Maher and Ebben 1978). The combination of career development and adult personality development appears to be two sides of the same coin (Freedman et al. 1979; Schien 1978).

From their viewpoint, administrators have seen improvements in scholarly output on their campuses, the design of new interdisciplinary courses that attract students, and the increase of collegial interaction among the faculties.

While professors share some common career goals, a younger professor is more likely to accept help from an older colleague, but an older professor is more likely to work out his career difficulties on his own. Furthermore, younger professors are more apt to participate in formal faculty development programs than their senior colleagues. The vocational experiences a college professor has early in his career play a large role in his later career, implying that an institution should take great interest in the support of new professors (Baldwin 1979).

The label or name given to the program is more critical than may appear at first glance. Faculty members feel

threatened, defensive, and even reluctant to participate in something called "faculty development." It appears that it is better to call it "professional (or instructional) improvement (or facilitation)" (Gaff 1975, p. 121). Regardless of what kind of program is established or its name, administrators need to develop a communications system that will encourage a dialogue about teaching and learning (Elioff 1980; Reddick 1979).

One last caveat concerns the timing of faculty development programs. "If an institution is faced with the possibility of cutting back faculty positions and faculty members are threatened with the loss of their jobs, that is probably the least hospitable time to attempt to implement a program of faculty development (Gaff 1975, p. 135).

The Reward System

To be effective, faculty development must yield benefits for the institution as well as for individual faculty members (Reddick 1979). Three types of systems are available to reward faculty: direct, including merit pay and promotions; extrinsic, including research assistants, more laboratory equipment, higher library budgets, a reduction in the teaching load, travel funds, and sabbaticals; and intrinsic, including professional status and respect of colleagues (Chait and Gueths 1981). Not all of these rewards will succeed with all faculty, because faculty members' preferences for rewards differ by age, school, and rank (Fenker 1977).

One of the least effective so-called rewards is the annual teaching award, which is used at over three-quarters of the universities. These awards are sometimes compared to beauty contest prizes, and thus the assumption that they provide incentive to all teachers to improve may not hold" (Centra 1976, p. 62).

Results

Successful faculty development programs have positive advantages for both faculty and administrators. Faculty members have expressed "feelings of revitalization, indicating that their lives had actually changed as a result of faculty development activities" (Nelsen and Siegel 1980, p. 3). From their viewpoint, administrators have seen improvements in scholarly output on their campuses, the design of new interdisciplinary courses that attract students, and the increase of collegial interaction among the faculties. Campuses as a whole have been improved also, even in these difficult times. Committee systems have been streamlined and reward more clearly formulated as a result of faculty development (Nelsen and Siegel 1980, p. 3).

But not all faculty development programs succeed. "Faculty development will always be to some degree a risk. The only greater risk would be to do nothing" (Chait and Gueths 1981, p. 33).

Faculty development, long underemphasized, is here with all its attendant difficulties, problems, and challenges. The collected wisdom of successful programs (and failures) can help an administrator in higher education to chart a course through the sensitive waters of collegiality, economic setbacks, and bargaining units.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W. 1974. "Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment." New Rochelle, N. Y.: Change Magazine Publishers, The Group for Human Development in Higher Education.

Baldwin, Roger. 1979. *Adult and Career Development: What Are the Implications for Faculty?* Current Issues in Higher Education No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education. ED 193 998. 44 pp. MF-$1.17; PC not available EDRS.

Berquist, William, and Phillips, Steven R. 1975. *A Handbook for Faculty Development,* vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Council of Independent Colleges. ED 115 174. 299 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$24.14.

1977. *A Handbook for Faculty Development,* vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: Council of Independent Colleges. ED 148 204. 323 pp. MF-$1.17; PC not available EDRS.

1981. *A Handbook for Faculty Development,* vol. 3. Washington, D.C.: Council of Independent Colleges. ED 209 201. 360 pp. MF-$1.17; PC not available EDRS.

Bevan, J. 1980. "Faculty Evaluation and Institutional Rewards." *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin* 33: 1.

Bumpus, J. Frank. 1981. "Career Vitalization and Stress among Professors: An Attributional Model." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, 24-28 August, in Los Angeles. ED 207 478. 15 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74.

Centra, John A. 1976. *Faculty Development Practices in U. S. Colleges and Universities.* Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service.

1977. "Faculty Development Practices." In New Directions for Higher Education No. 17. *Reviewing and Evaluating Teaching,* ed. J. Centra. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chait, R., and Gueths, J. 1981. "Proposing a Framework for Faculty Development." *Change* 13 (4): 30-33.

Christensen, F. 1977. "Equipping Faculty to Serve Lifelong Learners." In *Reviewing and Evaluating Teaching*. ed. J. Centra. New Directions for Higher Education No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K. Patricia. 1977. "Not Can, but Will College Teaching Be Improved?" In *Reviewing and Evaluating Teaching*. ed. J. Centra. New Directions for Higher Education No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elioff, Ione H. 1980. "A Study of Part-Time Faculty and Recommendations for Faculty Development at Vista College. A Noncampus Community College." Ed. D. dissertation, Nova University. Ed 188 725. 129 pp. MF$1.17; PC-$12.87.

Fenker, Richard. 1977. "The Incentive Structure of a University." *Journal of Higher Education* 48 (4): 453-71.

Freedman, Mervin, et al. 1979. *Academic Culture and Faculty Development*. Orinda, Calif.: Montaigue Press.

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

Green, Charles R., and Mink, Walter D. 1973. "A Proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education." St. Paul, Minn.: Macalster College.

Heie, Harold; Sweet, David; and Carlberg, R. Judson. 1979. *Professional Development through Growth Contracts Handbook*. Wenham, Mass.: Gordon College. Ed 168 405 106 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$11.12.

Hennessey, Mary Delaney. 1982. "Faculty Development: An Orientation Model for Part-time Faculty." Ed. D. dissertation, Boston University.

Koffman, Michael, and Theall, Michael. 1980. "Instructional Development Activities in a Faculty Development Program." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1 April, in Boston. ED 185 937. 60 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$7.24.

Lazarus, Barbara, and Tolpin, Martha. 1979. *Engaging Junior Faculty in Career Planning: Alternatives to the Exit Interview*. Current Issues in Higher Education No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education. ED 193 998. 44 pp. MF-$1.17; PC not available EDRS.

Lindquist, J. 1980. "The Challenge to Professional Development." *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin* 33 (1): 3-7.

Maher, R., and Ebben, J. 1978. "The Margin of Quality: Selection and Evaluation of Part-time Faculty." In *Employing Part-time Faculty*. Ed. D. Leslie. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 18. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Many, W. A.; Ellis, J. R.; and Abrams, P. Spring 1969. "In-Service Education in American Senior Colleges and Universities: A Status Report." *Illinois School Research*: 46-51.

Moe, J. 1977. "A Staff Development Model for Part-time Instructors." In *Developing Staff Potential*. ed. T. O'Bannian. New Directions for Community Colleges No. 19. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nelsen, William C. Summer 1979. "Faculty Development: Prospects and Potential for the 1980s." *Liberal Education* 65: 141-49.

Nelsen, William C. and Siegel, Michael E. 1980. *Effective Approaches to Faculty Development*. Washington, D. C.: Association of American Colleges. ED 184 439. 154 pp. MF-$1.17.

Noonan, John F. 1974. Case study prepared for the Faculty Development Project of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Center for Improving Teaching Effectiveness, Virginia Commonwealth University. Mimeographed.

O'Bannion, T., ed 1977. *Developing Staff Potential*. New Directions for Community Colleges No. 19. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pfnister, Allan O.; Solder, Jill; and Verroca, Nina. 1979. *Growth Contracts: Viable Strategy for Institutional Planning under Changing Conditions?* Current Issues in Higher Education No. 2. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education. ED 193 998. 44 pp. MF-$1.17; PC not available EDRS. Reddick, DeWitt. 1979. *Wholeness and Renewal in Education: A Learning Experience at Austin College*. Sherman, Texas: Austin College. ED 187 158. 119 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$10.12.

Sanders, Joseph L. 1978. "Faculty Development." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, 27-30 December, in New York City. ED 165 693. 14 pp. MF-$1.17; PC $3.74.

Sanford, Nevitt. Winter 1971. "Academic Cultures and the Teacher's Development," *Soundings*: 357-71.

Schein, Edgar. 1978. *Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Seldin, Peter. 1977. *Faculty Growth Contracts.* London, Eng:: University of London, Institute of Education. ED 157 469. 17 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74.

Shucard, Alan R. 1978. "Educational Development at a Moderate-sized University." In *Institutional Renewal through the Improvement of Teaching.* ed. J. G. Gaff. New Directions for Higher Education No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shulman, C. 1980. "Do Faculty Really Work That Hard?" *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin* 33 (2): 5.

Smith, Donald K. 1978. "Faculty Vitality and the Management of University Personnel Policies." In *Evaluating Faculty Performance and Vitality,* ed. W. Kirschling, New Directions for Institutional Research No. 20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spitz, Lewis W. 1977. "Humanistic Approaches to Faculty Development." *Liberal Education* 63: 529-36.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current literature on higher education for the National Institute of Education's monthly bibliographic journal *Resources in Education.* Most of these publications are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). For publications cited in this bibliography that are available from EDRS, ordering number and price are included. Readers who wish to order a publication should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. When ordering, please specify the document number. Documents are available as noted in microfiche (MF) and paper copy (PC). Since prices are subject to change it is advisable to check the latest issue of *Resources in Education* for current cost based on the number of pages in the publication.

Administrator's Update is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, D.C. Series Editor is Glenn M. Nelson, Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh. Copies of Administrator's Update may be ordered for $2.00 each from the American Association of University Administrators, 1133 Fifteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. 400-82-0011. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or the Department.

ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE

American Association of University Administrators
1133 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage Paid
Washington, DC.
20005
Permit No. 3235