DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 452 IR 013 204

AUTHOR Lawrason, Robin Edgar
TITLE Politics of Instructional Development in Higher Education. Chapter 9.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 20p.; In: Instructional Development: The State of the Art. Volume I, 1978; See IR 013 196. For chapter 5, see ED 144 587.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; *College Instruction; *Curriculum Development; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; *Political Influences; School Surveys

ABSTRACT

This chapter discusses the implementation and encouragement of instructional development on the university campus, with particular emphasis on the instability and political nature of the campus environment. Empirical data obtained from a survey of instructional development activities throughout the Delaware Valley of Pennsylvania and New Jersey are used in evaluating the points found in a survey of the literature. Factors discussed in evaluating the survey data include commitment by the institution, faculty rewards, skills of the instructional development staff, resources and facilities, evaluation of programs, openness to change, student attitudes, the importance of strong internal personalities, focus of the instructional development center, program documentation, and the importance of strong interpersonal communication between developers and other university personnel. The text is supplemented by two tables, and a 24-item bibliography is provided. (Author/EW)

CHAPTER IX

POLITICS OF INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By
Robin Edgar Lawrason

The literature on the theory of instructional development is voluminous. Every ardent ID specialist is able to write with precision and specificity concerning the construction and testing of instructional products. A more relevant problem for developers, however, is not how to do ID, but how to get it done at their own campus. Academic ID programs have given considerable training in instructional process skills, yet little in the way of personal or political skills.

Those within the profession generally agree that ID involves a systematic process whereby instructional problems are analyzed and solutions developed and tested, with the goal of improving the achievement of learners. The process has been described with the aid of models or flow charts illustrating the numerous instructional variables and the interrelationships among them (Baker and Schutz, 1971; Davies, 1971; Davis, Alexander and Yelon, 1974; Gerlach and Ely, 1971; Popham and Baker, 1970; etc.). Components of the process include the analysis of learner variables, the specification of content and of performance objectives, the development of both teaching and learning strategies together with appropriate resources, the allocation of space and time, and the evaluation of learner skills, instructional products and procedures.

The majority of writers, however, concentrate on those variables related to the instructional act itself: learner characteristics, subject-content hierarchies, the specific teaching procedures and products. The study of such variables as performance objectives, prompts, practice, feedback, and various instructional methods is an essential task of the researcher and developer in determining their effects upon learner achievement. Scientific development of an individualized freshman English program, however, is by no means an assurance that the innovative course will be implemented.

Implementation of any instructional development project within an institution of higher education is not an easy task. It requires considerable time, energy and commitment. Any project undertaken in the hope of achieving significant results requires extensive planning, controlled implementation, and continued evaluation over time. The text book ID

approach prescribes important decision-making tasks as well as the time-consuming production requirements throughout the project. The process must also take place within an institutional context, and thus, must interface with yet another system which has its own range of controls, variables, and priorities. Approvals and arrangements are required from faculty through policy or curriculum committees and from administrators concerned with funds, resources, time and space. Ironically in many institutions of higher education, it is not uncommon to find that the priorities and procedures of the academic community and of the administrative structure conflict with those of individuals who are seriously concerned with improving the quality of instruction. An ID team may have spent many months developing a new freshman English course, with individualized learning modules, based on the principle of student mastery performance. After testing the new units with students the team discovers significant increases in both learner achievement and motivation. These innovators may be congratulated for their research, but if they were to attempt to implement the new course they would most likely be criticized by angry administrators and colleagues who are afraid of "grade inflation".

It has become increasingly evident in recent years, therefore, that the successful instructional developer must also become a change agent. As a change agent the ID professional must be willing to identify, utilize and attempt to modify the institution's political power structure in order to develop policies that lead to meaningful improvement of instructional programs. The research of other social scientists interested in the study of change, innovation, or the diffusion of new ideas can be helpful to the ID professional. The study of change in itself has become a discipline with its own systems and theories. Recent reviews of change literature by Chin and Downey (1973), and Giacquinta (1973) provide evidence of the extensive research in this field. The ID community must be able to use this new change theory to develop strategies and isolate factors that can aid in the diffusion of the results of its developmental projects throughout higher education.

POLITICAL ID SUCCESS FACTORS FROM THE LITERATURE

Many educators have been concerned about implementation from an administrative or curricular standpoint. An excellent review of implementation or organization system models is provided by Baker in Travers' *Second Handbook of Research in Teaching* (1973). These models, however, are concerned with theoretical constructs based on a stable environmental context. Teaching or conducting ID in higher education today cannot be said to occur in a stable environment. Both tangible and intangible factors are at work within the complex matrix of an institution. Little research has yet been conducted that can

determine the relative importance of those factors which could facilitate ID in higher education. Identification of those significant factors, however, is not enough. Study must also be made of strategic interrelationships, not only among factors, but also in interaction with those involving the loci of political control within the institution.

Comparison of published studies of factors influencing the implementation of ID products is difficult because much of the research to date has either been too abstract, written in terms of general administrative or organizational theory; or else it has been anecdotal, pertaining to specific ID programs within a single institution. Another problem in comparing studies is created by the differing perceptions various people in the academic community have of ID. The research-oriented developers tend to stress their concerns for maintaining controlled variables in the application of their theoretic process. Producer-developers meanwhile are more concerned with providing adequate material resources and staff and perhaps even with the development of a marketable product. Administrators, pushed by politicians, are often concerned with the basic productivity and accountability of their faculty and staff. Faculty, on the other hand, are concerned with maintaining academic control, as well as receiving both the needed time and rewards for their ID efforts. All groups are legitimately concerned with an even more essential factor: the financial support for providing ID work. Research that attempts to examine change or innovation strategies is thus often confounded by the wide range of perspectives to be found on the subject within the academic community.

Despite these difficulties it is possible to find some consensus in authors writing about successful ID projects concerning factors that contributed to that success. At least eight factors are commonly reported in the literature.

1. COMMITMENT BY THE INSTITUTION

This rather general factor was identified as essential in the establishment of an effective program of instructional development on campus by the majority of the authors reviewed. Both Diamond (1974) and Purdy (1975) state that the administration is responsible for the internal campus communication system and for addressing both problems and the need for change. Whitefield and Brammer (1973), DeBloois and Alder (1973), and Lee (1971) all stress that this support must be forthcoming from either the president or provost in charge of academic affairs. The creation of an "innovational climate" by the administration is also stressed by Alexander and Yelon (1972), Diamond (1975), Lee (1972) and Purdy (1975).

Commitment by the administration, however, is measured by most authors in terms of budgetary support for ID Centers: DeBloois and Alder (1973); Diamond (1975); Lee (1971, 1972); Popham (1974); Stowe (1971); and Whitefield and Brammer (1973). This specific factor is clearly the success variable most frequently cited by those ID Centers canvassed by Alexander and Yelon (1972).

Another indication of the administration's commitment which appears to effect the success of ID programs is the position of the ID Center within the hierarchy of the institution. In reporting on fifteen ID Centers currently in operation throughout North America, Alexander and Yelon (1972) report that the majority were operated from a central position, whereas the remainder were operated within individual Colleges or departments. Diamond (1975) stresses the necessity for ID services to be controlled centrally with decision-making policies being made at the Vice Presidential level where communication is clearly defined between colleges and departments. Lee (1972) also argues that the director should not only be given academic rank equal to faculty colleagues, but also should have the power to make policy decisions in relation to the ID projects under development. In describing their own operations, four of the fifteen Centers in the Alexander and Yelon study specifically mention the position of the ID Director in the administrative hierarchy as an essential factor controlling his success.

2. FACULTY REWARDS

The current reward structure commonly found, particularly in older institutions of higher education, has had a strong negative influence upon efforts to improve teaching and learning. Benston (1973) repeats the common argument that faculty are rewarded for research, not for teaching. Good teaching, he argues, does bring a certain level of prestige to the professor, but instead of positive reward, a good teacher finds the work load is increased when improvement efforts are undertaken. Benston, as well as all other authors reviewed, stresses the importance of providing incentives for improvements in teaching through changes in current out-dated standards for promotion, merit, tenure, release time and so on.

3. SKILLS OF THE ID STAFF

The first success factor which is related to variables within the ID Center itself appears well down the list, below the previous two factors which were related to the administrative structure of the campus. The most important internal factor described by most authors relates directly to the range and quality of the professional skills available to faculty at the Center. Specific skills mentioned by authors included personal dynamics skills, such as diagnosis of personal needs and counseling; skills

required to move through the ID process, such as the definition of goals, selection of strategies, etc; technical skills related to the design, production and implementation of instructional materials; and skills related to the evaluation of needs, people, materials and programs: Alexander and Yelon (1972); DeBloois and Alder (1973); Diamond (1975); Lee (1972); Lindquist (1975); Purdy (1974); and Whitefield and Brammer (1973).

4. RESOURCES AND FACILITIES

Closely related to the "human" resources noted above, most of the same authors cite the need for physical resources and facilities. These include office, library and media resources (both hardware and software) necessary for the design, production, implementation and evaluation of new teaching resources and programs.

5. EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

A smaller number of authors stress the need for programs of evaluation. Diamond (1974) sees evaluation not only as a part of the revision cycle, but also stresses a type of evaluation at the "front end". He calls for both the administration and the center to have clearly identified goals and objectives, presumably to provide guidance in the selection of development projects, as well as to provide a yardstick against which to measure the final effects of the programs under development. Popham (1974) stresses the need for focusing on student achievement as a means of getting at the complex and difficult task of measuring teaching effectiveness. Both Lee (1971) and Lindquist (1974) cite overall program evaluation as another essential consideration. In the review of ID Centers by Alexander and Yelon, several Centers list evaluation of ongoing programs as a key factor, and stress the need for consistency in evaluation procedures.

6. FACULTY OPENNESS TO CHANGE

The strongest evidence of the importance of this factor is found in the Alexander and Yelon book. At least nine of the fifteen ID Centers stress this issue, making it second in importance only to budgetary support as a critical factor in the promotion of instructional development on campus. Lindquist (1974) devotes his article to a consideration of "change models" useful in promoting innovation on the campus. Purdy (1975) states directly that the faculty's openness to change will seriously effect development efforts on campus. Both Lindquist and Purdy, however, suggest that unless faculty are involved in the change process the efforts of the administration may be in vain.

7. STUDENT ATTITUDES

Few articles directly consider the needs of students, or try to relate their attitudes to the development process. Only two of the fifteen Centers in the Alexander and Yelon book mention the importance of positive student attitudes. Diamond (1975), however, lists "a relevant curriculum" as a primary factor. He explains that the curriculum should be relevant to the present and future needs of the student, as well as to the community, to society, and to existing psychological and social factors.

8. FOCUS OF THE ID CENTER

This factor seems to be a concern primarily of those ID Centers that have developed beyond early stages. Diamond (1975) stresses the need for the ID Center to focus on large scale projects which utilize the full range of the ID process. By selection of well planned projects with good prospects for success, and by following through on all development phases on a collegial or departmental level (rather than on an individual or course level), projects have a better chance of survival, as well as a better chance of having a significant effect upon a wide group of learners and faculty. In the Alexander and Yelon book, at least one third of the ID Centers included level of focus as an important success variable in the operation of their ID programs.

A recent study (Lawrason and Hedberg, 1977) attempted to determine whether there was any correlation among the perceptions held by various university people with respect to the relative importance of a range of factors which could conceivably effect the success of ID efforts. Subjects were taken from two major northeastern universities. They included faculty, administrators, ID staff, and ID graduate students. Each was asked to rank the importance of twenty specific factors, then rate (on a scale of 1 to 5) the manipulability of each factor within the institution. Manipulation was rated in two areas: the ability of the factor to be manipulated by the ID Center, and for it to be manipulated by the administration.

While the study was not entirely successful in producing a generalized systems model that demonstrated consistent interrelationships among factors, a number of important trends were noted. In overall ranking the administration's support of the ID Center was selected as the most important factor. When weighted averages were formed (ranking x rating), this factor was again first in the administrative control column. It was third, however, as a factor that could be manipulated by the ID Center itself. The second ranking factor also involved administration: budgetary support. Skills of the ID director and staff were next in line, highly rated in terms both of the administration's and of the ID Center's ability to control.

An interesting observation in the study, moreover, was that subjects tended to respond according to their individual concerns rather than their academic roles. Factors clustered into four response patterns: administrative support, instructional development policy, campus climate, and IDC image. Subject groups tended to consistently favor one cluster of factors or another; no correlation was found between the status of the members of the groups and their perceptions of the locus of control for making ID work successfully.

Perhaps the most important conclusion of the study relates to the political environment of the campus in relation to the ID Center's position in the administrative structure. An ID Center cannot exist successfully alone. While it can control to some degree the quality of director and staff, instructional products and the diversity of services offered, the more essential controls are related to areas outside its purvue: administrative support through funds, rewards for faculty, position of the ID Center and director in the university hierarchy, and the innovative climate among administrators and faculty.

The Lawrason and Hedberg study attempted to examine the relative importance of ID implementation strategies, but was limited to responses based on perceptions acquired through personal training or experience. Much of the current literature on implementation and diffusion deals with such personal theories of advice to prospective change agents. There are few studies in which a range of ID projects are analyzed in terms of specific administrative and political factors. One such study, The Rand Report, reviewed by Berman and McLaughlin (1976), examines specific federal projects for change in education. The multi-volumed Report examines project outcomes in terms of perceived success, changes in behavior, fidelity and implementation within the institutional setting.

The purpose of the present study, therefore, is to compare recently published theory with the reported practices of those institutions which are currently involved in instructional development projects. In this way one can compare current theory with practice and gain a better perception of the actual role of the ID professional within the political hierarchy of the institution. Questions raised in the study were, basically, who promotes ID? Who does ID? Who pays for ID? and how is ID implemented and evaluated within the institution?

A Delaware Valley ID Project Survey

METHOD

The study surveyed sixteen representative institutions in the Delaware Valley region. The geographic region of southeastern Pennsylvania and southwestern New Jersey represents an area containing approximately eight million inhabitants with a geographic center in Philadelphia. The region is composed of high density inner city neighborhoods, a variety of surrounding suburban communities, as well as large rural areas.

Included in the survey were five two-year community colleges, five four-year private colleges, one four-year state college, three private universities and two state-related universities. Contacts were made with principal academic leaders who referred the investigator to projects in progress within each institution.

Data was then collected by the investigator, primarily through telephone interviews. In some cases on-site interviews were conducted to gain additional information or insight into the nature of the project. During the pilot testing of the data form (Appendix A), it soon became evident that answers given by respondents to the simplest questions often were qualified, and that additional information was necessary before the responses could be placed in a proper context. The vast differences in the level, scope, content and organization of the projects surveyed made data collection a most difficult task. Thus, it was decided that the phone interview procedure would be more efficient than mailing the forms to project directors. Moreover, given the return rate normally experienced with such forms, the direct interview approach was also deemed to be more likely to procure the required data.

Respondents were first read the following introductory statement, which includes a definition of an instructional development project:

> I am currently making a survey of instructional development projects for a research paper that I am writing. The purpose of my paper is to provide useful information to other developers about the various ways ID projects are organized in terms of the administrative structures of the institution. I am defining an instructional development project as any project that involves the following stages of development:
>
> 1. a proposal stage to gain financial support (either internal or external).
> 2. a goals stage where student performance objectives were specified.
> 3. a design and production stage where instructional procedures and materials were developed to help students reach the stated goals.

4. an evaluation stage where procedures and materials were tried out with representative students and measured for effectiveness.

Has your institution had any such projects under development over the last year?

If respondents felt that their project qualified as an ID project, the investigator proceeded with the questions listed on the data form.

RESULTS

A. PROJECTS BY INSTITUTION

The sixteen regional institutions surveyed reported twenty-eight ID projects, distributed according to Table 1. The five community colleges accounted for eleven of the total, the five private four-year colleges four, and the single state college one. The two state-related universities reported six projects in the survey, while the three private universities also reported six.

TABLE 1. PROJECTS BY INSTITUTIONS

Institutional Level	Number of Institutions	Number of Projects
Community College	5	11
Private Four-year	5	4
State Four-year	1	1
State-related University	2	6
Private Universities	3	6
	16	28

B. PROJECT ACADEMIC SUBJECT AREA

A full range of academic subject areas were represented in the 28 projects surveyed. Education projects accounted for the greatest number with five projects. Interdisciplinary studies projects involving three or more subject areas (primarily Humanities and Social Science areas) had four projects in progress. Science, Mathematics, and Allied Health each had three; Faculty Development, Basic Skills, Engineering, and Social Work areas had two each. Career Education and English both had one project represented in the survey.

C. PROJECT SIZE AND SCOPE

The majority of projects (twenty) involved more than a single course (Table 2). Several of these projects were at the level of a full career-oriented program to train professionals in required competencies. Only one project represented a single workshop session, and the remaining seven projects were at the level of a three credit unit course.

D. PROJECT FUNDS

Funds for ID projects came from a variety of sources. Federal grants accounted for almost half the projects (thirteen), while state aid provided support for only one. The second largest investor was the institution itself. Seven projects were funded from the central administration, two by colleges within institutions, and one by an academic department. The remaining four projects were funded by grants from private agencies.

E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1. Rank of the Project Director:

Interviewees from each project were asked to define the principal role of the project director (PD). Seventeen directors out of twenty-eight were faculty within the academic discipline of the project. Three PDs were department chairpersons, four served at the level of academic dean or vice president of the institution and four were ranked as staff positions. The four staff persons were hired specifically for the task of directing their project, while the other twenty-five directors were already at the institution prior to the acceptance of the proposal.

2. Training and Experience of the Project Director:

Ten of the directors interviewed in the survey underwent formal training in the ID process. Another ten of the PDs had some exposure to the concept through workshops, seminars or extended readings. Eight PDs, however, had no training at all for their task. This lack of training seemed to be somewhat offset by the previous experience of most PDs. Nineteen had worked on prior projects, while nine were freshmen to the development process. Of the nine novices, four had neither training nor previous experience.

3. The ID project Team:

In almost all cases the development team involved a number of institutional representatives. Only one project relied wholly upon the director for program input. Another was completed by two people, the director and a top administrator. Fifteen projects were a cooperative effort between the PD and a group of faculty from the academic subject area. Another nine projects involved not only faculty but also a range of specialists including curriculum and evaluation experts.

TABLE 2. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION/DIFFUSION STRATEGIES

Implementation/Diffusion Strategy		Frequency of Use in Projects*
1.	faculty planning input	17
2.	faculty planning rewards:	
	a. money	9
	b. promotion	4
	c. release time	5
3.	faculty implementation rewards:	
	a. money	9
	b. promotion	3
	c. release time	4
4.	faculty orientation program	19
5.	faculty in service	13
6.	use of validation data	9
7.	teacher self evaluation procedure	11
8.	publicity for ID project	9
9.	continued monetary support	16
10.	external evaluation	12
11.	student opinion data	20
12.	other unsolicited strategies:	
	a. support of administration	13
	b. sale of instructional development product	3

*Total of 28 projects.

4. The Project Staff:

While twenty-five of the projects had some clerical assistance, only a few teams had the services of a full-time secretary. In almost all cases such aid was recruited from existing departmental or institutional pools. Similarly of the nineteen projects that had media specialist assistance, all used regular campus services rather than a full time staff. Ten of the projects had the aid of fully trained instructional development consultants. In most instances this assistance was provided through the director, or a senior academic adviser with advanced training. Only in two instances were professional consultants outside the project approached.

DISCUSSION

It is perhaps misleading to attempt to draw conclusions from the data on whether the size of the institution was related to the number of ID projects identified. The survey did not attempt to include all projects

identified. The survey did not attempt to include all projects underway at each institution, where all institutions in the region canvassed. But it was apparent that some institutions seemed to have more projects in progress than others. One of the private state colleges, for example, had three of the total four projects identified for that group. Different philosophies and priorities of the institutions would perhaps account for these differences rather than their size alone. The one most productive college had an administrator who was a positive change agent and who reached into the community as well as promoted ID activity within his own faculty. The other colleges, while espousing improvement of instruction, had not been totally successful in moving faculty out of the traditional limited lecturer/scholar role.

The most ambitious projects in terms of both scope and subject area shared one common factor: all were innovative either in terms of curricular content or instructional technique. For example, several colleges developed new curriculum in allied health, career education, or in the new field of gerontology as a response to community needs and interests. These projects had the highest potential for success for a number of reasons. First, as a response to both community and federal priorities, the projects had selected target areas which qualified for government funding. Second, since the projects were a direct response to a local community need, student populations were assured for the new programs. By selecting new subject fields not formerly taught at the institutions, two project teams overcame one additional obstacle that hampered other projects. These two teams had a clean slate to develop new instructional strategies and policies which would then be established in a new college department rather than in a pre-existing department with all its political and administrative priorities. As noted in later discussion, ID success often appears correlated inversely with the number of administrative committees and levels of control that projects must pass through before receiving approval.

The Career Education Project and several other major projects involved experimentation with inter-disciplinary teaching approaches, or with new learning concepts such as experiential learning, personalized learning, or individualized instruction. All such projects depend upon voluntary contributions by existing faculty. While the potential for change is high, the political realities in sustaining complicated arrangements for assuring continued administrative and faculty support make the full incorporation of such projects into the institutional mainstream less secure.

The role of the ID project director would seem to be a critical one in the development of new instructional procedures and resources. Yet, neither the academic rank nor training of the PD seemed to be

correlated with project approval. The lack of any formal training for the majority of PDs is distressing, particularly to the professional instructional developer. While more than 50% of the PDs had undergone at least informal ID training, the majority were from the academic subject area of the project and lacked the more widely-based educational expertise associated with the professional developer. It is perhaps even more significant to note that only five of the sixteen institutions surveyed have such professional assistance available. In at least three of those institutions that have ID support there has been turnover in these positions due to conflicts between the ID professional and the administration. Only one of the sixteen institutions maintains a Center for Instructional Development as a separate office within the administrative structure.

The implementation and diffusion strategies used were primarily the traditional ones used in most institutions, and the results obtained from their use corroborated current theory. The most successful and commonly used strategy was the involvement of faculty in determining the project content. The means of achieving input varied greatly from forming small committees to gathering data from large numbers of interested faculty. In projects where new subject disciplines were being introduced, this strategy was less useful. One project gathered this valuable input from external subject area professionals, as well as from interested community leaders.

Orientation of faculty before the implementation of the project was a common strategy in many projects, but less than half the projects followed up with continued support for the faculty throughout the first year. Only one third of the projects attempted to convince faculty of the validity of the new procedures by demonstrating successful results from either pilot test data or other successful programs.

Project evaluation was not used widely as either an implementation or a diffusion strategy. While twenty projects did use student feedback, much of this was done in order to fulfill an institutional requirement and was not related to the actual need of the project. Only one third used instructor self-evaluation to give feedback throughout the project implementation; and only one third built in an external evaluation to measure the success of the procedures, and to gain support for the project.

Although directors were not asked specifically about administrative support for their projects, thirteen PDs voluntarily stated that such support was essential. The visibility of their support can be interpreted through several other reported factors. The first indicator comes from their project's source of funds. Only ten of the twenty-eight were funded by the institution itself. In terms of tight budgets

this may not be a true test of administrative support; it may be, however, an indication of the low level of priority that such projects have in relation to other budgetary items. Only those projects that proved cost efficient or generated a larger student population were assured of continued support by the institution after external funds were expended.

A more critical area by which to evaluate administrative support for innovative ID projects is that of faculty rewards for participation in such work. Data indicated that concrete support for faculty was given in less than half of the ID projects surveyed. Rewards for both planning and implementation stages came in the form of money or release time to work on projects. Only four project directors, however, could report with any certainty that they might receive consideration for promotion based on the time and effort spent on the project. Several PDs indicated that their work had seriously impaired their chances for promotion, and that their administration had encouraged them to stay away from development tasks in favor of further research. One such director admitted that he had been discouraged from such activity, despite the fact that he had been awarded the Distinguished Teacher Award by the institution's student body based on his innovative project. Such conflict among the traditional priorities of research, service, and teaching is by no means uncommon within other institutions. Changes in the promotion policies, giving all three areas equal weight, appear to be slow in coming. While administrators often actively promote the concept of better teaching, those groups who are in control of promotion standards seem uninformed of any shift in priorities towards the development of better instruction.

It is perhaps significant to note that a large percentage of the projects came from the community colleges, which are more strongly committed to providing instruction to a wide variety of learners than for individual faculty research. Two other four year colleges accounted for another sizable number of projects. In all these institutions, instruction seemed to be rated as equal in priority to faculty research. In one large university where such a priority does not exist, an enlightened administration bypassed the problem created by the recognized "second class status" of instructional development activity by employing only tenured professors to develop the large scale interdisciplinary program.

Part of the difficulty in giving administrative support to ID relates to the general role of the administrator in relation to the faculty. Many faculty perceive administrators as the adversary and fight to maintain as much control as possible over academic decision-making. An administration that appears too supportive of ID can be seen by

insecure faculty members as a threat to their academic freedom and integrity. Confrontation over management of instructional questions is not uncommon, particularly in older, more academically oriented, institutions where the individual freedom of the faculty member is sacrosanct. Several major projects involving several different subject-matter disciplines and consequent administrative approvals, failed because of either bitter polarization or total lack of communication between faculty and administrators concerning instructional goals.

At one institution, the staff of a major project charged that the administration had failed to take leadership because of a fear of arousing conflict, and thus, all central efforts for instructional improvement failed. The paradox here is that while administrators encourage improvement and even greater "productivity" among faculty, they tend to abdicate their power to allocate major resources and rewards, in favor of voluntary efforts at improvement by individual faculty members. While voluntary innovative projects are to be commended, such efforts are unlikely to produce major changes in the overall instructional practices on the campus. One director in a final plea to his administration for support stated that it alone "holds in its hands the symbols and prerogatives of legitimate authority. If it chooses to use that authority to improve instruction, change is possible . . . without that authority, the boundaries of voluntary innovation will prove impossible. . . ."

The same director was also critical of both faculty and administration for failing to recognize the intellectual depth of the instructional process. Gaps in knowledge, he claimed, were evident in areas of group dynamics, organization theory, experimental design, measurement, epistemology, statistics, instructional design, developmental and educational psychology, and details of particular technologies. To state that the missing knowledge is merely in the area of education, a field of little status and use, he charged, was an anti-intellectual defense.

A second institution is currently encountering a similar polarization and resistance with respect to a major campus-wide improvement grant. In the first institution the grant was finally terminated when it was evident that the administration could not and would not support the recommendations of the project director. In the second, the administration has used its power through the grant as a political tool against an already embittered faculty. Developers caught in a power struggle have had little opportunity to effect major changes on a campus wide basis. In both cases the projects have been rendered ineffective by the lack of communication concerning methods for the achievement of common goals espoused by both sides.

It would appear at first glance that the size of the institution may have some effect upon the opportunity to achieve better communication. The larger the institution the more difficult successful communication becomes. In addition to size and communication systems, there are also the factors of the efficiency and the priorities of the institution's organization and management systems. Many successful projects surveyed were found in smaller institutions with supportive administrators who shared common goals with faculty. The small, voluntary, course-sized project, moreover, had a greater chance for survival than did those involving several faculty departments and more extensive program or budgetary needs.

Such interdisciplinary projects are only successful when supported by strong administrative initiative or backing. If, however, a number of different levels of administrative and faculty support or approval are necessary, the chances for success are reduced. As soon as major decision-making between potentially rival groups is involved, the opportunity for real change becomes dependent upon complex systems of internal communication and management. Too often these systems may be at cross purposes with a system for instructional improvement.

CONCLUSIONS

The overall low level of instructional development activity in the Delaware Valley/Philadelphia region was somewhat disheartening. The initial task of identifying qualifying ID projects was itself a difficult one. The fact that only one institution in the region, including those outside the survey, has an office and staff for instructional development, underscores the lack of serious concern for the improvement of instruction at the institutional level. This observation, however, should not be interpreted as a reflection of the success or failure of those projects reviewed in this survey, or of those committed faculty working on them. To the contrary, the survey illustrates that certain concerned faculty, dedicated to the improvement of instruction, will spend much energy and time on tasks which ultimately may not receive support from their peers or even from their administration. In fact, they persevere even though these ID tasks may damage their chances for promotion and their careers.

The single most apparent implementation strategy observed through the series of interviews with project directors, therefore, was not one present on the data sheet. It is a factor that is most difficult to measure quantitatively or even objectively. The power of a committed individual to do battle for change should never be underestimated. Lack of ID training, lack of experience, failure to evaluate all aspects of the project and even ignorance of all political and administrative hurdles can often be overcome by such commitment to a project goal. The

confidence and determination of knowledgeable professional academics stood out as an effective means of achieving legitimate improvement in instructional practices.

While such commitment is essential, strong independent personalities alone cannot bring about the full range of improvement needed by most institutions. Often when cast in the role of rebel, such individuals can become isolated or defensive about their own individual projects. For too long institutions of higher education have stressed the independence of individual academic roles. If instruction is to be significantly improved across the spectrum of college level education, then expertise is needed in many areas. Our institutions train graduates in interpersonal communication, in organization, in administration, in learning and instruction. It is time that these skills were used within the structure of the university community to effect the improvement of its own internal systems. Instructional development systems cannot be totally successful without parallel study and development of the institution's communication and management systems.

It is also apparent from this survey that the role of the professional instructional developer is one of support for the academic project director rather than one of leadership. To give too much power to a change agent appears to threaten both faculty and administration. To illustrate this supportive, facilitative role, one can note the change of strategy that our foreign service change agents have adopted in the last few years. Programs like Action no longer march confidently into underdeveloped countries complete with all of the answers. While these agents are prepared with the latest medical agricultural technologies, they no longer set up the programs paternalistically for the native populations. The new approach is to begin to interact at a more personal level with people in the target areas in order to begin the definition of problems and the discovery of workable solutions. Both sides contribute not only to "the project", but also to sharing and interpersonal growth. This more humane, and ultimately more successful, approach allows the partners to exchange new ideas and technologies in the implementation of new programs. As programs begin to be implemented with advice from the change agents, the role of the agents begins to diminish as the learners acquire the skills to incorporate the innovations into their own daily routines. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971, p. 235) document this shift in the role of the change agent, using research on innovation which they have reviewed. Professional instructional developers have much to offer regular academic faculty, but their ability to utilize interpersonal communication skills as well as social and political organizational skills are just as valuable to their success as are their abilities with instructional systems.

Perhaps the single most valuable tool the ID professional can bring to the faculty member is the technique of program documentation. Without the documentation of the ID process from its initial planning through the evaluation and revision of the system, the faculty developer cannot hope to remove the stigma of second class status which the academic community attributes to the developer. The technology involved in the ID process (when done according to its step by step procedures, including learner and content analysis, specification of learner performance goals, development of evaluation measures, design of instructional strategies and resources, testing of procedures, learner and program evaluation) is a rigorous exercise that can be documented in every phase. Such data can provide faculty with specific evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of their programs to both their administrators and to their peers. Such information provides the basis for a growing body of research into learning strategies. Published or unpublished, the amount of effort expended in writing proposals, completing development tasks, and collecting and evaluating documentation is as measurable as is that expended in traditional research efforts by other faculty. Such documentation of ID projects can thus be used as evidence of scholarship in the consideration of faculty members' promotions.

In summary, the implementation of instructional development technologies for the improvement of education requires the skills of committed agents possessing proficiences in instructional systems, in interpersonal communication systems, and in organizational systems. Such change agents can assist faculty not only in building their own skills in instructional improvement, but also in documenting their work, thereby helping them to receive the appropriate recognition that they deserve from the academic community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, L. T. and Yelon, S. L. (eds.) *Instructional Development Agencies in Higher Education.* East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1972.

Baker, E. L. The technology of instructional development. In R. M. W. Travers (ed.). *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, 245–285.

Baker, R. L., and Schutz, E. E. (eds.) *Instructional Product Development.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971.

Benston, G. J. Good teaching and the ambitious university. *Improving College and University Teaching.* Winter 1973, *21*, 40–42.

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M. W. "Implementation of educational innovation", *Educational Forum,* March 1976.

Chin, R. and Downey, L. "Changing change: Innovating a discipline," in *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, p. 513.

Davies, I. K. *The Management of Learning.* London: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Davies, R. H., Alexander, T., Yelon, S. L. *Learning System Design.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1974.

DeBloois, M. and Alder, D. D. Stimulating faculty readiness for instructional development: a conservative approach to improving college teaching. *Educational Technology.* July 1973, 16–19.

Diamond, R. M. Academic redesign in higher education – matter of survival. *Audiovisual Instruction.* December 1974, 6–8.

Diamond, R. M. *et al. Instructional development for individualized learning in higher education.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1975.

Gerlach, V. S. and Ely, D. P. *Teaching and Media.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1971.

Giacquinta, J. B. "The process of organizational change in schools," in *Review of Research in Education.* Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1973, p. 173.

Lawrason, R. E. "Facilitating instructional development in higher education." ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. October 1976. (ED 124 043).

Lawrason, R. E. and Hedberg, J. G. "A systems model for instructional development success factors?" *Educational Technology.* XVII (4), 1977, p. 15.

Lee, A. M. An administrator's guide to instructional development. *Audiovisual Instruction,* December 1971, 18–20.

Lee, A. M. A survey of instructional development programs in higher education. *Audiovisual Instruction.* October 1972, 16–17.

Lindquist, J. Institutional services for teaching improvement: combine your change assumptions. Paper presented at the International Conference on Improving University Teaching. University of Massachusetts, Amherst. October 1974.

Popham, W. J. Higher education's commitment to instructional improvement programs. *Educational Researcher,* December 1974, *3*(11), 11–13.

Popham, W. J., and Baker, E. L. *Systematic Instruction,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970.

Purdy, L. Community College instructors and the use of the new media: why some do and why some don't. *Educational Technology,* March 1975, 9–12.

Rogers, E. M. and Shoemacher, F. F. *Communication of Innovation.* New York: Free Press, 1971.

Stowe, R. A. The critical issues in instructional development. *Audiovisual Instruction,* December 1971, 8–10.

Whitefield, R. D. and Brammer, L. M. Diagnosis and prescription. *Journal of Higher Education,* January 1973, *44,* 1–13.