

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 614

HE 024 576

AUTHOR Genthon, Michele  
 TITLE What Are Academic Administrators Doing To Improve Undergraduate Education? Accent on Improving College Teaching and Learning.  
 INSTITUTION National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, Ann Arbor, MI.  
 SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.  
 REPORT NO NCRIPAL-R-8  
 PUB DATE 90  
 CONTRACT G008690010  
 NOTE 7p.  
 AVAILABLE FROM NCRIPAL, 2400 School of Education Building, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259 (free with self-addressed stamped envelope).  
 PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Administrator Attitudes; Educational Administration; \*Educational Improvement; \*Educational Planning; Faculty Development; Higher Education; \*Instructional Improvement; Postsecondary Education; Trend Analysis; \*Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of a study of 1,053 institutions that revealed several beliefs and trends among chief academic officers about improving undergraduate education. Among the beliefs and trends discovered are the following: (1) most commonly reported academic practices for undergraduate educational improvement were faculty recruitment, selection and promotion processes, and academic planning; the least used were student assessment and academic administrative leadership practices; (2) chief academic officers consider faculty recruitment, selection, and promotion practices the most effective practices at their institutions while the least were those related to instructional development; and (3) two-year colleges are more likely to have recently introduced new academic management practices, comprehensive institutions are more likely to have such practices in place, and four-year institutions are more likely to rate the existing practices as effective. The Academic Management Practices Inventory, developed by the National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, is noted for providing the means for identifying the extent and effectiveness of academic management practices on individual campuses. (GLR)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

NCRIPAL



NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH TO IMPROVE POSTSECONDARY TEACHING AND LEARNING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.  
 Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NCRIPAL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED332614

# IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

## What Are Academic Administrators Doing to Improve Undergraduate Education?

The management revolution in higher education has now become the academic management revolution. A survey of academic leaders at 1,053 institutions across the United States indicates that most of them have instituted the type of academic management practices you would expect to find in any well-run enterprise. Interest in effective academic management runs high: in the past three years, new practices have been developed in many areas, reflecting the shift from governance, administrative, and financial issues to educational, curricular, and learning issues.

To document this revolution, we asked chief academic administrators two questions: What are the barriers to improving teaching and learning, and, what management practices do you think improve teaching and learning? In an earlier **Accent** ("Administrative Barriers to Improving Undergraduate Education") we discussed the impediments; here, we focus on the practices.

Three questions were asked about practices: whether the institution had them, whether they had been initiated within the past three years, and whether they were perceived to be effective. Responses were solicited on 111 different items, each representing a different academic management practice aimed specifically at improving undergraduate education. These 111 items

were factor analyzed and summarized into fifteen categories, or academic management functions:

- Academic Planning
- Academic Administrative Leadership
- Institutional Academic Governance
- Institutional Emphasis on Undergraduate Education
- Academic Management Information and Analytic Support Systems
- Academic Resource Allocation
- Admissions and Enrollment Management
- Academic, Curriculum, and Program Policy
- Educational Technology and Computers
- Faculty Development
- Instructional and Teaching Development
- Faculty Recruitment, Selection, and Promotion
- Assessing and Rewarding Teaching Effectiveness
- Student Academic Support Systems
- Student Assessment

HEO 24 576

## What's Happening?

- The management activities cited most often as being in place relate, not surprisingly, to faculty recruitment, selection, and promotion.
- More than three-fourths of the institutions also report that academic planning, educational technology, and an emphasis on undergraduate education are in place.
- Practices least likely to be in place are those related to student assessment.

When we compared public with private institutions, we found similar academic management practices in the majority of the categories. Where there are statistically significant differences,

- Public institutions more frequently indicate having academic management practices in the areas of management information systems, curricular policy, resource allocation, and instructional development.
- Private institutions indicate more practices related to faculty recruitment.

Comparisons among comprehensive, four-year, and two-year institutions indicate a much greater number of differences. Of the fifteen categories, statistically significant differences appeared for thirteen of these categories. Four-year institutions report lower occurrences of academic management practices in more categories than do comprehensive or two-year institutions. The following table shows which type of institution indicated the highest and lowest occurrence of the management practices in the survey.

## What's New?

The results of the survey showed that some administrative practice categories are fairly new in higher education. For instance,

- Half the institutions in the survey had instituted practices related to educational technology within the three years prior to the survey.
- Over thirty percent of the institutions had implemented changes in academic planning, enrollment management, instructional development, and student assessment.
- Of all the institutions that already had instructional development practices in place, half had introduced them within the past three years.
- Over two-thirds of those practicing student assessment had instituted it within the last three years.
- Practices that reflected academic leadership, the faculty reward system, academic governance, and faculty recruitment were much less likely to have been initiated recently.

When we compared public with private institutions, we found that the occurrence of new practices is similar for both. The only statistically significant difference occurs in the institutional emphasis on undergraduate education. Although both public and private institutions indicate the same frequency of practices that reflect an emphasis on undergraduate education, these are more likely to have been recently implemented in public institutions, leaving us with the assumption that the emphasis in private institutions is not a new phenomenon.

### Existence of Academic Management Practices, by Type of Institution

	Comprehensive	4-yr	2-yr
Academic Planning	—	LO	HI
Academic Leadership	LO	—	HI
Institutional Governance	HI*	HI*	LO
Academic Management Information & Analytical Systems	HI*	LO	HI*
Academic Resource Allocation	HI	LO	—
Admissions & Enrollment Management	HI	LO	—
Curriculum & Program Policies	—	LO	HI
Faculty Development	—	LO	HI
Instructional Development	—	LO	HI
Faculty Recruitment, Selection, & Promotion	LO	HI	—
Assess & Reward Teaching	HI	—	LO
Student Academic Support Systems	HI	—	LO
Student Assessment	LO	—	HI

\*Some rankings

When we looked for differences by type of institution, we found few. Over half of the practices recently implemented seem to have been adopted at the same rates, regardless of type of institution. Where differences occurred, we found the following:

- Two-year institutions were more likely to have recently implemented practices related to educational technology, management information systems, student academic support systems, emphasis on undergraduate education, faculty reward systems, and faculty recruitment.
- Two-year institutions were least likely to have newly implemented practices for academic administrative leadership, which is not surprising since they had indicated a higher level of these practices than had other types of institutions.
- Four-year institutions, where emphasis on undergraduate education is high, were less likely to have newly instituted practices in administrative leadership.

### What Works?

On the average, chief academic officers rated all of the practices listed as effective at their institutions. Where there were differences, we found:

- In general, college administrators believed that their most effective practices were those related to faculty recruitment and rewards for teaching effectiveness.
- Some practices were rated as less effective than others, with instructional development receiving the lowest ranking.

When we looked at different types of institutions, seven categories (academic planning, academic governance, information systems, faculty development, faculty selection and promotion, rewarding teaching, and student assessment) showed statistically different ratings for effectiveness. In all seven cases, academic administrators at comprehensive institutions gave lower effectiveness ratings to their practices than did administrators at four-year or two-year institutions.

When we compared public and private institutions, private institutions gave higher effectiveness ratings to the academic management practices on which there were statistically significant differences (such as academic planning, academic leadership, faculty selection and promotion, rewarding teaching, and student support systems) than did public institutions.

A combined comparison of public and private institutions by institutional type revealed four categories of practices with statistically significant differences for both, leading one to conclude that four-year, private

institutions find that their faculty recruitment, faculty rewards, emphasis on undergraduate education, and academic planning activities are the most effective.

### Summary

In general, the results of this study indicate several beliefs and trends among chief academic officers:

- The most commonly reported academic management practices designed to affect teaching and learning are faculty recruitment, selection, and promotion processes and academic planning. The least used are student assessment and academic administrative leadership practices.
- New practices are more likely to have been introduced in educational technology and academic planning than in the other areas listed.
- Not only are faculty recruitment, selection, and promotion practices reported most often, but chief academic officers consider them the most effective practices at their institutions. The least effective practices in their opinion are those related to instructional development.
- Two-year colleges are more likely to have recently introduced new academic management practices; comprehensive institutions are more likely to have such practices in place; and four-year institutions are more likely to rate the existing practices as effective.
- Although, for the most part, the same practices exist at public and private institutions, the perceived effectiveness of these practices and recent changes in them vary significantly, with private colleges being more likely to view practices as effective.

In general, academic administrators report that there is an extensive set of practices being used in higher education to improve undergraduate teaching and learning, and these practices are considered effective.

The Academic Management Practices Inventory, developed by NCRIPAL researchers, provides a means for identifying the extent and effectiveness of academic management practices on individual campuses. Once such practices are identified, administrators and faculty can then address the issues raised and explore innovative decision making to ensure that management practices support the teaching and learning process.

—Michele Genthon

---

This Accent is based on the research of Marvin W. Peterson and Kim S. Cameron and the staff of NCRIPAL's research program on the Organizational Context for Teaching and Learning.

---

## REQUEST FORM

Please send me the following reports for which is enclosed payment to The University of Michigan to cover the costs of production and handling.

Materials requested are not returnable.

### SELECTED NCRIPAL PUBLICATIONS

Title	Price	Qty	Total
<b>Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for Faculty</b> ✓ <i>K. Patricia Cross and Thomas A. Angelo</i> 88-A-004	\$15.00		
<b>Preparing Course Syllabi for Improved Communication</b> ✓ <i>Malcolm A. Lowther, Joan S. Stark, and Gretchen G. Martens</i> 89-C-006	\$ 5.00*		
<b>Planning a College Course: A Guidebook for the Graduate Teaching Assistant</b> ✓ <i>Michael P. Ryan and Gretchen G. Martens</i> 89-C-005	\$ 5.00*		
<b>Approaches to Research on the Improvement of a Postsecondary Teaching and Learning: A Working Paper</b> <i>Patricia J. Green and Joan S. Stark</i> 86-A-001	\$ 5.00		
<b>Postsecondary Teaching and Learning Issues in Search of Researchers: A Working Paper</b> <i>Carol D. Vogel and Joan S. Stark</i> 86-A-003	\$ 5.00		
<b>Teaching and Learning in the College Classroom: A Review of the Research Literature, 2nd Edition</b> ✓ <i>Wilbert J. McKeachie, Paul R. Pintrich, Yi-Guang Lin, David A. F. Smith, and Rajeev Sharma</i> 90-B-003	\$10.00		
<b>Psychological Models of the Impact of College on Students</b> <i>Harold A. Korn</i> 86-B-002	\$ 5.00		
<b>Planning Introductory College Course :: Influences on Faculty</b> <i>Joan S. Stark, Malcolm A. Lowther, Richard J. Bentley, Michael P. Ryan, Michele Genthon, Gretchen G. Martens, and Patricia A. Wren</i> 89-C-003	\$15.00		
<b>Reflections on Course Planning: Faculty and Students Consider Influences and Goals</b> <i>Joan S. Stark, Malcolm A. Lowther, Michael P. Ryan, Sally Smith Bomotti, Michele Genthon, and C. Lynne Haven</i> 88-C-002	\$15.00		
<b>Designing the Learning Plan: A Review of Research and Theory Related to College Curricula</b> <i>Joan S. Stark and Malcolm A. Lowther, with assistance from Sally Smith</i> 86-C-001	\$10.00		
<b>Performance Appraisal for Faculty: Implications for Higher Education</b> <i>Robert T. Blackburn and Judith A. Pitney</i> 88-D-002	\$10.00		
<b>Faculty as a Key Resource: A Review of the Research Literature</b> <i>Robert T. Blackburn, Janet H. Lawrence, Steven Ross, Virginia Polk Okoloko, Jeffery P. Bieber, Rosalie Melland, and Terry Street</i> 86-D-001	\$10.00		
<b>The Organizational Context for Teaching and Learning: A Review of the Research Literature</b> <i>Marvin W. Peterson, Kim S. Cameron, Lisa A. Mets, Philip Jones, and Deborah Ettington</i> 86-E-001	\$10.00		

\* Bulk prices available.

✓ Practical Guide.

Title	Price	Qty	Total
<b>Design in Context: A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Computer Software in Higher Education</b> <i>Robert Kozma and Robert Bangert-Drowns</i> 87-F-002	\$10.00		
<b>Electronic Information: Literacy Skills for a Computer Age</b> <i>Jerome Johnston</i> 86-F-001	\$5.00		
<b>The Electronic Classroom in Higher Education: A Case for Change</b> (Videotaped also available) <i>Jerome Johnston and Susan Gardner</i> 88-F-016	\$7.50		
Other titles available in the <b>Accents</b> series:	No charge for single issues.*		
<b>Helping Teaching and Learning Centers Improve Teaching</b>			
<b>Faculty Performance Appraisal: A Recommendation for Growth and Change</b>			
<b>Why Does It Take "Forever" to Revise the Curriculum?</b>			
<b>Assessing Growth in Thinking in College Courses: A Caveat</b>			
<b>The Computer Revolution in Teaching</b>			
<b>Administrative Barriers to Improving Undergraduate Education</b>			
<b>Teaching Thinking in College</b>			
<b>Bridging the Gap Between Education Research and College Teaching</b>			
<b>Personal Growth as a Faculty Goal for Students</b>			
	Subtotal		
(For non-Book Rate handling, add \$5.00)	Special Shipping		
*Bulk prices available for <b>Accents</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>		

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_

INSTITUTION \_\_\_\_\_

MAILING ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY/STATE/ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE \_\_\_\_\_

- Please add my name to your mailing list.
- Please send me a complete list of NCRIPAL publications.

Make checks and purchase orders payable to **The University of Michigan.**

Mail request form and payment to: **NCRIPAL**  
2400 School of Education Building  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259

## REFERENCES

- Peterson, M. W., Cameron, K., Alexander, J., Jones, P., and Mets, L. (1987). *Report of pre-survey of key problems which inhibit and academic management practices which improve teaching and learning*. Ann Arbor: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. Working paper.
- Peterson, M. W., Cameron, K., and Alfred, R. L. (1987). *Academic Management Practices Survey*. Ann Arbor: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.
- Rourke, F. E., and Brooks, G. E. (1966). *The managerial revolution in higher education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

---

Copyright © 1990 by the Regents of The University of Michigan. All rights reserved.

**Accents** summarize and present current issues and findings on teaching and learning in higher education. **Accents** are a publication of NCRIPAL, the

National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Single copies of this **Accent** are available free from NCRIPAL if the request is accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please write to the Editor at NCRIPAL for permission to reproduce this **Accent** partially or in its entirety. Additional copies of **Accent** are available at nominal cost; contact the Editor for prices.

NCRIPAL, the National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, is funded at The University of Michigan by grant G008690010 from the Office of Research of the U. S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI/ED) and The University of Michigan. The opinions expressed herein do not reflect the position or policy of OERI/ED or the Regents of The University of Michigan, and no official endorsement by the OERI/ED or the Regents should be inferred.

NCRIPAL, 2400 SEB, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259; (313) 936-2741. Joan S. Stark, Director; Wilbert J. McKeachie, Associate Director; Marv K. Joscelyn, Editor.

## NCRIPAL

2400 School of Education Building  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

NON-PROFIT  
ORGANIZATION  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Ann Arbor, MI  
PERMIT No. 144