ED 367 419   JC 940 190

AUTHOR   Bolge, Robert D.
TITLE   Development of a Plan To Make the Office of
                Institutional Research a Human Resources Development
                Utility at Mercer County Community College.
INSTITUTION   Mercer County Community Coll., Trenton, N.J.
PUB DATE   Apr 93
NOTE   45p.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
                Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Faculty
                Development; *Institutional Research; Questionnaires;
                *Researchers; *Research Utilization; School Surveys;
                Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS   Mercer County Community College NJ

ABSTRACT
        A study was undertaken at Mercer County Community
College (MCCC) in New Jersey to establish a human resources
development (HRD) utility role for the college's Office of
Institutional Research (OIR). The study involved a search of current
literature; a survey of OIRs at 14 New Jersey community colleges;
interviews with 24 senior faculty members; and planning meetings with
the president and deans at MCCC. Study findings included the
following: (1) most of the community college OIRs provided a range of
services to full-time faculty (e.g., student profiles, program
evaluations, and test score analyses); however, only 5% to 10% of the
faculty actually took advantage of these services, and services to
faculty amounted to only 2% to 7% of the OIRs' annual activities; (2)
faculty members informed of OIR resources felt that these resources
could help them in self-development and improve their teaching and
their management of the learning environment; (3) a
practitioner-based research program would address the needs of
faculty as expressed by both faculty members and administrators; and
(4) senior MCCC administrators favored the idea of establishing an
HRD-utility role for the OIR and were willing to support its
implementation. The research produced five guiding principles which
were used to develop an HRD-utility role for MCCC's OIR. Initial
programs and services have been well received by full-time faculty.
These principles can be used as a blueprint for other colleges to
establish cost-effective HRD programs. (Contains 40 references, 2
survey instruments, and a 3-year implementation plan.) (KP)

DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN TO MAKE THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH A HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT UTILITY AT MERCER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by

Robert D. Bolge
April, 1993

DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN TO MAKE THE OFFICE OF
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH A HUMAN RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT UTILITY AT MERCER COUNTY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by

Robert D. Bolge
April, 1993

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to establish an
human resources development (HRD) utility role for the
Office of Institutional Research (OIR) at Mercer County
Community College (MCCC). To accomplish this task, the
following research activities were conducted:
(a) search of current literature, (b) survey of OIR's
at 14 N.J. community colleges, (c) interviews with 24
senior faculty members, and (d) planning meetings with
the President and deans at MCCC.

The collected data showed that (a) full-time
faculty members, the most valuable resource of a
college, are left to develop mostly on their own; (b)
many OIR's are equipped for and provide development
services to faculty members who individually make
contact with these offices; (c) faculty members who
were informed about the resources available at the OIR
of their college felt that these resources would help
in self-development and improve their teaching and
management of the learning environment; (d) a
practitioner-based research program would adequately
address the HRD needs of faculty as expressed by both
faculty members and administrators, and (e) senior
administrators at MCCC favored the idea of establishing
an HRD-utility role for the OIR and were willing to
support its implementation.

The research produced five, guiding principles
which were used to develop an HRD-utility role for
MCCC's OIR, the initial programs and services of which
have been well received by full-time faculty members.
These principles can serve as a blueprint for other
colleges to establish their OIR's as cost-efficient and
effective HRD utilities for faculty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

INTRODUCTION

Through several discussions with members of the President's Cabinet and the President of MCCC during the summer of 1992, a consensus emerged that the full-time faculty was the employee group in most need of development. The shared belief of the senior administrators was that many of the full-time faculty members at MCCC were not adequately prepared to meet the challenges and opportunities which were emerging with respect to student needs, new educational technologies, and the socioeconomic needs of the community which the college served.

For MCCC, this human resources development (HRD) need was further complicated by (a) a financial crisis in the State of New Jersey which has led to a significant withdrawal of funding support from the community college sector and (b) the installation of a new President of the College leading to a change in leadership style and management philosophy. As a result, MCCC is faced with a real need to develop full-time faculty within the immediate limitations of a changeover in upper management and minimal available funding to implement an effective HRD plan.

A creative solution to MCCC's dilemma, described above, is to turn its Office of Institutional Research (OIR) into an HRD utility. The OIR, established in 1969, has had an effective history of collecting and reporting data and trends within the college and the community served by the college. Also, it has served MCCC as a general clearinghouse for outside research and internal evaluation operations.

The OIR has the expertise and library required to take on the role of HRD utility for full-time faculty development. However, until the writer first framed out the possibility of establishing such an HRD role for the OIR, no consideration had been given to using the OIR as a HRD utility.

Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this study is to establish an HRD utility role for the college's OIR, focusing on the development of full-time faculty. To guide the study

the following research questions were formulated:

1. Does the OIR already have resources from which the full-time faculty could benefit?

2. What faculty developmental activities have OIR's in the N.J. community college sector sponsored?

3. What development needs (information and research) do full-time faculty members believe they have?

4. What development needs (information and research) does MCCC's executive administration believe full-time faculty members have?

5. How can MCCC's OIR become a useful HRD utility for full-time faculty?

Importance to MCCC

If the OIR at MCCC can be turned into an HRD utility, the benefits to the college will be well worth the effort. Such an operation would provide MCCC with a reasonably economical way to train full-time faculty and, eventually, other staff members, to conduct their own research. These activities would produce better outcomes evaluations, appropriate blueprints for increasing the quality of outcomes, and a future orientation necessary to address emerging student and community opportunities and challenges.

Further, MCCC has committed itself to the development of a strategic planning process and the institution of total quality management (TQM). Both of these college-wide endeavors would be fully supported by the human resources development (HRD) accomplished through the OIR.

LITERATURE REVIEW

To support this study, a literature search was conducted in three, topical areas with a focus on the community college movement: (a) the impact of societal change on the higher education enterprise, (b) the (human resources) development of faculty members, specifically full-time faculty members, and (c) the

role of the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) within the college organization. The findings of the search are summarized below by topical area.

Societal Change

American society is changing from an industrial society to an informational society (Johnston, 1987). Old industrial models are still lingering on while new information models are challenging economic and social life in all areas of society (Kiplinger & Kiplinger, 1989). Further, the American population is changing rapidly (Levine, 1989). The nonwhite, lower-socio-economic population is increasing rapidly as the white, middle-class population is shifting slowly downward in numbers (Levine, 1989). To prepare the current workforce and all groups in America to take advantage of the many opportunities offered by an informational society, as well as to ensure the health and progress of the informational society, new demands are being placed on the education institution (Johnston, 1987).

Community colleges appear to be best able of all the sectors of higher education to meet the emerging educational needs of the evolving, informational society (Parnell, 1990). Their unique mission (to provide open access to postsecondary education for all peoples) and structure (staffing patterns and funding sources) allow them to react more quickly and more effectively to the changing needs of the economy and potential students (Katsinas & Swender, 1992). Most of these colleges, however, have faculty and staff who were trained in accord with industrial-age models (Hoffman, 1990). As a result, human resources develop-ment is essential to ensure that faculty and staff can implement the organizational changes necessarily to meet the emerging needs of an informational society and the students who must learn to work and live within it (Norris, 1989). Principally, community colleges must provide the in-house human resource development programs which will train faculty and staff in the strategic management of the organization, programs and services, and teaching-learning operations (Groff, 1990).

Development of Faculty

A college's faculty is its most important and most

expensive resource (Groff, 1985, 1986; Impara, Hoerner,
Clowes, & Allkins, 1991). As such, it should receive
maximum attention with respect to development; however,
this is seldom the case (Lapin, 1992; O'Banion, 1992).
Most often, colleges simply expect their faculty
members to receive training and development elsewhere,
e.g., in graduate school, at national meetings of
discipline-based and professional associations, and by
personally-motivated, self-study (Spear, 1991;
Kalantzis & Cope, 1992; Lapin, 1992). In short, very
few colleges appear to have the will or interest in
mounting and sustaining effective, human resources
development programs for their faculty members (Deegan,
Tillery, & Associates, 1985; Hankin, 1992; Leatherman,
1992).

Studies of full-time faculty members have shown a
consistent pattern of professional excitement during
the initial years of teaching followed by the growth of
feelings of being isolated and alone (alienation)
without support (DeLoughry. 1992). Recent research on
faculty development programs gives further testimony to
full-time faculty disenchantment (Impara, Hoerner,
Clowes, & Allkins, 1991; O'Banion, 1992). Of all the
development activities open to faculty, discipline-
based activities are the most attended --at a 60%
level; all the other activities receive even less
participation (Impara, Hoerner, Clowes, & Allkins,
1991). Furthermore, it appears that incentives
external to the planned development activity are more
important to faculty members than the intrinsic
motivation of becoming more competent in managing the
learning environment (Impara, Hoerner, Clowes, &
Allkins, 1991; Spear, 1991; O'Banion, 1992).

A review of the Chronicle of Higher Education
(Chronicle) and AACJC Journal over the 1992-1993
academic year provides solid evidence of the prevailing
attitude that development is a singular, personal
activity which each faculty member should pursue
individually. In the "information technology" section
of the Chronicle, faculty members are introduced to the
latest classroom technology and techniques as
individual consumers. Examples of this form of
"development consumerism" can be found in the following
issues of the Chronicle: September 23, 1992 (A21-22);
October 7, 1992 (A19); November 25, 1992 (A13-15); and
February 24, 1993 (A19-22). In the AACJC Journal,
there is an assortment of articles featuring the

innovations of highly-motivated faculty members which
give a clear message of "doing your thing on your own"
(Galant, Keith, Kaplan, 1991-91; Alssid, 1992; Kaplan,
1992; Palmer, 1992).

Experts in human resource development appear to
agree on one, very important point: authentic
development is an active and motivating process which
must be directly and immediately practicable (Groff,
1987).   For college faculty, K. Patricia Cross has
developed and promoted "classroom research" as a
superior development activity (Cross, 1987, 1989).   It
offers the faculty member a course of action through a
series of differing techniques by which he/she can
assess student learning and make immediate adjustments
to the learning environment to promote more and better
student learning (Cross, 1990).   "Classroom research"
as a human resource development activity makes the
faculty member his/her own developer with immediate and
measurable results (success) (Cross & Fideler, 1988 and
1989).

However, "classroom research" has an important
drawback.   It is an individual enterprise as promoted
by Cross and Angelo (1989).   As such, it is an
isolating activity unless it is actively stimulated by
the institution itself (Kurfiss, 1987).   A good case in
point is the project conducted by Diane Kelly (1991).
While her findings point to the exceptional excitement
and development generated by the "classroom research"
method of human resources development among faculty,
one cannot dismiss the impact of the group support she
provided as part of the project (Kelly, 1991).

In short, to mount and sustain an authentic human
resources development program for faculty, a community
college must provide an organizational mechanism which
will provide continuing motivation and support for the
program (Kurfiss, 1987; Walleri, 1989).   The appearance
of informal, faculty-support groups at some community
colleges testify to the need for such an organizational
mechanism (Walleri, 1989; Bolge, 1993).

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR)

The OIR is one of the newest structures in the
college organization, emerging in the 1950's (Clemens &
Nojan, 1987).   Originally, the OIR was established to

gather enrollment and graduate statistics to support
public funding (Cohen & Brawer, 1982). The OIR became
a permanent part of college operations when its func-
tion broadened to cover the analysis of institutional
operations, planning, and the growing reporting demands
made by government agencies (Chickering & Associates,
1981). The OIR became an administrative necessity and
an administrative operation, without any connection to
the faculty or the learning process (Banks & Colby,
1989).

Most of the efforts of these OIR's were and are
confined to producing required reports for state
departments, federal agencies, and accrediting groups
and to providing administrators with marketing,
enrollment, and other planning data. Whereas the need
for institutional research grew slowly in most sectors
of higher education, it was of clear, direct, and
immediate importance to the community college sector
which was established in a fully-articulated, state-
based system of higher education (Cohen & Brawer,
1982). Consequently, community colleges have had to
contend with state and federal statutes and demands
from their very beginnings (Chambers, 1987). With the
rapid enrollment growth experienced by most community
colleges, institutional research became essential to
the community colleges (Banks & Colby, 1989).

As part of their success in becoming the newest
sector of higher education, community colleges
established Offices of Institutional Research (OIR's)
quite early in their development (Fordyce, 1989).
These OIR's have served as central collection and
reporting agents of internal and external student,
operational, and community data and trends (Saupe,
1990). As they have matured, OIR's have implemented
evaluation programs, provided clearinghouse services,
assisted employees engaged in research, and completed
studies to establish "why?" students and certain
publics do what they do (Fordyce, 1989).

Through their twenty-year history of operation,
community college OIR's have developed research models
and techniques and collected large amounts of data
which can be used by faculty members for better
understanding students, their needs, and learning
behaviors (Fordyce, 1989). Such new data include
students' perceived needs, demographic and biographic
profiles, community needs assessments, and learning

outcomes (Clemons & Nojan, 1987). Yet, OIR's have
tended to remain predominately an administrative
resource and operation (Banks & Colby, 1989).

Currently, there is mounting interest in
reevaluating and expanding the traditional role of
OIR's (Banks & Colby, 1989). OIR's are local
operations concerned with understanding local issues
and addressing local needs, e.g., community needs,
local economy, students and potential students,
evaluation of college programs and services, and
improving the college's efficiency and effectiveness
(Saupe, 1990). As such, the OIR can provide faculty
members with a focused center from which they can
improve their understanding of student needs and
increase their teaching effectiveness (Frydenberg,
1989).

The OIR has the potential of becoming a human
resources development utility for its supporting
college with special focus on the development of
full-time faculty members. There are three advantages
to turning the OIR into a human resources development
utility. First, the office itself will provide faculty
members with a real center for cooperative work and
communication, thus eliminating the problem of
isolation (Clemons & Nojan, 1987; Chambers, 1987).
Second, OIR staff can provide the research expertise to
assist faculty members in developing and executing
"classroom research" which, currently, appears to be
the most promising and direct form of faculty
development (Frydenberg, 1989). Third, the OIR can
provide faculty members with a resource library of
local data and findings that bear directly on the
students they teach, the community they serve, and the
college in which they work (Fordyce, 1989). There is
no need to translate national data or broad,
educational research studies.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Data for the formulation of a human resources
development (HRD) utility plan for MCCC's Office of
Institutional Research (OIR) were drawn from six
sources. These sources and the procedures used to
gather data are described below under each specific
research issue established to guide the study.

Current OIR Resources From
Which Faculty Could Benefit

To review the current holdings and activities of
the OIR, two groups were used. One group was the
Planning Review Committee (PRC) which is one of the
Standing Committees of MCCC's Governance System. The
PRC was selected to participate in the study for the
following reasons: (a) it is composed of nine faculty
members who, by their commitment to membership on the
committee, have shown an interest in improving the
college and its professional community and (b) a review
of OIR holdings fitted well into the official
responsibilities of the PRC.

The other group was established as an OIR
oversight group and was composed of three, senior
administrators: one from the Student Services Division,
one from the Administrative Division, and one from the
Academic Affairs Division. The administrators who
composed the group were all familiar with the products
and resources of the OIR. Additionally, they had
extensive experience in working with faculty members at
the college over a twenty-year period. The oversight
group was charged with assessing the worth of each
category of OIR products and resources to full-time
faculty members as a group and, based on their
experience with faculty, judging how these products and
resources would be received and used.

Both groups were given a listing of OIR holdings
(resources) which contained internal publications and
external publications. Internal publications included
(a) current and historical student, course, and
graduation data by gender, curriculum, and ethnicity;
(b) technical reports; (c) MCCC Information Index;
and (d) a selection of data briefs. External resources
included (a) current and historical student data by
region and county as well as by higher educational
sectors; (b) local, regional, and national impact
(external) variables; and (c) a selection of
theoretical, methodological, and issue books and
documents. Exemplary material from each category of
holding was provided.

The same methodology was followed with both
groups. Group members received materials a week prior
to the scheduled group meeting. At each meeting
informational questions were answered by an OIR staff

member (the researcher) and a focused analysis of the
the usefulness of each documented holding and/or
activity to faculty members was discussed.

Faculty Development Activities
Sponsored by OIR's Within the
N.J. Community College System

To address this issue, a survey methodology was
employed. First, telephone interviews were conducted
with OIR personnel at four, New Jersey community
colleges which were large and sophisticated enough to
maintain institutional research offices of two or more
full-time professionals. The interview format was
exploratory and focused on the following, broad
questions: (a) What HRD activities have you done and
are currently engaged in doing? (b) What additional
HRD activities do you believe the OIR could offer
faculty and staff? and (c) What, if any, additional
resources would be needed by the OIR for it to become
an HRD utility for the college?

Second, from the information gleaned through the
telephone survey, a survey instrument was constructed
and used to gather historical and planning data from
all N.J. county (community) colleges which had OIR
representation on the County College Association for
Institutional Research and Planning (C.C.A.I.R. & P.).
A copy of the instrument is in the Appendix.

Faculty Developmental Needs as
Perceived by Full-Time Faculty Members

To assess the self-perceived development needs of
full-time faculty members, structured interviews were
conducted with a randomly selected sample of
twenty-four, full-time faculty members from each of the
five academic divisions of the college. This
methodology and procedure were chosen because of the
exploratory purpose of the study. It was considered
more important to search out as full a range of
perceived, developmental needs in the qualitative
sense, than to perform a disinterested study of
significant differences in perceptions. A copy of the
structured interview sheet is in the Appendix.

Faculty Developmental Needs as
Perceived by MCCC's Senior Administration

To address this issue, two, existing
administrative groups were consulted: the President's
Cabinet and Academic Council. Members of the College
Cabinet included the President, Vice President - Chief
Academic Officer, Vice President for Administration &
Finance, Provost for the James Kerney Campus, and
Executive Assistant to the President. This group
offered a broad view of the human resources development
needs of full-time faculty.

The Academic Council consists of the chairpersons
of each academic subdivision and the Dean for Academic
Affairs. The Council is, of course, a valuable
resource because it is directly concerned with the
quality of teaching and learning at MCCC.

A focus-group session was held with each
administrative body. Members of the groups were asked
to relate freely their experiences with students and
faculty members, their knowledge of problems and
issues, and their feelings about how teaching and
learning could be improved at MCCC.

Making MCCC's OIR a HRD
Utility for Full-Time Faculty

To build a workable HRD utility-model for the OIR,
the following procedures were followed. Utilizing the
data collected from the questions and procedures above,
the researcher drafted guiding principles for
establishing an HRD utility plan. These principles
were reviewed by the President of the College and the
Dean for Academic Affairs and modified in consultation
with the researcher.

Using these guiding principles, a three-year draft
plan was outlined and submitted to the Academic Council
for further input and modification. The revised,
three-year draft plan was submitted to the the
President of the College and the Dean for Academic
Affairs for approval to implement.

Definition of an HRD Utility

An "HRD utility" is defined as a system of

developmental components designed to motivate professional development, to guide individual and group development projects, and to communicate the results of developmental activities which can benefit the ongoing professional work of others. These components include (a) a repository of information (library), (b) communication organs, (c) access to hardware and software support, and (d) staff who can perform as experts, collaborators, coordinators, and/or linkage agents.

Assumptions

This study is based on three assumptions. First, the OIR is an under-utilzed resource in most colleges, especially community colleges. By its nature and the functions it performs, the OIR takes on the role of HRD utility for faculty members.

Second, faculty, especially full-time faculty at community colleges, can best develop themselves by actively pursuing teaching-learning excellence in the classroom. To accomplish this end, faculty members need a central, HRD utility which will assist them by providing expertise, collaboration, coordination, and/or linkage when each is needed.

Third, effective human resources development is a team effort. Too often, faculty members are left on their own without essential assistance and/or guidance.

Limitation

The study was exploratory and practitioner-based. As a result, survey data were collected in an information format, not a scientific format. Although the survey instruments were developed from initial open-ended interviews, they were not designed to support inferential analysis.

RESULTS

The development of a plan to make the OIR a HRD utility at MCCC is described below. Specific data and processes are summarized under each research issue

established to guide the study.

Current OIR Resources From
Which Faculty Could Benefit

    The Planning Review Committee (PRC) devoted ten
meetings to the review of OIR holdings during the
academic year. The committee members (nine faculty
members) who participated in these focus-group sessions
showed genuine interest in being provided with research
data. They felt that the available biographic,
demographic, and academic data on MCCC students would
definitely help them and their peers in preparing
classroom presentations. Additionally, they were
genuinely surprised at the external resources which
were available through the OIR. They viewed these
resources as important for giving faculty members
perspective on what was happening within the community
college movement and the whole of the higher education
enterprise in the state and nation.

    None of these committee members had taken the
opportunity to search out institutional resource data
or to contact the OIR on their own. They cited the
following reasons: (a) lack of knowledge about what was
available, (b) not knowing whom to ask, and (c) lack of
time because of their class schedules and/or divisional
responsibilities.

    Furthermore, The PRC members reported that they
had never received OIR data briefs or technical reports
from their chairpersons. To their recollection, these
documents had never been presented or discussed in
their monthly divisional meetings.

    Lastly, seven of the nine PRC (faculty) members
had not known of the existence of the MCCC Information
Index. The remaining, two faculty members were
familiar with the Index because, as curriculum
coordinators, they had used the statistics in it to
complete program evaluation reports. (Each academic
division at MCCC has a copy of the Index for which the
OIR distributes updates at regular intervals throughout
the academic year.)

    The oversight group held four meetings during the
academic year. The group reached consensus on the
following, four assessments. First, they found that

most (approximately 90%) of the internal publications
(products) would benefit faculty members, especially
those reports and statistics which addressed student
characteristics and success by course and curriculum.
These materials were most directly applicable to
faculty responsibilities.

Second, the group members believed that most of
the external publications and resources were tangential
to the immediate concerns of faculty members. As such,
most faculty would not find the "psychological time" to
pursue them unless certain responsibilities (e.g.,
program evaluation, membership on specific college
committees, graduate work, or outside associational
affiliations) required such information and resources.

Third, the group proposed that the OIR could best
provide human resources development assistance to
faculty members if it focused on the direct teaching
experience, course and program construction, course and
program evaluation, and the evaluation of academic
services. In accord with this position, the group
recommended a selection of resource categories which
would be of major interest to faculty.

Fourth, the group recommended that, once OIR was
able to establish a successful human resources
development program (utility) for full-time faculty, it
should expand its services to part-time faculty members
and student services professionals.

Faculty Development Activities
Sponsored by OIR's Within the
N.J. Community College System

Results From Telephone Interviews. The telephone
interviews with the administrators in charge of the OIR
at each of the four, selected county colleges averaged
about 45 minutes. The interviews provided additional
categories of services and developmental activities.
These data were added to the data on categories which
were provided by the MCCC oversight group and used to
prepare the survey instrument which was used to glean
data from all N.J. county college OIR's.

The experiences with faculty members which the
respondents related were very similar to the
experiences at MCCC. Few faculty members requested

information or assistance from the OIR. Among the four
OIR's, the average number of faculty members who
requested services never rose more than 10% of the
total, full-time faculty. Most of the requests were
centered around program evaluation studies. No
respondent was able to remember the last time the OIR
was asked to provide research services which related
directly to teaching-learning, with the exception of
grant activities.

All responding schools had OIR-based, college-wide
procedures for giving faculty members the opportunity
to receive assistance in developing students and
analyzing data. As with MCCC, most requests to the OIR
were based on graduate work and on the administrative
duties of tenured faculty members.

All four, college OIR's prepared reports for
administrative offices with the expectation that
faculty members would be informed about the reports
(products) and motivated to review them. However, as
in MCCC's case, there appeared to be little interest
among supervising administrators to present these
products to faculty members and to motivate faculty use
of the research data. As a result, some of the college
OIR's had developed direct avenues to the faculty. One
OIR distributed its own quarterly newsletter. Another
circulated a monthly OIR publication called
Institutional Research Notes. Another OIR submitted
short articles to the college-wide, monthly newsletter.
Lastly, one innovative OIR developed a communication
system with the faculty which consisted of an annual
factbook, voice mail messages, and electronic
mail enrollment updates.

When questioned about what additional resources
they would need to establish an HRD role for their
OIR's, the respondents were unanimous in their
responses. They needed additional staff members.
Equipment, software, and supporting supplies
were not an issue. The respondents reported that these
were in sufficient supply. Additional staff members,
however, were regarded as an absolute need to work with
faculty on a one-to-one basis if they were going to
establish an HRD role for their OIR's.

Results From Survey. Of the nineteen county
(community) colleges in New Jersey, fourteen submitted
completed survey forms and participated in follow-up

telephone checks. Of the five colleges which did not participate, two did not have OIR administrators at the time of the survey and three chose not to participate because their OIR's consisted of one employee whose responsibilities did not extend to support of the faculty.

Most of the county (community) college OIR's which participated in the survey, provide a wide range of services to full-time faculty. Table 1 on page 16 presents the number of OIR's providing each of the services included in the study.

The question is how many faculty members actually take advantage of these services as compared to the administrative staff? From the data provided on the survey forms and from follow-up telephone checks, the answer is between five to ten percent of the full-time faculty for most OIR's with one OIR claiming 25%. Also, faculty requests and services amounted to an average of two percent to seven percent of annual OIR operations.

According to the survey results, less than half the OIR's surveyed provided staff development activities for full-time faculty. Table 2 on page 17 presents the number of OIR's providing each of the staff development activities included in the study.

A telephone follow-up of OIR respondents was conducted to gather information about recent staff development activities. First, all respondents expressed greater satisfaction with individualized development activities (working one-to-one with faculty members).

Second, most respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the use of workshops as staff development vehicles. Workshops were seen as requiring a lot of time to prepare and being poorly attended. Twelve of the responding OIR's had sponsored their last workshops in the mid 1980's. The two, remaining OIR's had sponsored their last workshops in 1988. Less than one-third of the OIR's which participated in the study were planning future, staff development activities as shown in Table 3 on page 18.

Table 1: Number and Percentage of N.J. Community College OIR's Which Provide the Following Services to Full-Time Faculty Members (n = 1ℓ)

Number of OIR's	Percent of OIR's	Service
12	86%	Profile Information on Students by Specific Programs
12	86%	Profile Information on Students by Entering Cohort
12	86%	Follow-Up of Graduates
11	79%	Profile Information on Students by Status (PT/FT)
11	79%	Profile Information on Total Student Population by Semester
11	79%	Assistance with Graduate Research Projects
11	79%	Needs Assessment for Program Development
9	64%	Profile Information on Total Student Population by Year
8	57%	Profile Information on Students by Specific Courses
8	57%	Evaluation of Programs
7	50%	Evaluation of Student Learning
7	50%	Evaluation of Courses
6	43%	Test Score Analysis
5	36%	Test Scoring
4	29%	Test Development
2	14%	Analysis of Grades and Grading
1	7%	Assessing Special Treatments/ Subgroups of Students
1	7%	Assistance in Determining Course Offerings per Term
1	7%	Selection of National Assessment Instruments
1	7%	Assistance in Developing Assessment Instruments

Table 2: Number and Percentage of N.J. Community
College OIR's Which Have Provided the
Following Staff Development Activities to
Full-Time Faculty Members (n = 14)

Number of OIR's	Percent of OIR's	Staff Development Activity
6	43%	Assessing Student Learning Outcomes
4	29%	Designing/Conducting Program Evaluations
3	21%	Constructing Tests
3	21%	Conducting Research Projects
3	21%	Designing/Conducting Student Evaluations
3	21%	Designing Data Collection Instruments
3	21%	Statistical Methods of Analysis
3	21%	Using Computer Statistical Packages (Software)
2	14%	Analyzing Test Results
2	14%	Identifying Learning Styles
2	14%	Designing/Conducting Course Evaluations
2	14%	Utilizing Current Research on Teaching and Learning
1	7%	Educational Technology
1	7%	General Educational Practices

Table 3: Number and Percentage of N.J. County
        (Community) College OIR's Which Are
        Considering Providing the Following Staff
        Development Activities to Full-Time Faculty
        Members (n = 14)

Number of OIR's	Percent of OIR's	Staff Development Activities
4	29%	Designing/Conducting Student Evaluations
4	29%	Designing/Conducting Program Evaluations
4	29%	Statistical Methods of Analysis
3	21%	Constructing Tests
3	21%	Identifying Student Learning Styles
3	21%	Assessing Student Learning Outcomes
3	21%	Conducting Research Projects
3	21%	Designing/Conducting Course Evaluations
3	21%	Designing Data Collection Instruments
3	21%	Utilizing Current Research on Teaching and Learning
3	21%	Using Computer Statistical Packages (Software)
2	14%	Designing/Conducting Experiments
1	7%	Analyzing Test Results

Faculty Developmental Needs as
Perceived by Full-Time Faculty Members

Of the twenty-four faculty members who
participated in the structured interview portion of
this study, 71% targeted the "evaluation of student
learning" as the key service which MCCC's OIR could
provide to them. Table 4 on page 19 shows the number
of faculty respondents who selected each of the OIR
services addressed in the interviews.

Table 4: Number and Percentage of Full-Time Faculty
Respondents Who Believed That MCCC's OIR
Should Offer the Following Services to
Full-Time Faculty Members (n = 24)

Respondents		
Number	Percent	Service
17	71%	Evaluation of Student Learning
11	46%	Needs Assessment for Program Development
11	46%	Evaluation of Courses
9	38%	Evaluation of Programs
9	38%	Profile Information on Students by Specific Courses
7	29%	Profile Information on Students by Specific Programs
7	29%	Assistance with Graduate Research Projects
5	21%	Test Score Analysis
4	17%	Test Development
1	4%	Analysis of Student Success After Leaving MCCC
1	4%	Resources Available Through the OIR
1	4%	Data to Steer Marketing Efforts at High Schools
1	4%	Student Academic Tracking
1	4%	Student Withdrawal Rates Over Time
1	4%	Trends within MCCC to Address Issues Quickly

Of the twenty-four faculty respondents, 67%
selected "identifying student learning styles" as the
key staff development activity which MCCC's OIR could
provide to them. Table 5 on page 20 shows the number
of faculty respondents who selected each of the
possible OIR staff development activities addressed in
the interviews.

Table 5: Number and Percentage of Full-Time Faculty
Respondents Who Believed that MCCC's OIR
Should Offer the Following Staff Development
Activities to Full-Time Faculty Members
(n = 24)

Respondents

Number	Percent	Staff Development Activities
16	67%	Identifying Student Learning Styles
13	54%	Course Evaluations (Designing and Conducting)
11	46%	Assessing Student Learning Outcomes
11	46%	Utilizing Current Research on Teaching/Learning
10	42%	Constructing Tests
9	38%	Program Evaluations (Designing and Conducting)
8	33%	Analyzing Test Results
7	29%	Student Evaluations (Designing and Conducting)
4	17%	Using Computer Statistical Packages (Software)
3	13%	Conducting Research Projects
3	13%	Designing Data Collection Instruments
2	8%	Learning Methods of Analysis
1	4%	Interpretation of Skills Tests Scores
1	4%	Standards of Grading
1	4%	Terminals and Their Use
1	4%	Methods of Reaching "Quiet Students" (Nonparticipants)

Faculty Developmental Needs as
Perceived by MCCC's Senior Administration

Results From President's Cabinet. In a focus-group
session with the President's Cabinet, members
discussed how to improve the quality of teaching and
learning at MCCC through developing the full-time
faculty. Most of the criticisms about the faculty's
performance appeared to center on an insensitivity of
full-time faculty to the learning needs of the

students. This 'nsensitivity was judged to be, in
large part, a rebult of the inability on the part of
the faculty to match teaching techniques to student
needs.

The Cabinet members reached consensus on three
issues. First, the full-time faculty could benefit
from a human resources development (HRD) program which
focused on the improvement of teaching techniques based
on an understanding of student needs.

Second, such an HRD program should be independent
of the regular, managerial operations of the college.
Development should not be labelled as an
administrative, add-on requirement. Faculty members
should consider such a program as a natural part of
their ongoing responsibilities.

Third, the OIR had sufficient resources and
leadership to develop and implement a faculty HRD
program and should be empowered to do so by the
President of the College. To accomplish this end, the
Cabinet recommended that the President consider
adjusting the title of OIR and its position within the
MCCC's organizational structure.

Results From Academic Council. In the focus-group
session held with the Academic Council, the chair-
persons of the academic divisions expressed agreement
that the faculty needed continuing development to
ensure that the quality of teaching and learning at the
college would remain high. They expressed three,
specific concerns, however, about the OIR becoming an
HRD utility for faculty.

First, the Academic Division of the college was
providing faculty with teaching improvement workshops
under the Instructional Theory into Practice (ITIP)
program. These workshops together with regular
graduate study and attendance at discipline-orientated
conferences were considered a sufficient development
program given the time which faculty had to devote to
development concerns. There was, therefore, consensus
that faculty had a limited amount of time to spend on
new, development activities.

Second, consensus was reached on the issue of
presentation of such a development program to the
full-time faculty. Group members believed that the new

program had to focus on direct teaching benefits; i.e.,
being closely related and immediately applicable to
teaching responsibilities.

Third, the Academic Council stressed that, in
order to give the new HRD role for OIR the best chance
for success, development activities had to be
non-threatening and based on individual preferences.
The group members recommended that the OIR conduct all
developmental activities on a volunteer basis,
stressing individual development.

Making MCCC's OIR a HRD
Utility for Full-Time Faculty

In consultation with the President of the College
and Dean for Academic Affairs, the researcher
constructed a workable, faculty-orientated HRD
utility-model for the OIR which was brought to the
Academic Council for its review, input and commitment.
The model consisted of a tailored set of guiding
principles from which a three-year development plan and
restructuring of certain OIR operations were developed.
The the approved, three-year is in the Appendix.

DISCUSSION

Both the literature reviewed for this study and
the results of focus-group, interview, and survey
research support the notion that faculty members,
administrators, and educational researchers are
sensitive to the changing needs of new student
constituencies and changing societal demands on higher
education. There appears to be a strong consensus
among faculty, administrators, and educational
researchers that the teaching-learning environment and
faculty-student interaction within said environment can
be improved.

In the planning stage of this study, the idea that
an Office of Institutional Research could take on the
role of a human resources development (HRD) utility for
faculty members was considered new. In actuality, it
was found that for some years many of the N.J. county
(community) college OIR's have performed and continue
to perform aspects of an HRD-utility role in serving

faculty members. It appears, however, that the
majority of faculty in these colleges still remains
unaware of the valuable services offered by OIR's, as
shown by the focus-group data with MCCC faculty and the
information on faculty participation given by those
OIR's surveyed for the study. As shown in the
"Results" section of this report, both faculty members
and administrators believe that the resources of the
Office of Institutional Research can assist faculty
members in accomplishing their responsibilities and
improving their performances as managers of the
learning experience, thereby increasing student
success.

Why has not the HRD-utility role of OIR's become
fully realized in the community college? Why have not
more faculty members taken advantage of the development
potential available through OIR resources? The data
show three, interlocking, probable reasons for the
underdevelopment of the OIR as an HRD utility.

First, there has been a long standing belief that
faculty members are individually responsible for their
own development. This belief is probably based on the
idea that each professional is responsible to keep
up-to-date in his or her discipline.

Second, faculty members tend to be fully occupied
with their ongoing responsibilities, e.g., teaching,
preparing courses and programs, and evaluating courses
and programs. This attitude is supported, also, by
administrators. Development is viewed as not directly
applicable to a faculty member's ongoing responsibil-
responsibilities or directly related to achieving
greater success in these endeavors. As a result,
faculty members have been left mostly alone to find
their own individual ways to professional development
and to increased success as teachers.

Third, the Office of Institutional Research
continues to be viewed from within the college
organization as an administrative operation. Data
collected for the study illustrate that administrators,
in general, do not share OIR resources with faculty
members. Further, faculty members who are exposed to
OIR resources, while they value them highly as
as pertinent to their development, find reasons of
their own for their lack of proactive use of said
resources. Among faculty and their immediate

supervisors (chairpersons), there is a protectionist
mentality which separates the use of OIR resources and
the developmental value of classroom (educational)
research from the faculty responsibilities which are
considered "important."

CONCLUSIONS

Four, interlocking conclusions flow from the
findings of this study. First, the development of
faculty and the improvement of teaching-learning are
one and the same and should be more actively nurtured
as an ongoing, institutional operation. To achieve
this end, development opportunities for faculty must be
aligned more closely with their immediate responsibil-
ities and shown to be directly related (applicable) to
positive growth in the faculty members' ability to
fulfill these responsibilities in a changing society
and with differing student constituencies.

Second, the findings of this study support the
notion that the best development programming for
faculty members is individually-based or, perhaps,
small group-based, educational research whose focus is
on local (immediate) teaching-learning concerns. This
concept subsumes what has been coined "classroom
research" by Cross and Angelo. A better label for this
type of development program is "practitioner-based
research." After all, faculty members are
practitioners, and practitioner-based research focuses
on learning to do better what one has chosen to do.

Third, Offices of Institutional Research (OIR's)
can take on the role of human resource development
(HRD) utility for faculty. This is possible because an
OIR is the center of the college's local resource
library on its students, service community, and history
of successes and failures with respect to course
offerings, programs, and services. In addition, the
OIR has research personnel who are trained, through
service, to perform as guiding experts, collaborators,
coordinators, and/or linking agents.

Fourth, for the OIR to be successful in developing
a role as an HRD utility for faculty, it must be
reconceptualized as an internal service unit of the
college's organization. Currently, OIR's are
considered as administrative units with no functional

connection to the other units of the college. As such, they are used only by faculty members who have administrative responsibilities (e.g., course coordinators, program coordinators, assistant chairpersons, special committee memberships) or by faculty members who are directed to them because of special needs (e.g., need to access mainframe files or get advice on statistical analyses for a graduate paper or dissertation).

IMPLICATIONS

There are three, important implications which can be drawn from this study. Each will appear radical to traditionally-oriented professionals in higher education.

First, the concept of staff development as an add-on experience is out-of-step in a world which is quickly becoming future orientated. To meet the human resource development (HRD) needs which are evolving at the community college level, a research-based development program is needed. Simply, research on immediate and local problems or issues produces locally-tailored answers which can be immediately implemented, even in mid-semester, thereby increasing student success.

Such a locally-driven, research-based development program is, in fact, an HRD utility because it must be operated continually in order to give individual faculty members the opportunity to explore new alternatives at their own rate and in their own time frames. As a utility, the new form of development program must provide its clients with access to local profile data, trend data, and human assistance in the forms of expert consultation, collaboration, coordination and linkage.

Second, the most cost-effective way to provide faculty with an HRD utility is to develop it as part of the services offered through the college's Office of Institutional Research (OIR). To establish the OIR as an HRD utility for faculty, administrators must learn to share the OIR resources which they currently hold only for themselves. This change of mind-set will not be as easy to do as it sounds, but it is doable, and

the rewards are well worth the effort it will take.

Third, what can be done for full-time faculty can
be done, also, for adjunct (part-time) faculty and
other college professionals (e.g., student services
personnel). The OIR can become an HRD utility for
these other employee groups as well as full-time
faculty. Care must be taken, however, to ensure that
the OIR has a sufficient number of staff members to
meet the development demands placed upon it. One
possible solution to OIR staffing during the current
period of underfunding facing many county colleges
is to provide part-time positions in the OIR for
faculty members and other professionals who have gained
experience and success in using practitioner-based
research as a development tool.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The development of the HRD utility role for MCCC's
OIR was based on five principles derived from the
research. These principles are listed below and can
serve as recommendations for other county (community)
colleges which may be interested in establishing an OIR
based HRD utility:

1. To become a successful HRD utility, an OIR must
   become a non-threatening, serivice-orientated
   office to the full-time faculty and other
   professionals of the college.

2. Faculty members must be considered as individuals
   with unique concerns, levels of motivation, and
   professional orientations. An authentic HRD
   operation, therefore, must promote and support
   professional development as an individualized
   enterprise.

3. The development of HRD activities among faculty
   members is dependent on the guiding leadership of
   the OIR staff. This leadership should stimulate
   faculty interest, motivate the articulation of
   concerns, and exemplify development approaches.

4. The best HRD program for a professional is one which focuses directly on improving his or her daily performance as a professional.

5. An HRD activity is meaningful when it stimulates active learning which is immediately applicable. Learning through doing, reinforced by the direct application of results and communication of findings and accomplishments, is the key to successful HRD. An excellent action model of this principle is practitioner-based research.

REFERENCES

Alssid, J. L. (1992, February/March). PREP: training minority and women entrepreneurs. AACJC Journal, 62(4), 9-10.

Banks, D. L. & Colby, A. (1989, December). Organizing institutional research in the community college. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 320 648)

Bolge, R. (1992, December). Informal discussions conducted with faculty members from several New Jersey community colleges who were participating in the Master Faculty Program sponsored through the New Jersey Department of Higher Education and with faculty members from Mercer County Community College who were participating in an informal discussion group which they called "The Curriculum Project."

Chambers, S. (1987, May). Recent trends in campus institutional research for the system central office: A study of western state universities. Kansas City, MO: Paper Present at the Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 433)

Chickering, A. W. & Associates. (1981). The modern american college: Responding to the new realities of diverse students and a changing society. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clemons, M. L. & Nojan, M. (1987, May). The practice of institutional research: Perception vs. reality. Kansas City, MO: Paper Presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 297 631)

Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F. B. (1982). The american community college. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K. P. & Fideler, E. F. (1988). Assessment in the classroom. Community/Junior College Quarterly. 12, 275-285.

Cross, K. P. & Fideler, E. F. (1989, March/April). Community college missions: Priorities in the mid-1980's. Journal of Higher Education. 60(2), 209-216.

Cross, K. P. & Angelo, T. A. (1989, April/May). Faculty members as classroom researchers. AACJC Journal, 23-25.

Cross, P. (1989, May 29). Improving learning in community colleges. Regina, Canada: Paper Prepared for a Conference of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 308 888)

Cross, K. P. (1990). Making teaching more effective. Journal of The Freshman Year Experience. 2(2), 59-74.

Deegan, W. L., Tillery, D., & Associates (eds). Renewing the community college: Priorities and strategies for effective leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

DeLoughry, T. J. (1992, October 28). Scholarly societies courted in effort to spread faculty use of technology. The Chronicle of Higher Education, A21 and A24.

Fordyce, H. (1989, November). The role of the college institutional research office. New York, NY: United Negro College Fund, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 314 002)

Frydenberg, J. (1989). Community college institutional research: What, why, and How? Los Angeles, CA: University of California. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 313 061)

Galant, R., Keith, G., & Kaplan, S. (1991-92, December/January). LAND: A liberal arts network for development. AACJC Journal, 62(3), 39-40.

Groff, W. H. (1985). Preparing agents of change in vocational, technical, and occupational education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 247)

Groff, W. H. (1986). Perspectives on the education and training system of the future. Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education (Information Series No. 112).

Groff, W. H. (1987, July). The independent learner: the key characteristic in transformational leadership. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Fifteenth Annual Summer Institute for Higher Education Programs Sponsored by Nova University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 347)

Groff, W. H. (1990). Human resources development: A study guide for the core seminar. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Nova University.

Hankin, J. N. (1992, February/March). Moving your institution into the 21st century. AACJC Journal, 62(4), 36-40.

Hoffman, M. S. (ed). (1991). The world almanac and book of facts. New York, NY: Pharos Books.

Impara, J. C., Hoerner, J. L., Clowes, D. A., & Allkins, M. T. (1991). Professional development programs: A comparison of full- and part-time occupational-technical faculty. Community Services Catalyst. 21(2), 8-12.

Johnston, W. B. & Packer, A. H. (1987). Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st century. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Kalantzis, M. & Cope, W. (1992, November 4). Multiculturalism may prove to be the key issue of our epoch. The Chronicle of Higher Education, B3 and B5.

Kaplan, S. (1992, June/July). Providing academic options for nontraditional students. AACJC Journal, 62(6), 6-7.

Katsinas, S. G. & Swender, H. J. (1992, June/July).
Community colleges and JTPA: Involvement and
opportunity. AACJC Journal, 62(6), 18-23.

Kelly, D. K. (1991, June). The effects of classroom
research by part-time faculty upon the retention
of adult learners. Fullerton, CA: Practitioner-
Based Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction
Service No. ED 335 076)

Kiplinger, A. H. & Kiplinger, K. A. (1989). American
in the global '90s: The shape of the future-how
you can profit from it. Washington, D.C.: The
Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc.

Kurfiss, J. (ed). (1987, October). To improve the
academy: resources for student, faculty, and
institutional development. Washington, D.C.:
Professional and Organizational Network in Higher
Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service
No. ED 344 539)

Lapin, J. D. (1992, August/September). Back to the
future: Anticipating and preparing for change.
AACJC Journal, 63(1), 29-33.

Leatherman, C. (1992, September 16). Recession's
assault on U.S. colleges ranges from minor pains
to gutted departments. The Chronicle of Higher
Education, A17-18 and A20.

Levine, A. & Associates. (1990). Shaping higher
education's future. San Francisco, CA:
Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, D. (1992, August/September). Increasing
enrollment in voc-tech programs: Eight low-cost
steps. AACJC Journal, 63(1), 34-37.

Norris, N. A. (ed). (1989). Community college
futures. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

O'Banion, T. (1992, April/May). Proven techniques:
The use and impact of major management concepts in
community colleges. AACJC Journal, 62(5), 26-30.

Parnell, D. (1990). Dateline 2000: The new higher
education agenda. Washington, D.C.: The Community
College Press.

Saupe, J. L.   (1990, March).   The functions of
     institutional research, 2nd edition.   Tallahassee,
     FL: The Association for Institutional Research.
     (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.   ED 319
     327)

Spear, B.   (1991, April/May).   "Leave banking": PGCC
     faculty and administration join to sponsor
     professional development.   AACJC Journal, 61(5),
     13-14.

Walleri, D. (ed).   (1989, June 25-27).   Effectiveness
     and student success: transforming community
     colleges for the 1990's.   Chicago, IL: Community
     College Consortium Conference.   (ERIC Document
     Reproduction Service No. ED 335 088)

SURVEY OF FACULTY-OIR INTERACTION

As the supervisor of the Office of Institutional
Research at Mercer County Community College, I am
interested in starting a faculty development program.
The purpose of this survey is to gather information
about the faculty-OIR interaction at your college.
Simply, I would like to know if you already have any
"wheels" which Mercer can adopt or adapt instead of
going through the inventing process all over again.
Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Bob Bolge

College _____

Part 1:   Services to Faculty

Please indicate in the space provided, whether you
offer the following services to faculty members and, if
so, the approximate number of faculty members helped
during the last twelve months.)

YES	NO	Number	
___	___	_____	1. Test scoring
___	___	_____	2. Test score analysis
___	___	_____	3. Test development
			4. Profile information on students
___	___	_____	a. by specific courses
___	___	_____	b. by specific programs
___	___	_____	c. by entering cohort
___	___	_____	d. by status (part-/full-time)
___	___	_____	e. by total student body on semester basis
___	___	_____	f. by total student body on yearly basis

YES	NO	Number	
___	___	_____	5. Graduate follow up
___	___	_____	6. Assistance with graduate research projects
___	___	_____	7. Needs assessment for program development
			8. Evaluation of
___	___	_____	a. Student learning
___	___	_____	b. Courses
___	___	_____	c. Programs

Part 2: Staff Development Activities

Please indicate in the space provided, whether you have conducted or are considering conducting workshops/seminars for faculty members on the following topics.

Have Conducted Workshops/ Seminars		Consider ing Work- shops/ Seminars		
Yes	No	Yes	No	
___	___	___	___	1. Analyzing test results
___	___	___	___	2. Constructing tests
___	___	___	___	3. Identifying student learning styles
___	___	___	___	4. Assessing student learning outcomes
___	___	___	___	5. conducting research projects
___	___	___	___	6. Designing/conducting student evaluations

39

Have Conducted Workshops/ Seminars		Consider ing Work- shops/ Seminars		
Yes	No	Yes	No	
___	___	___	___	7. Designing/conducting course evaluations
___	___	___	___	8. Designing/conducting program evaluations
___	___	___	___	9. Designing/conducting experiments
___	___	___	___	10. Designing data collection instruments
___	___	___	___	11. Utilizing current research on teaching and learning
___	___	___	___	12. Statistical methods of analysis
___	___	___	___	13. Using computer statistical packages (software)

When would be the best time during the week that I
could phone you for more information?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE.

POSSIBLE SERVICES AND HUMAN RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY

MCCC OIR INTERVIEW DATA SHEET

Interview Procedure

1. Check the services/staff development activities
   which the respondent believes would be good to offer
   faculty members.

2. Have the respondent identify the two top services/
   staff development activities in his/her opinion.

3. Be sure to note additional services/staff
   development activities suggested by the respondent
   under "other."

Services to Faculty

_____ 1. Test score analysis

_____ 2. Test development

3. Profile information on students

_____   a. By specific courses

_____   b. By specific programs

_____ 4. Assistance with graduate research projects

_____ 5. Needs assessment for program development

6. Evaluation of

_____   a. Student learning

_____   b. Courses

_____   c. Programs

_____ 7. Other _____

_____ 8. Other _____

Staff Development Activities

_____ 1. Constructing tests

_____ 2. Analyzing test results

_____ 3. Identifying student learning styles

_____ 4. Assessing student learning outcomes

_____ 5. Conducting research projects

_____ 6. Student evaluations (designing and conducting)

_____ 7. Course evaluations (designing and conducting)

_____ 8. Program evaluations (designing and conducting)

_____10. Designing data collection instruments

_____11. Utilizing current research on teaching and learning

_____12. Learning statistical methods of analysis

_____13. Using computer statistical packages (software)

_____14. Other _____

_____15. Other _____

_____16. Other _____

_____17. Other _____

ESTABLISHING A PRACTITIONER-BASED, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

OPERATION AT MERCER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

A THREE-YEAR PLAN

Rationale

In its first twenty-five years of operation, Mercer has successfully met the challenges of providing postsecondary opportunities to community members who would not be served by traditional higher education institutions. In its next twenty-five years, Mercer must address the newly emerging issues of (1) a larger nontraditional student body which is becoming more fragmented with respect to educational preparation and learning needs and (2) an evolving economy which requires special training, life-long learning, and a diversity-orientated liberal arts education.

To meet these new challenges, Mercer should begin to focus on the teaching-learning techniques, delivery systems, and the behavioral objective system which it uses to serve its students. Which techniques and systems are best for whom? Are there inexpensive techniques and systems which work as well as or better than more expensive techniques and systems? How can student learning styles be used to improve learning?

These questions and others can be addressed through small-scale, local research studies. The Office of Institutional and Educational Research can assist individual faculty members who are interested in conducting important and immediately usable research. Also, such research studies can help other faculty members assess their efforts.

Simply, research has become easier to do and more needed within the educational enterprise. New, more sensitive forms of analyses are now available. Further, grass-roots research is needed to increase student success and to give faculty members a fruitful channel for professional development and a sense of accomplishment and professional self-worth.

Phase I: Introduction of practitioner-based,
    educational research as a viable option for
    full-time faculty members.

A. Time line: Academic Year 1993-1994

B. Objectives:

1. To introduce the concept of educational research
   to the faculty through visits to academic
   divisions and presentations at divisional
   meetings.

2. To promote thinking on teaching-learning topics
   for research among interested faculty members.

3. To enlist volunteers for a student-learning
   styles project.

4. To begin disseminating information pieces on
   current teaching-learning research activities and
   findings to the full-time faculty.

Phase II: Execution of a student-learning styles
    project.

A. Time line: 1994 Spring Semester

B. Objectives:

1. To select an appropriate instrument.

2. To have faculty volunteers administer the
   instrument to their course sections.

3. To share results with participating faculty
   members.

4. To follow up the usefulness of results among
   participating faculty members.

Phase III: Reinforcement of practitioner-based,
    educational research opportunities among
    full-time faculty members.

A. Time line: Academic Year 1994-1995

B. Objectives:

1. To continue to promote thinking on teaching-learning topics for research among interested faculty members.

2. To expand the student-learning styles project, if appropriate.

3. To assist faculty members in conducting teaching-learning research projects (minimum desired outcome: five projects).

4. To continue to disseminate information pieces on current teaching-learning research activities and findings to full-time faculty.

5. To prepare and distribute an OIR Research Guide on (a) available educational research resources, (b) types of possible research projects, and (c) a "how to do" step-by-step section.

Phase IV: Institutionalization of practitioner-based, educational research as a standard operation of and professional growth opportunity at the college.

A. Time line: Academic Year 1995-1996

B. Objectives:

1. To promote practitioner-based, educational research among permanent, part-time faculty members, appropriate student service personnel, and academic support personnel.

2. To assist faculty members and selected others in conducting educational research projects (minimum desired outcome: ten projects).

3. To publish and distribute an internal research journal.

4. To distribute a newsletter to faculty and staff focusing on current research findings and topics which could be applicable to Mercer.