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GO BEYOND: ORGANIZATIONS BECOME MORE DIVERSE WHEN THEY DIG DEEP

Author: Dr. Paul Henry Hawkins

Sometimes facts act like snapshots. First they record a moment, then they help us remember it, then they help us understand its long-term relevance. To demonstrate, here are two local facts from each of the past two years: In 2009, Allegheny County Council barely passed an ordinance prohibiting employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity -- and then only after carving out a huge exemption for religious, charitable and fraternal organizations. In 2010, census data revealed that among the nation's 40 largest population centers, the Pittsburgh region has the highest poverty rate among working-age African-Americans.

Taken together, these factual snapshots reveal that our region has work to do. We have not yet overcome persistent barriers to employment, barriers that stem from a generational legacy of racism, heterosexism and other interconnected social inequities. But the good news is that when we see contemporary employment barriers as the result of a generational legacy -- and not just momentary acts of individual discrimination -- then we can see the importance of acting collectively and acting for the long-term.

Over the long term, our region can only respond to persistent employment barriers as employers recognize how those barriers have imbedded themselves within their organizations. This is a steep challenge. Compared to overt bigotry, which has gone out of fashion, it is far more difficult to pinpoint the subtle nuances that advantage some while disadvantaging others. Besides, in our PR driven world, organizations are resistant to the idea that they have a problem; stating and enforcing a nondiscrimination policy often seems like a sufficient response.

But it is precisely the organizations that go beyond the mere adoption and enforcement of a nondiscrimination policy—organizations that actively manage for diversity and inclusion -- that are rising as industry leaders. These organizations are retaining loyal employees, building team cohesiveness, better communicating with customers and identifying emerging opportunities. They understand that actively managing for diversity and inclusion is a smart business strategy just as much as it is indispensable to the evolution of an ethical, socially responsible organization.

This kind of active management does not occur automatically, however. It takes time. It takes time to acquire a multilayered knowledge base, and it takes time to develop leadership capable of leveraging that knowledge to guide the organization through process-oriented change. Moreover
there are no cookie-cutter solutions. Every organization must identify solutions appropriate for their business model and stage of development.

Understanding diversity in these terms opens two questions for Pittsburgh-area organizations. How do we acquire the knowledge base? How do we develop the leadership? To help Pittsburgh area organizations answer these questions, this year a small group of local professionals started a new nonprofit entity: Working Diversity Inc. Working Diversity matches a volunteer consultant with an individual or organization. We work with organizations that have started building a diversity vision, but want to make it stronger. We also work with individuals attached to organizations that have not yet developed a diversity vision. We help those individuals become organizational change agents.

As a result of identifying this niche, Working Diversity is the only nonprofit corporation in our region that focuses on directly helping individuals and organizations create more diverse work environments. We are also different from other nonprofits and for-profit consultancies because we have no fee schedule. Instead of working to generate revenue by selling services to potential clients, we look for promising relationships where our investment in people and organizations will create a community benefit.

Although we are glad to help the individuals and organizations that grow from our guidance, our primary allegiance is to the people of the Pittsburgh region. We believe that when we help organizations create more diverse work environments, the communities where those organizations operate are positively affected. And as our region's organizational landscape changes, so does our regional ability to redress the historical legacy of identity-based inequalities. Working together for long-term change, we can reduce the hidden employment barriers that impede the social and economic development of the Pittsburgh region.
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Author: Dr. Mary E. Robinson, Chair of English and Reading
Montgomery College

______________________________________________________________________________

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty development practices at public community colleges. This chapter provides a review of relevant literature, which is divided into three major categories. The literature discussed in the first category examined the historical perspective of faculty development in higher education. The second category is a review of the three theoretical foundations of the components of Gaff’s (1975) faculty development model: faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development. The third and final review category explores the scholarship of community college faculty development.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

In the 1900s, Harvard University began offering faculty development to support faculty personal development and professional growth, which took shape in the form of sabbaticals to provide release time for respite (Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Schuster & Finklestein, 2006). As such, sabbaticals are considered the earliest form of faculty development in higher education (Sorcinelli, 2006).

Between the end of World War II and the early 1970s, the number of college and university professors tripled (Schuster & Finklestein, 2006). As the number of professors increased, the significance and purpose of faculty development programs were questioned (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). The changes in higher education produced new types of faculty development programs. In 70 years, faculty development programs transitioned from sabbaticals as respite to include a variety of activities and special programs that attempted to improve institutional effectiveness (Alstete, 2000; Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Schuster & Finklestein, 2006).

Researchers observed that the expansion from a focus on sabbaticals to a focus on instruction was done to address the disciplinary expertise and pedagogical skills of faculty (Alstete, 2000; Centra, 1978; Nelsen & Siegel, 1980). According to Nelsen and Siegel (1980), in the early 1970s, American higher education shifted from a focus on students to a focus on faculty. They provided three important factors which drove the change in faculty development: (a) administrators concerned about decline in faculty turnover, (b) student involvement in faculty and teaching, and (c) faculty personal interests. Ten years later Gaff and Simpson (1994) claimed:

At a more conceptual level, faculty development has moved slowly from a fragmented, often misunderstood, and peripheral position to an integrated, better
understood, and more centrally located position of importance within the institution. It is on the verge of becoming fully institutionalized in American higher education. (p. 173)

In the changing environment of higher education the premium placed on quality teaching continued to grow, and the need to fully utilize skills and talents of faculty increased (Caldwell & Sorcinelli, 1997, Lail, 2009); hence, researchers sought to identify ways to characterize faculty development in higher education (Amey, 1999; Bergquist & Phillips, 1975a; Centra, 1975; Brancato, 2003; Diamond, 2002; Nelsen & Siegel, 1980; Toombs, 1975).

Sorcinelli (2006) categorized the history of faculty development in higher education by decades which they called “The Five Ages” (p. 2). They proposed that faculty development was a key strategic lever for ensuring institutional quality and supporting institutional change. They observed that within the context of today’s higher education environment, faculty development was essential to both the individual faculty member and the higher education institution as a whole. The authors explained that faculty development is an emerging issue for colleges and universities:

To meet shifting expectation for which they may not be fully prepared faculty may need academic support systems and professional learning opportunities beyond those traditionally offered. Providing institutional support for faculty facing changing contexts and new demands becomes an essential strategic choice. We believe that the contours of change require us to rethink how we approach, organize, and support faculty development. (Sorcinelli, 2006, pp. xvii-xviii)

The “Five Ages” of faculty development serve as a framework to examine historical direction for faculty development. Table 2 displays the basic characteristics of the “Five Ages” of Faculty Development.

Table 1

“The Five Ages” of Faculty Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1960s</td>
<td>Age of the Scholar</td>
<td>Few colleges and universities had formal programs aimed at promoting faculty members professional development, and there were few studies of faculty development efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 1960s through 1970s</td>
<td>Age of the Teacher</td>
<td>Foundation support spurred campuses to create faculty development programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1980s  Age of the Developer  External funding heightens interest in measuring the outcomes of teaching and faculty development efforts.

1990s  Age of the Learner  Faculty development proposals and recognition were created within education associations, professional societies, and internal consortia.

Early twenty-first century Age of the Network Faculty developers were charged with task to enhance the purpose of faculty development.

Source: Sorcinelli et al., 2006

McGriff’s (2000) perspective on faculty development was slightly different from Sorcinelli’s. McGriff stated, “The key concept to faculty development as a transforming agent of colleges and universities is accepting, understanding, and managing dynamic changes brought about by external and internal factors” (p. 35). Furthermore, he identified four areas that heightened the ongoing need for faculty development in the twenty-first century: (a) the changing socio-demographics of students, (b) faculty and administration, (c) the effect of societal demands for graduates, and (d) the need to adapt technology to meet current instructional practices. Other contemporary researchers, Murray, 1995; Schuster, Wheeler, & Associates, 1990, have found that faculty development has been on the higher education scene for several decades; however, its impact in the classroom is not readily apparent (Murray, 1999, para. 2).

**Theoretical Underpinnings of Faculty Development Practices**

Simply describing the many sources of faculty development does not fully convey the scope of the program goals or complexity of the decisions why institutions of higher education design, develop, and deliver faculty development programs. Knowledge of the theoretical underpinnings of faculty development programs provides support for program goals and purposes of faculty development practices at community colleges.

Over the past 30 years, researchers have offered several theoretical frameworks for the nature and scope of faculty development in higher education (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975b; Diamond, 2002; Gaff, 1975; Sorcinelli, 2006; Sprouse et al. 2008). These researchers found that faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development are the major theoretical frameworks that guide faculty development practices. Millis (1994) explained:

Faculty development can take many guises. Distinctions have traditionally been made between three terms: (a) faculty development (activities such as classroom visits or one-on-one counseling intended to improve the teaching skills of an individual faculty member); (b) instructional development (activities such as media support or curriculum design focused on the student, the course, or the curriculum); and (c) organizational development (activities such as campus wide retreats intended to improve institutional resources or climate). In practice, however, these
definitions overlap, and virtually all activities affect the individual faculty member. (p. 454)

Faculty Development

The theoretical perspective of faculty development is rooted in human development (Gaff, 1975; McAfee, 2008; Merriam & Clark, 2006). According to Knowles (1990), adults in all professions have an internal desire for continued learning. He observed that adult learners are self-directed, and adults are motivated to learn as they experience needs and interests. Community colleges respond to the long-term, ongoing training needs of their faculty by offering program and services to promote faculty growth (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Rouseff-Baker, 2002; Sydnor, 2000; Welch, 2002). Gaff (1975) said, “Substantial numbers of faculty will accept when offered opportunities to improve personal development” (p. 17). There are many programs offered at community colleges in which faculty can receive training. Watts and Hammons (2002) stated “A key challenge for faculty developers is to recognize that professional development should be to improve the faculty individual performance by focusing on the whole individual and not just the part that relates to his or her job” (p. 25).

Diamond (2002) identified four major outcomes of faculty development: (a) demonstration of the institutions’ concern for the individual; (b) improvement in the productivity of individual faculty members through improvement of their teaching effectiveness; (c) facilitation of focused change with more emphasis on what students learn and less on what the faculty member covers; and (d) improvement of faculty attitudes toward teaching. Although it is important to focus on the development of the individual faculty, it is equally important for community colleges to recognize the important role that instruction plays in meeting the learning needs of a diverse student population (Barr & Tagg, 1995; Lail, 2009; McClenney, 2004; McPhail & McPhail, 1999; Mueller, 1991).

Instructional Development

According to Merriam et al. (2007), instructional development is anchored in learning theory. Hill (2002) advanced the notion that learning theories have two major values: (a) language and conceptual frameworks to interpret and explain the learning that takes place and (b) frameworks to look for solutions to problems associated with learning. O’Banion (1973) noted the formal preparation of community college faculty appeared to be a missing link in the community college. He critiqued that these programs were "grossly inadequate" and taught by "narrow, subject-matter specialists" (p. 84). O’Banion’s critique is supported by community college scholars who have suggested that instruction can be improved by creating faculty development programs to assist faculty in developing new teaching skills and strategies (Burnstad, 1994; McAfee, 2008; Murray, 2002; Van Ast, 1999). Gaff (1975) concluded, “If faculty development focuses on faculty, instructional development focuses on the conditions of learning, particularly courses and curricula” (p. 10). He defined instructional development as “the systematic and continuous application of learning principles and educational technology to develop the most effective and efficient learning experiences of students” (p. 47).
The POD Network (2007) depicted instructional development as a three-pronged approach for improving instruction. Based on their framework, instructional development focused on the course, the curriculum, and student learning. In this context, instructional development is different from faculty development in that the intent is to engage faculty in redesigning and developing curriculum and identifying new teaching strategies (POD Network, 2007, para. 1). The intent behind instructional development is to encourage faculty to work together to advance instructional accountability and institutional goals (Murray, 2002; POD Network, 2007).

America is undergoing an economic, political, and social revolution that will require transformation in traditional educational delivery systems at community colleges (Bailey & Smith, 2006). This transformation includes changes in the way community college faculty teach and the way students learn (Carter, 1998; Cox, 2009; McGriff, 2001). Previous studies have indicated that the traditional graduate school program curriculum does not adequately prepare individuals to pedagogically respond as faculty to the teaching and learning challenges brought on by the open-door policy and mission of the community college (Amey, 1999; Austin, 2002a, 2002b; Lail, 2009; Pollard, 2005; Sprouse et al. 2008). Faculty and administrators generally concur that understanding what and how faculty are teaching can strengthen the community college mission (Gaff, 2007; McPhail & McPhail, 2006; Townsend & Twombly, 2007). With demands on community college faculty to be accountable for student success, there is also increased pressure to improve teaching practices at community colleges (Bragg, Kim, Barnett, 2006; Cambridge, 2005; Hunt, 1993; Miles & Wilson, 2004; Romano, Gallagher, & Shugart; 2010; Simpson, 2002; Syed & Mock, 2008). Developing a cadre of professionally trained faculty for their new roles and responsibilities in the community college classroom requires ongoing faculty development (Austin, 2002a, 2002b; Cambridge, 2002; Smith, 2007). In review of the changing roles of faculty and the changing and increasing diversity of student populations at community colleges, it is apparent that classroom practices must adapt to the varied interests and learning styles of students to improve student learning outcomes (Syed & Mock, 2008).

Amey (1999) argued that because faculty must use different teaching and learning approaches to meet the needs of today’s diverse learners, instructional development is a key component of faculty development practices. For example, faculty must determine ways to improve instruction through the use of technology (Amey, 1999; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Floyd, 2003; Foote, 1997; Keengwe, Kidd, & Kyei-Blankson, 2009; Medlin, 2001; Waiwaiole & Noonan-Terry, 2008). According to these scholars, faculty must be provided avenues to explore and integrate the newest technologies into their courses. In addition, Cohen and Brawer (2008) identified instructional media training as a current practice in instructional development for assisting faculty to meet the needs of the nontraditional classroom environment. Medlin (2001) contended that strategies to enhance instructional development practices with the use of technology will continue to plague higher education, as institutions struggle to answer the question, How do institutions develop course materials inclusive of the needs of the current diverse student population? The answer to faculty resistance to the adoption and integration of technology into lectures continues to be an ongoing discussion of faculty developers (Keengwe, Kidd, & Kyei-Blankson, 2008; McGriff, 2001).
Organizational Development

Organizational development is derived from organizational theory (Priem & Rosenstein, 2000). According to Jones (2004), organizational theory describes how a company operates in the environment (i.e., self-impact) and how the environment affects the company’s operational agenda. French and Bell (1990) proposed that organizational development transitions over a period of time. Murray (2002) observed that some faculty development programs have made little progress in connecting their organizational development program goals to the community college mission. Priem and Rosenstein (2000) called for creating an effective institutional atmosphere in which faculty and faculty development personnel jointly link the mission to faculty development practices. Moore (1997) found that there was little evidence that faculty development programs were a major instrument for institutional change or improvement that was linked to the accomplishment factors that are consistent with the college mission and goals.

Organizational development strategies can be beneficial toward the enhancement of faculty development programs at community colleges. Although virtually every community college has some mechanism in place that might be called faculty development, the program goals and purposes vary widely in type and resources (O’Banion, 1994). Murray (2002) stated, “The most common thread running through the literature is that most faculty development programs lack goals—especially goals that are tied to the institutional mission” (p. 91). To date, the literature suggests that much of the efforts to promote faculty development have targeted the personal and professional growth of faculty, but such programs fall short, because they do not connect these programs to organizational development strategies (Laursen & Roueche, 2009; McAlpine, Amundsen, Clement, & Light, 2009).

The American Community College

According to Cohen and Brawer (2008), one of the strengths of the American higher education system is the community college, defined as “any institution regionally accredited to award the Associate’s degree in Arts or the Associate’s degree in Science as its highest degree” (p. 5). The origin of the American community college dates back to Joliet College, in 1901. William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago, is credited with creating the first two-year college in America in response to the increasing number of underprepared students who were entering higher education (Deegan & Tillery, 1985; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Vaughan, 2000).

In 1947, a seminal report from President Truman’s Commission on Higher Education recommended that a network of low-cost, public, comprehensive two-year colleges be established (Boggs & Carter, 1994; Quigley & Bailey, 2003). This landmark report identified the role for community colleges in higher education. Quigley and Bailey (2003) indicated that the Truman Commission Report reexamined the higher education system, recommending the removal of any barriers to attaining a college education, such as denying admission based on race or sex. They suggest that the Truman Commission Report led to the open-door policy of the American community college and provided access to all those seeking admission to public colleges. Miller, Finley, and Vancko (2000) contended that the report was integral to the development of the
community college, as a segment of the U.S higher education system. In a short period of time, community colleges became a dynamic force by making significant contributions toward meeting the needs of diverse student populations within local communities (Quigley & Bailey, 2003).

According to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2008a), there are over 1,173 two-year colleges in the U.S., 987 of which are considered to be public institutions. Within the U.S., most urban, rural, or suburban residents have a community college, branch campus, or extension center that is an hour’s drive or less from their homes (AACC, 2008a). Katinsas (2003) stated, “Community colleges have distinct characteristics that vary based on control, type, and location which tell a unique story of the significant contribution that community colleges make to the American Higher Education system” (p. 7). Hardy and Katinsas (2006) posited that a classification system for two-year institutions provided a way for community colleges to demonstrate their diversity in enrollment and location.

With community colleges’ open-door mission and their location in local communities, there are major differences between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities. Dougherty (1994) explained the difference between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities this way:

Several key features of community colleges apparently lead them to provide greater access to college than do four-year colleges. Typically, community colleges are closer by, whereas many four-year colleges are located in distant rural areas. They are cheaper to attend, if only because they are commuter schools. And because of their open-door admissions ideal, they are more willing to take non-traditional students: high school dropouts, the academically deficient, vocational aspirants, and adults interested in leisure education. (p. 35)

As the mission of the community college changes and adapts, so too should community college faculty have opportunities to change and adapt their approaches to teaching (Sell, 1982). Further, faculty development can help provide training opportunities for faculty renewal, while simultaneously meeting demands of accountability and fostering curriculum and instructional innovation (Sell, 1982). The unique mission and evolution of the community college provides an essential context to better understand faculty development practices in that setting (Grant & Keim, 2002).

**Faculty Development at Community Colleges**

The response to the need for faculty development at community colleges began in the 1970s (Murray, 1999; O’Banion, 1973; Watts & Hammons, 2002). Cohen and Brawer (2008) indicated that the demand for in-service training reached its peak in the 1970s as the expansion of community colleges subsided. Many scholars have expressed several viewpoints about how community colleges have responded to the need for faculty development. In 1995, Murray surveyed faculty development at Ohio community colleges to examine the relation, if any, between professional development and reward structures. He later replicated the same study for community colleges in
the State of New York in 1998. In 2002, Murray expanded his study to include a broader population of public community colleges. Hasting-Taylor (2006) conducted a study to assess the goals and influences, challenges, of faculty development practices at Wisconsin community and technical colleges.

O’Banion (1981) wrote that the purview of faculty development expanded from just a focus on instruction to a focus on organizational development. Watts and Hammons (2002) argued that the overall effectiveness of community colleges could be enhanced through its faculty development programs. Fugate and Amey (2000) contended that a change in the increased diversity of students entering community colleges called for new instructional practices tailored to meet the needs of the ever increasing student populations. These findings suggest that demographic changes were factors contributing to increased attention to faculty development. According to Watts and Hammons (2002) faculty development at the community college became crucial as this sector of higher education was faced with challenges of public accountability, teaching high risk students, changes in institutional governance, and the need for faculty to embrace technology to improve their instructional strategies. Moreover, Watts and Hammons’s (2002) observations about faculty development practices was expressed this way, “No singular event heralded the start of the movement; it simply developed out of the rapid growth that community colleges were experiencing at the time” (p. 5). Wesley (2005) cited several factors that contributed to the need for faculty development at community colleges: (a) the graying factor (b) need for enhanced technological skills, (c) heterogeneity and under preparedness of students, and (d) a shift in pedagogy practices.

By their history and tradition, community colleges are committed to serving a broad range of students of all races and typically have support programs to help these students (AACC, 2010; Cox, 2009; McClenney, 2004; Rendon & Valadez, 1994; Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Trained and talented faculty members have played a major role in the college’s ability to respond to students’ needs (Austin, 2002a). More than in the past, some scholars argue that expanding the role of faculty development is not optional for community colleges, but integral in the overall development of faculty to meet the needs of a diverse student population, and contribute to institutional effectiveness (Community College Survey of Student Engagement [CCCSE], 201; Grant & Keim, 2002; Murray, 2000, 2002).

**FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

Several contributing factors (e.g., mission, diverse student populations, and the changing role of community college faculty) propelled faculty development into the forefront of a nationwide discussion among community college educators (Barr & Tagg; 1995; Bellanca, 2002; Bettinger, & Long, 2009; Bragg, Kim, Barnett, 2006; Eddy & Beach, 2005; Grant & Keim, 2005; McPhail & McPhail, 2006; Murray, 2002; O’Banion, 1981, 2003; Toombs, 1975; Wallin & Smith, 2005). These forces influenced the current process of teaching and framed the key basis for designing and implementing faculty development.
First, it is evident that the mission of the community college is expanding. If the mission of the community college shapes the programs and services of the institutions, then community colleges may want to better understand the need and impact for faculty development to assist faculty in individual professional growth (Alfano, 1994; Grant & Keim, 2002; McPhail & McPhail, 2006; Murray, 2002; Wallin & Smith, 2005; Watson, 2005). Faculty development activities may ensure that faculty remain current in their disciplines and create an effective environment for faculty to remain aware of institutional policies and procedures (Grant & Keim, 2002; Oromaner, 1998). Murray (2002) postulated that community colleges must connect faculty development to the mission of the community college. Murray stated:

The menu of choices should be tied directly to the institutional mission. Faculty should be allowed to select from a menu of activities that meet their goals and the institutional goals. In this way, both the institutions and faculty can grow in ways that ultimately benefit the students they serve. (p. 92)

Grant and Keim (2002) argued for the development of a comprehensive approach to faculty development: “In essence, if community colleges are to recruit and retain quality faculty, a formal, comprehensive development program to orient, enculturate, renew, and develop all faculty is crucial to the success of institutional missions and individual faculty goals” (p. 805). In other words, faculty development has emerged as an important issue in the community college. Alfano (1994) posited:

Community colleges currently face some of the most difficult challenges in their history. Increases in student enrollment, budgets and heavy workloads, have created tremendous pressures on the faculty, staff, and administrators of community colleges. Faculty and staff development projects are sometimes the only avenue to relieve pressures by allowing community college faculty to link with professional colleagues, to modify and improve instructional material and delivery, and to keep the spark of creativity and enthusiasm alive for themselves and their students. (Summary, para. 1)

Second, the ever-increasing diversity of the student population at community colleges has brought an unprecedented number of nontraditional students to their doors (McClenney, 2004; Miller, Finley, & Vancko, 2000; Murray, 1999; Kim, 2002; Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Due to the increase in student diversity, the contemporary community college now enrolls many students who are underprepared for college level courses (Berg, 1999; Bettinger & Long, 2009; Cox, 2009; McClenney, 2004). Although many community college educators are very proud of the open-door policy, established by the Truman Commission Report of 1947, today the open-door mission brings new and different challenges to teaching a non-traditional student population (Bueschel & Venezia, 2006; Brown, 2003; Gerardi, 1990; Levin, 2004; McPhail & McPhail, 1999; Murray, 1999; Rendon & Valadez, 1994; Sanchez, 2000).

Record numbers of first-year students at public community colleges are required to take remedial courses (Cox, 2009; Shults, 2000; Wright, 1985; Young, 2002). For example, Gilroy (2010) found
that 63% of first-year community college students enroll in remedial education courses. Rendon and Valedez (1994) and Miller and Kissinger (2007) observed that diverse student demographics challenges community colleges to provide programs and services that incorporate the diverse learning styles of students. Sanchez (2000) posited that the current composition of the community college student body is represented by increased numbers of minority students, English as Second Language (ESL) students, immigrants, and first-generation students. This change will require that the teaching environment for community college faculty must adapt to meet their needs (Cox, 2009; Lail, 2005; Van Ast, 1999).

The student demographics have not only changed the faces inside the classrooms, but these demographics have also placed a different set of faculty and institutional expectations on community colleges (Chen, 2009; CCCSE, 2010; Kiefer, 1997; Outcalt, 2000; Waiwaiolo & Noonan-Terry, 2008; Windham, & O., 1996). In describing the contemporary community college Quigley and Bailey (2003) noted:

After several decades of growth, community colleges now face a particularly challenging environment. All of the following factors are threatening established patterns of community college-activities and potentially altering the role of the college within the wider landscape of higher education: changes in pedagogic and production technology, state funding policies, the expectation of students, parents, policymaking, demographic trends, and the growth of new types of educational institutions and providers. (p. 70)

Laursen and Rocque (2009) claimed that faculty development can address first-and second-tier needs of the learner by providing opportunities for ongoing career and professional growth for faculty. Faculty development shows significant promise as a means to improve student success as a response to calls for increased accountability at community colleges (CCCSE, 2010; DiazLefebvre, 2006; Laanan, 2002; Judd, 2006. Given the increased attention to faculty engagement and outcomes assessment at community colleges, faculty development may even help community colleges attract resources necessary to promote higher levels of student success (Laanan, 2001; Layne, Fryod, Simpson, Caso & Merton, 2004; Rendon & Valadez, 1994). Despite the recent interest in faculty development programs, some researchers found that pedagogical changes in programs and practices have not been sustained (Diamond, 2002; Gillespie et al. 2002).

Third, few community college faculty have been trained to teach at the college level (Fugate & Amey, 1999; Lail, 2009; Sprouse et al. 2008). Fewer yet have been formally engaged in curriculum development; consequently, community colleges have found it necessary to implement faculty development to address changes in instructional delivery modalities (Amey, 2000; Cross, 1986; Rafkin, 2000). Schrum et al. (2005) noted that faculty development can be a means to assist faculty in remaining current in their discipline to meet the diverse needs of students at the community college.

According to Murray (1999), community college faculty are faced with many instructional and organizational challenges, but none more difficult than tailoring instructional pedagogy to a diverse
student population with individuals from different ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, and academic backgrounds. Twombly (2004) raised a similar argument by suggesting that community college faculty are challenged to provide instruction for an increasingly diverse student population with broader ranges of academic preparation. Although this diversity is welcomed by the community college, diversity sometimes creates a unique pedagogical challenge for community college faculty (Mueller, 1991; Murray, 1999; Waiwaiole & Noonan-Terry, 2008; Young, 2008). Twombly (2004) provided the rationale that a community college faculty must employ flexible and creative teaching methods to reach the diverse learning styles and interests of its students. In addition, she argued that internal and external demands are required major changes in the community college curriculum.

Many community colleges are responding to the calls for curriculum redesign, by providing a wide range of faculty development programs, such as the Professional Development Program for New Faculty (PDP-NF) at Montgomery College in Maryland. These three-session workshops provide professional development activities in the topical areas, such as infusing technology and curriculum, assessment, classroom management, culturally responsive pedagogy, and adult learning models (M. Newman, personal communication, September 27, 2010). Stern (2003) highlighted the online faculty development program offered at Valencia Community College in Florida, where asynchronous online format captures the participation of full-time and part-time faculty. She explained that an online option for faculty development activities provides a flexible schedule for faculty to enhance their pedagogical skills. According to Smith (2007) faculty development program at North Shore Community College, provides a range of faculty development activities linked monthly two-hour faculty/staff meetings. Ongoing faculty development activities sponsored by individual colleges are frequently viewed as a means to help faculty, especially full-time faculty—become more effective teachers (McElhany, 2007; Townsend & Twombly, 2007).

It is essential that community colleges undertake aggressive efforts to ensure that qualified faculty development coordinators are in place to design, implement, and evaluate faculty development programs (Lieberman, & Guskin, 2003). The literature suggests that at many community colleges, faculty development is left in the hands of senior level academic administrators (Murray, 1998; Nwagwu, 1998; Sorcinelli, 2006; Sydow, 2000).

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COORDINATORS**

Cohen and Brawer (2008) claimed that the greatest need in the area of faculty development was for faculty to emerge as specialists in the areas of curriculum development and assessment. Their hunch was that these leaders would come from within the ranks of practicing instructors. They stated, “Few individuals [faculty developers] with those instructional skills can be expected to appear as new employees” (p. 457). Gaff and Simpson (1994) emphasized that typically faculty development coordinators were drawn from a pool of faculty who took on the assignment in addition to maintaining their teaching role. More specifically, Nwagwu (1998) and Sydow (2000) indicated that faculty development coordinators serve dual roles—that of faculty developer and that of senior-level administrator. Contemporary researchers (Murray, 1998; Nwagwu, 1998;
Sydow, 2000) considered faculty development to be more effective when chief academic officers or deans of instruction are involved.

Lieberman and Guskin (2003) argued that as the role of faculty changes the role of faculty developers’ changes as well. They noted:

Much like librarians, faculty developers will have to shift their thinking from being providers of good and important technical services to professionals whose work is critical for the transformation of the institution . . . To accomplish these critical functions faculty developers must perceive themselves as change agents. Rather than directing support activities to individual faculty, faculty developers will also need to take responsibility for supporting administrators and faculty leaders, who have some sense that significant change is needed, by providing access to new conceptions of educating students, new institutional forms to enable them to occur, and the change process needed to accomplish both. (p. 263)

Hopple (1991) examined the effectiveness of professional development at community colleges. Hopple found that 45% of 281 reporting community colleges and 34% of 156 reporting technical colleges indicated the title of faculty developer varied and fell under the auspices of development coordinator, director, or development committee which reported to the chief instructional officer. Grant and Keim (2002) in their investigation, Faculty Development in Publicly Supported Two Year Colleges, found that at least 52% of faculty development coordinators were senior-level administrators.

The findings from the Sorcinelli’s (2006) study revealed that 60% of the study’s participants reported that they served in dual roles of director and faculty member. They explained:

It is not unusual for individuals responsible for faculty development at their institutions to hold more than one position. Those with faculty status as well as an administrative title may be perceived as more credible on issues of teaching and learning because of their direct involvement in the classroom. (p. 32)

Watts and Hammonds (2002) suggested that the length of service of faculty development coordinators was typically two or three years; however, they argued that the length of service of a faculty development coordinator is not as important as the instructional and organizational skill sets to implement change. Most recently, Eddy and Beach (2005) examined the length of service of faculty developers, which they divided into three categories: (a) new professionals (i.e., less than four years); (b) established developers (i.e., four to nine years); and (c) experienced professionals with over 10 years in the field. The gaps continue to exist in the literature pertaining to the exact number of year’s faculty development coordinators were employed in their position and the impact that the number of years as a coordinator has on faculty development programs and services at their institutions.
Watts and Hammons (2002) stated:

The coordinator of professional development whether full time or part time, is obviously a key person in the success of the program and should be selected with certain skills and attributes in mind . . . He or she should also have a nonthreatening personality, an understanding of adult learning, and some training or expertise in human relations, group process, instructional design, organizational development, and strategies for implementing change. (p. 9)

Graf, Albright, and Wheeler (1992) listed seven abilities faculty development coordinators should possess to be effective. They included these abilities: (a) to engage in needs assessment activities; (b) to design and develop strategies that promote individual, pedagogical, curricular, and organizational growth; (c) to organize and implement specific programs, projects, and studies; (d) to plan and deliver oral presentations; (e) to conduct research about teaching and learning and the evaluation of instruction; (f) to produce print and non-print communications; and (g) to establish and maintain consulting relationships.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BUDGETS

When Roueche and Roueche (1993) examined funding for faculty development programs their research revealed that funding to support faculty development remains one of the least prominent budget items at the majority of higher education institutions. The authors stated, “It is clear that faculty development has not been featured prominently in the budgets of the majority of American colleges and universities” (p.114). McClenney’s (2007) study, Faculty development getting results, indicated that adequate funding was crucial for the sustainability of faculty development programs. McClenney’s comments echoed Eison and Sorcinelli’s (1999) observation that applying for grants for faculty development efforts is both timely and competitive. Sorcinelli (2002) expressed ideas about funding and teaching learning centers. She stated the following:

A related issue that merits discussion is funding for the center…while centers can get started with modest funding (I opened the Center for Teaching with an operating budget of $5,000), improving teaching costs [sic] money. Funds for orientations, conferences, teaching technologies, faculty release time, and outside speakers can quickly add up . . . We find that funds readily come our way if we continually build a track record of quality programming in areas that are deemed important by students, faculty, and academic leaders. (p. 17)

Grant and Keim (2002) found that faculty development programs appear to be reasonably wellfunded. Their findings indicated that more than 90% of two-year colleges received financial support for faculty development from multiple funding sources, including state funds, grants, and local budgets. Forty-three percent allocated more than 1% of their total budget on faculty development (Grant & Keim, 2002, p. 803). Funding to support faculty development continues to be an ongoing discussion in higher education (Sorcinelli, 2006).
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT MODELS AND COMPONENTS

A variety of faculty development models have been proposed over the years (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975a, 1975b; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Murray, 2002; Stern, 2003; Wach, 2007). Bergquist and Phillips (1975a) were among the first to offer some conceptual ideas about faculty development. Their model delineated three components of faculty development: (a) instructional development, (b) personal development, and (c) organizational development. The authors reported that instructional development was a primary dimension, and personal and organizational development together constituted a secondary dimension. During the past several decades, faculty development programs at community colleges have taken the form of several different models. In addition, Brown, Hugstad, and Hugstad (1991) highlighted seven key faculty development program attributes. They suggest an effective faculty development program must be educational, comprehensive, goal-oriented, flexible, varied in approaches, linked with personnel, and continuous.

Cranton’s (1996) perspective of faculty development models was different from the Brown, Hugstad, and Hugstad’s (1991) model. Cranton stated, “Faculty or professional development must include reflective practice to guide the educator along a path to insightful decision making” (p. 25). Cranton further proposed that classroom action research projects and collaboration across disciplines were critical elements of faculty development activities.

Sides-Gonzales and Byrd’s (2002) study Pathways to Excellence examined the goals of faculty development programs at community colleges using four distinct components: (a) teaching and learning, (b) technical skill-building, (c) leadership development, and (d) personal growth. They concluded that the overall goal was to provide an in-service faculty development program with a venue for employee growth and achievement.

Schrum et al. (2005) explored the benefits of online faculty development training models for community college faculty. They pointed out that faculty development models, with an online option, may motivate faculty and increase faculty participation. Fulton, Noonan, and Dorris (2004) conducted a study to identify the effectiveness of a web-based faculty development module. Based on their contention, web-based learning existed not just to meet the needs of students, but also to facilitate pedagogical strategies for faculty. They concluded:

Web-mediated professional development is pedagogically promising in that faculty can work together to explore issues over time, access internet resources, observe and participate in mentors’ and peers’ virtual classrooms, and work with international experts. Participants can be more active and more reflective in conversations, which is helpful to all and especially significant for new or introspective staff members. (para. 2)

The researchers observed that online faculty development can be both inexpensive and effective as it meets a faculty’s needs at times and locations that are convenient for participants (Summary, para. 3).
Faculty Development Activities

It is clear that until the most recent decade, faculty development was synonymous with in-service workshops for individual teachers to enhance personal interests (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Gaff and Simpson (1994) argued that one of the main reasons for in-service activities was to upgrade each participant’s knowledge about the curriculum and to study the psychology of her or his teaching and counseling skills. In examining the reasons faculty attend professional development programs, Schmuck and Runkel (1994) noted that faculty chose the workshops they wished to attend and went to them as free agents in search of professional development. Roueche, Roueche, and Milron (1993) identified faculty development activities as “activities (e.g., regularly scheduled formal and informal interactive events, and independent reading) that should be continuous throughout the academic year for all faculty” (p. 116). In addition the authors suggested that “for faculty development efforts to be effective, there must be ‘something in it for faculty’—that is, there must be mechanisms by which faculty are motivated by, involved in, and enthusiastic about their effort” (Roueche, Roueche, & Milron, 1993, p. 117).

Millis (1994) offered a narrower view of faculty development by proposing that faculty development efforts should be coordinated by faculty and should not include activities for entire staff and administrators. He advised a faculty development approach could include faculty newsletters, faculty discussion groups, individual consultation opportunities, workshops or seminars, mentoring programs, classroom observations, career counseling, research assistance, and sabbaticals. Grubb and associates (1999) maintained faculty is most concerned about faculty development activities which benefit faculty personal growth. In contrast, Diamond (2002) pointed out that faculty development activities can expand from just focusing on faculty personal interests to include instructional and organizational development activities. Moreover, Diamond noted that faculty development should also focus on improving the teaching skills of individual faculty and not limited to his or her personal growth. Diamond (2002), developed a model gleaned from the POD Network (2007) to identify the content of faculty development areas that focus on personal growth, instructional development activities, and organizational development activities (see Table 3). Table 3 illustrates Diamond's model of faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development activities.

Table 2

Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Development Activities</th>
<th>Instructional Development Activities</th>
<th>Organizational Development Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom visits by professional development staff</td>
<td>course and curriculum design</td>
<td>workshops and seminars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chism, Lees, and Evenbeck (2002) determined that faculty development has not risen to the forefront of priorities at community colleges as a necessary requirement for faculty. They concluded:

Effective faculty development involves working with the natural cycle of teaching change that characterizes faculty growth. Through providing activities, support, challenges, and resources at critical intervals, facilitators of faculty development can maximize their potential to foster change . . . When faculty development is successful in this way; informed innovation in teaching becomes part of the fabric of the institution. (Summary section, para.1)

**CHALLENGES FOR FACULTY MEMBERS AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

According to the findings from the Sorcinelli (2006) study, challenges facing faculty and faculty development programs included, balancing multiple roles, changing faculty roles, and student-centered teaching at all institutional types, with the exception of community colleges, who indicated that teaching underprepared students was the top challenge facing faculty and faculty development programs.

Brancato (2003) noted that higher education has faced numerous challenges, resulting in a sense of unpredictability and uncertainty among educators, and these challenges ultimately pressure institutions to address the demands of students, society, and organizations. The author said, “Faculty is challenged to confront demands and reflect on their current practices, knowledge, and skills to enhance students’ learning” (p. 24). Wetherill, Burton, Calhoun, and Thomas (2002) identified similar challenges in reference to teaching and learning, stating, “A critical challenge to improving the quality of teaching and student performance outcomes is to reconsider how faculty are initially trained and provided opportunities for professional renewal and retooling throughout their career” (p. 54).

Stolzenberg (2002) indicated that community colleges are challenged with identifying faculty development activities on an ongoing basis. Over 25 years ago, Eash and Lane (1985) reported in their overview, *Evaluation of a model of faculty development: Implications for educational policy*, that one major challenge of faculty development was identifying a means to motivate faculty to attend and participate. In addition, the authors outlined four additional challenges that hinder the ongoing daily operations of faculty development activities:
- a socialized professoriate that has fixed attitudes of performance expectations and responsibilities;
- weak program planning systems of the responsible academic administrators, which are haphazard and short ranged;
- lack of development capital and fiscal incentives for programs; and resistance of traditional structure (e.g., departments and colleges) to overall academic planning. (p. 134)

Eash and Lane’s (1985) findings have been supported by contemporary researchers as well. For example, Smith (2007) described several challenges community colleges face when attempting to involve faculty in faculty development. Smith determined that time and resources continued to be significant influencers of faculty development programs. Smith advised the following:

- Faculty workload of five courses plus advising and community service raises questions about when faculty can fit it into their schedules.
- Meeting time is difficult to fit into teaching schedules. Faculty members who must attend a meeting and cannot find someone to cover their course are left with few options.
- Cost to attend conferences can be prohibitive, especially if the college does not reimburse for travel, meals and/or transportation; compensation or stipends for attending a session are not always available, making it impractical for faculty to attend professional development sessions.
- Over the course of a year, there may be multiple opportunities to attend a conference or workshop. Having multiple options and then deciding which session to attend can be complicated and confusing. (p. 35)

Notably, Smith mentioned barriers related to adjunct faculty engagement in faculty development activities; he found that adjunct faculty:

- are not integrated into the life of the college and therefore they are not aware of faculty development offering;
- may not be on the college e-mail directory or the regular phone system, so it can be difficult to contact them;
- don't receive the college newsletter; and most work full- or part-time in another career, and scheduling sessions can be difficult. (p.25)

Laanan (2001) asserted that simply providing faculty development programs was not enough; community colleges must respond to the call of accountability by implementing strategies for faculty development practices. If the goal is not to simply provide faculty development activities but to facilitate faculty development to promote student success and other institutional effectiveness, it is crucial for community colleges to become more strategic about their faculty development offerings (Bailey, 2003; Watts & Hammons, 2002). For example, what are the goals of faculty development programs? What types of outcomes assessments are assigned to the faculty development programs? Community college faculty development programs can be a pivotal force in helping to create ways for faculty to work with students to promote student success (CCCSE,
Levine (2004) viewed faculty development programs as a challenge for community colleges. He speculated:

The demand for professional development programs can be expected to soar in an information economy in which the half-life of knowledge is growing shorter and shorter and workers are required to continually upgrade their skills and knowledge. Two-year colleges will be seen as a particularly good source for professional development in technical, vocational, and service fields. Beyond individuals seeking instruction, business, government, and the not-for-profit sector also will ask two-year colleges, which have earned a reputation for social responsiveness and speedy action, to assist them in creating contract programs for their workers. (p. 2)

Grahek (2007) argued for the need to incorporate global pedagogy into the curriculum, especially because accrediting organizations are rapidly transforming the concept of faculty development in higher education by requiring institutions to identify and measure teaching effectiveness; however, Carducii (2002) presented a compelling argument against a one-size-fits-all approach to faculty development initiatives, noting that such programs ignored the unique challenges, needs, and goals found among community college faculty members (Conclusion, para. 14). These challenges place pressures on administrators to identify and implement strategies and tactics necessary to make available, promote, and reward successful completion of faculty development opportunities (Murray, 1995).

**Current Practices and Emergent Directions of Faculty Development Programs**

Recently, faculty development coordinators identified several factors driving change and shaping the future of faculty development. Among the factors noted were developing and sustaining the vitality of all faculty members: newcomers, mid-career, seniors, and part-timers; the increasingly diverse student body (Burnstad, 2002; Lail, 2009; Rendon & Valedez, 1994). Another factor is the changing paradigm for teaching, learning, and scholarly pursuits (Barr & Tagg, 1995; O’Banion, 2003; Van Ast, 1999). Lail (2005) expanded on earlier comments by Barr and Tagg, (1995) and Van Ast, (1999) as discussed in her article, *Are new faculty prepared to teach diverse learner?* She explained:

Yet a major curricular revolution has emerged. We have certainly heard a call for the pivotal shift from teacher-centered instruction to learner-centered learning, which is generating new teaching-learning models. With this call comes urgency—that all community college faculty become as skilled in the detection, identification, and implementation of diverse student-learning styles and challenges as they are in their discipline contents. (p. 32)

O’Banion (1994) identified seven interrelated trends that created opportunities that made the 1990s a promising time for faculty development at community colleges: (a) continuing public and political pressures to improve the quality of higher education, (b) an increasing level of competition...
for funding, (c) a rise in educational consumerism, (d) changing faculty demographics, growing diversity in the student body, (e) an expanding base of useful, relevant research about college teaching and learning, and (f) a rising level of faculty development expertise.

Fulton, Noonan, and Dorris (2004) observed the literature regarding the role of faculty professional development was clear. They concluded that a quality faculty development program ought to improve a faculty members’ ability to (a) facilitate student learning, (b) build a community of education professionals, and (c) help faculty assess their teaching outcomes and their students’ learning outcomes. Watts and Hammons (2002) argued that change was a major force in shaping the focus of faculty development. They found the following:

Community colleges are continuing to change in response to community and societal changes and those who lead, teach, and provide support in those colleges will need to continually grow and change as well. Professional development has provided and will continue to provide the necessary programs to meet those growth needs. Although there are challenges and although its form and substance may change, professional development appears to be a permanent fixture in community colleges. (p. 10)

Rouseff-Baker (2002) asserted that ongoing faculty development programs, faculty leadership teams, and a supportive administration will help manage many challenges community colleges faced in the twenty-first century. A later study conducted by McElhany (2007) indicated a widespread concern from faculty regarding the need to embrace web-based course delivery. She suggests faculty are reluctant to teach online. Faculty development can be one venue to provide faculty with strategies to teach online, as well as to provide a means to train faculty on pedagogical strategies to infuse technology into the lecture.

Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) observed that many institutions are taking innovative approaches to faculty development. The authors suggest that a dual access approach, both on and off campus, and allows faculty to participate in faculty development activities that best match their interests and their circumstances. Dusick and Yildirim (2000) noted that an online mode, as well as face-to-face workshops, provides a flexible approach to increase access for faculty to participate in faculty development activities.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine faculty development practices at public community colleges. The literature review summarized and explained faculty development in higher education. The chapter summarized the three contemporary theories which undergirded faculty development practices in this study: faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development.
References


Berg, C. (1999). If a tree falls in the forest...Listening for my students' voices: A qualitative study of "underprepared" college freshmen. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED461394)


Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2010). *The heart of student success: Teaching, learning, and college completion (2010 CCCSE Findings)*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Community College Leadership Program


Medlin B. D (2001). The factors that may influence a faculty member’s decision to adopt electronic technologies in instruction. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: (AAT 3095210)


O’Banion, T. (1981). Organizing staff development programs that work. Community college staff development programs for the 80s, 128-160. Frederick, MD: Associated Faculty Press.


Young, K. (2002). Retaining underprepared students enrolled in remedial courses at the community college. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED467850)

The QUEST: Journal of Higher Education Excellence

Will host the 2016

WOMEN’S
HISTORY MONTH
Honoring the accomplishments of women.

Tuesday, March 1, 2016 at 12:00 pm

The Fine Arts Theatre Classroom--172

For more information regarding this great event, please e-mail jvance@bcccd.edu.
Call for Reviewers

The QUEST: The Journal of Higher Education

If you are interested in serving as a reviewer, please e-mail the required information listed below to TheQUEST@bccc.edu. The subject line should read: QJHEE REVIEW INTEREST.

- first and last name
- a brief biography (400 words)
- position and title
- institutional affiliation
- resume

Special Note: Reviewers and Advisory Board members are not paid. QJHEE is not a moneymaking venture.
The QUEST: The Journal of Higher Education Excellence

Featured Reading………………..
Tuesday, April 5, 2016 at 1:00 pm
The Gaare Auditorium

The QUEST: Journal of Higher Education Excellence

Will host the 2016

Men of Excellence