This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

THE IDENTIFICATION OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS RELATED TO EFFECTIVE TEACHING BASED ON THE PERCEPTIONS OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

presented by

Nancy E. Hogg

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Educational Administration

Major professor

Date April 1994

THE IDENTIFICATION OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS RELATED TO EFFECTIVE TEACHING BASED ON THE PERCEPTIONS OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

By

Nancy E. Hogg

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1994

ABSTRACT

THE IDENTIFICATION OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS RELATED TO EFFECTIVE TEACHING BASED ON THE PERCEPTIONS OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

By

Nancy E. Hogg

The purpose of this study was to determine the faculty development needs of full-time and part-time faculty relating to effective teaching at the four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College, a private, nonprofit institution in Michigan. The developmental needs of faculty were determined by asking for their perceptions and preferences relating to the importance, proficiency, and further development of certain teaching-related skills or abilities; their preferred methods for acquiring the skills or abilities; and the skills or abilities most important to further their teaching abilities. The data were also analyzed by employment status of faculty, experience level, and campus location.

Questionnaires were distributed to 73 full-time faculty and 255 part-time faculty during Fall Term 1993. Sixty (82%) of the full-time faculty and 106 (47%) of the part-time faculty returned their questionnaires, for an overall return rate of 56%.

Most faculty were confident of their proficiencies in each of the 13 skills or abilities and were reluctant to admit to any significant weaknesses. Faculty were inconsistent in matching their proficiencies with their need for further development. Faculty were extremely consistent in their ranking of the three skills or abilities most important to them to further develop their teaching abilities. Very few differences existed between the mean responses of the various groupings of faculty.

The following recommendations were made, based on the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. Teaching must be considered a discipline to be studied by faculty, promoted by administration, and provided for through the use of a variety of development methods as determined through the assessment of faculty needs and preferences.

2. A means of increasing the awareness of faculty to better identify their weaknesses and faculty development needs must be used before specific faculty development activities will be beneficial. Creative approaches to accomplishing this could include the organization of discussion groups focusing on teaching among faculty.

3. A replication of this study could be conducted using multiple questionnaires in order to compare the perceptions of faculty with students' and/or administration's perceptions of the same faculty.

Dissertation Advisor: Dr. Cas Heilman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

There continues to be a growing trend to focus greater attention on teaching in institutions of higher education (Cerbin, 1993). Researchers, authors, and the recent reform reports have all indicated that teaching, particularly effective teaching, is not as much a priority in American colleges and universities as it should be (AHE, 1991; Bok, 1992; Boyer, 1990). Many have made suggestions as to what the needed changes should entail. In the Carnegie Foundation's special report, Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, Boyer (1990) pointed out that it is necessary for the higher education community to accept teaching as authentic scholarship. He explained the need to emphasize teaching and provide greater support for the improvement of teaching at the postsecondary level.

Need for the Study

Graduate education does not adequately prepare scholars to teach (Cerbin, 1993). Brilliant teaching "occurs on every campus, but it takes place despite, not because of, the academic culture" (Cerbin, 1993, p. 1). In their

analysis of the teaching-related concerns of new and junior faculty, Finkelstein and LaCelle-Peterson (1992) explained how the inadequacy of graduate education for academic careers is the critical issue that remains to be addressed. Zemsky (1992) pointed out an overall lack of focus on effective teaching in American colleges and universities. Diamond (1988) explained how reports by the Carnegie Foundation (1986), the Association of American Colleges, the National Institute of Education (1984), and the National Endowment for the Humanities (1984) have directed national attention to problems relating to the lack of focus on effective teaching at many colleges and universities in the United States.

The Role of Part-Time Faculty

With the rapid growth in all areas of higher education following World War II, the use of part-time faculty was also greatly increased (Gappa, 1984b). During the 1970s, smaller four-year institutions began experiencing serious financial stress. Eventually, almost all colleges and universities experienced the same budget constraints. The effect of such growing financial pressures on the institution was to enhance the value of the part-time teacher, particularly in the eyes of administrators. The use of part-time faculty provides the institution with a meaningful way to conserve institutional dollars.

The flexibility of part-time faculty made possible the sometimes rapid expansion of programs and course offerings at the postsecondary level. According to Blackburn (cited in Gappa, 1984b), this has been and continues to

be particularly true for the community college sector with its "large assortment of vocational and technical programs available at low cost--with or without academic credit, day or night, on or off campus" (p. 3). More recently, institutions also have reaped the benefits of the expertise and practical experience of the part-time faculty member. However, the qualifications of part-time faculty differ greatly, as do their needs and aspirations. Likewise, the numbers and ways in which institutions use part-time faculty also vary, leading to much confusion and inconsistency.

According to Gappa (1984b), little research has been conducted on part-time faculty, with most research focusing on full-time faculty. Nonetheless, part-time faculty play a key role in the success of any institution's educational services and are great in number across all college and university campuses (Gappa, 1984b). Postsecondary institutions rely heavily on part-time faculty, and "the use of part-time and temporary faculty has become a way of life" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 2). "Part-time faculty will teach the majority of American students during their time in college, frequently during the crucial lower division years" (Gappa, 1984a, p. 3).

It is estimated that part-time faculty make up approximately one-third of all faculty employed by American colleges and universities. Research conducted during the early 1980s indicated that part-time faculty were teaching 28% of all undergraduate courses and 21% of all graduate-level courses. In more recent studies, Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that part-time and temporary faculty were

teaching from 20% to 50% of all undergraduate courses offered in American colleges and universities.

Referred to as "academe's second-class citizens," part-time faculty endure many problems (Gappa, 1984a, p. 3). In general, part-time faculty often are neglected and are in need of special programs, such as instructional-improvement programs, to aid them in becoming effective instructors (Gappa, 1984b).

Faculty Development Issues

The growth in faculty development activities provided by institutions of higher education has been triggered by the concerns for effective teaching. During the 1960s, few colleges had any system of formalized instructional-improvement programs (Albright, 1988). However, Centra (1976) reported that, by the middle of the 1970s, some type of faculty development program had been implemented in roughly 60% of American colleges and universities. More recently, Erickson (1985) found that almost 50% of all four-year colleges and universities provide some form of instructional-improvement programs. Such activities, however, do not guarantee improvement and often do not involve part-time faculty. "Teaching improvement programs have often been launched without careful study of the needs they are to satisfy" (Gaff, 1978, p. 60).

With the continued increase in the use of part-time faculty, particularly in the smaller four-year colleges and the community college sector, the developmental needs of part-time faculty may be most urgent. As Fink (1992)

indicated, often these part-time faculty are not career academics and have little or no teaching experience. Institutions must also address the differences in part-time faculty related to qualifications, their functions within the institution, and their contribution to the educational goals of the institution (Gappa, 1984b).

The growth of adult learners in higher education has also affected teaching at this level. Changing student populations have resulted in the average student age increasing dramatically from 20 years of age to over 30 at many college campuses. Working adult students who may be raising a family and pursuing a college degree all at the same time are commonplace in American institutions of higher education today. In particular, the smaller four-year colleges and community colleges have experienced the growth in adult learners. As a result of such changes, research has been conducted on how adults learn and has raised significant questions concerning the roles and developmental needs of postsecondary teachers.

Knowles's (1970) research and popularization of the term "andragogy," focusing on the adult learner, is in contrast to the more traditional concept of pedagogy, which focuses on children. Cross (1988) believed that Knowles's promotion of andragogy was an attempt "to meet a quite legitimate need--the need to provide a viable alternative to traditional 'school-like' education" (p. 225). The implications of the growth of the adult learner in higher education have added to the developmental needs of all college and university faculty.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that led to this study is the lack of teacher preparation for educators at the postsecondary level. The lack of preparation for faculty at the postsecondary level has raised concerns regarding full-time faculty, but for part-time faculty the lack of preparation may be even more serious and less recognized. Many differences exist between full- and part-time faculty. Differences in experience, qualifications, compensation structure, job security, developmental needs, and support services for part-time and full-time faculty are most common, according to Gappa (1984a). Part-time faculty are more likely to have difficulty being effective in the classroom because of their limited experience and lack of skills. Their needs may be not only content knowledge but also pedagogical knowledge. Such developmental needs may be best served if the employing institution is able to determine these needs and then provide its faculty with the opportunity to acquire the necessary skills and abilities related to effective teaching.

Purpose of the Study

The researcher's primary purpose in this study was to determine the faculty development needs of full-time and part-time faculty relating to effective teaching at the four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College, a private, nonprofit institution in Michigan. Davenport College is a comprehensive, thriving, nonprofit institution with diverse campuses, faculty, and students. The developmental needs of these faculty were determined by obtaining the

perceptions and preferences of the full-time and part-time faculty employed during Fall Term 1993 at the Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, and Lansing campuses. The extent to which faculty perceived they were proficient in some of the skills or abilities associated with effective teaching, how important these skills or abilities are to their teaching, to what extent they thought further development in such skills was needed, and their most preferred methods for acquiring these skills were determined. Comparisons were used to determine whether these needs and preferences differed between full-time and part-time faculty, between experienced and less experienced faculty, and between the main campus (Grand Rapids) and the satellite campuses (Kalamazoo and Lansing) of Davenport College.

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in this study:

1. How important do faculty think certain teaching-related skills or abilities are to effective teaching?

    a. Do full-time and part-time faculty rate the importance of these skills or abilities differently?

    b. Do experienced faculty and less experienced faculty rate the importance of these skills or abilities differently?

    c. Do faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus and faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses rate the importance of these skills differently?

    d. Do full-time faculty at the main campus and full-time faculty at the satellite campuses rate the importance of these skills differently?

e. Do part-time faculty at the main campus and part-time faculty at the satellite campuses rate the importance of these skills differently?

2. To what extent do faculty feel proficient in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

   a. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between full-time and part-time faculty at all four-year campuses?

   b. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty?

   c. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses?

   d. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

   e. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

3. To what extent do faculty perceive they need further development in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

   a. Do these perceptions differ between full-time and part-time faculty at all four-year campuses?

   b. Do these perceptions differ between experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty at all four-year campuses?

   c. Do these perceptions differ between faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses?

   d. Do these perceptions differ between full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

e. Do these perceptions differ between part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

4. What methods for acquiring certain teaching-related skills and abilities do faculty most prefer?

   a. Do these preferences differ between full-time and part-time faculty at all four-year campuses?

   b. Do these preferences differ between experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty at all four-year degree campuses?

   c. Do these preferences differ between faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses?

   d. Do these preferences differ between full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

   e. Do these preferences differ between part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

5. What three skills or abilities associated with effective teaching are the most important to faculty at Davenport College in order to further develop their teaching abilities?

   a. Do these three skills or abilities differ between full-time and part-time faculty?

   b. Do these three skills or abilities differ between experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty?

   c. Do these three skills or abilities differ between faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses?

   d. Do these three skills or abilities differ between full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

e. Do these three skills or abilities differ between part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

Delimitations

This study was delimited to include full-time and part-time faculty employed during Fall Term 1993 at the four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College, a private, nonprofit institution in Michigan. These campuses are located in Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, and Lansing, Michigan. The other four-year, degree-granting campuses of the Davenport/Detroit College system located in Michigan were excluded from the study.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they were used in this study.

Andragogy: "The art and science of helping adults learn" (Knowles, 1970, p. 38).

Experienced faculty: Those full-time faculty who have taught ten or more academic courses at the postsecondary level in the last three years and those part-time faculty who have taught for three or more years at the postsecondary level.

Faculty development: "Focuses primarily on improving the teaching skills of the individual faculty member" (Diamond, 1988, p. 10).

Full-time faculty: Anyone who (a) has a full-time faculty assignment and range of duties and (b) teaches a full-time teaching load (as defined by the institution).

Less experienced faculty: Those full-time faculty who have taught less than ten academic courses at the postsecondary level in the last three years and those part-time faculty who have taught less than three years at the postsecondary level.

Part-time faculty: "Anyone who (1) teaches less than the average full-time teaching load" (as defined by the institution), "or (2) has less than a full-time faculty assignment and range of duties" (as defined by the institution), "or (3) may have a temporary full-time assignment" (as defined by the institution) (Gappa, 1984b, p. 5).

Pedagogical knowledge: "With special reference to those broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter" (Shulman, 1987, p. 8).

Pedagogy: The art and science of teaching; a more traditional concept "concerned with helping children learn" (Cross, 1988, p. 222).

Satellite campus: Any campus of an institution that is housed in a different location from that of the main campus, but is administratively responsible to the main campus.

Summary

The adequate preparation of postsecondary teachers, combined with increased emphasis on and support for the improvement of teaching, is necessary for the improvement of teaching at this level. In particular, the needs of part-time faculty must be addressed. Institutions of higher education must recognize the urgency in assessing and providing for the developmental needs of their part-time faculty. The complexities of improving teaching at the postsecondary level continue to grow with the increased reliance of colleges and universities on part-time faculty and the diverse student population.

In Chapter II, issues relating to the lack of teacher preparation, teaching experience, teaching effectiveness, and faculty development at the postsecondary level will be discussed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This study was undertaken to determine the faculty development needs of full-time and part-time faculty related to effective teaching. Another purpose was to determine whether these needs differ between full-time and part-time faculty, between experienced and less experienced faculty, and between full-time and part-time faculty at the main campus versus the satellite campuses of Davenport College, a private, nonprofit institution in Michigan.

The review of literature is organized into four sections:

1. Issues relating to the lack of teacher preparation and teaching experience for full-time and part-time faculty at the postsecondary level.

2. A brief review of related research and studies on the lack of effective teaching at the postsecondary level and the identification of effective teaching.

3. A brief profile of full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and their differences.

4. Issues relating to faculty development at the postsecondary level, including faculty development activities and the socialization of faculty.

5. A brief review of related research and studies on campus expansions, particularly the main campus versus satellite campuses of an institution.

Lack of Preparation and Experience

The lack of teacher preparation and teaching experience for educators at the postsecondary level has long been an area of concern for postsecondary institutions. Research has shown that teaching activities make up a significant portion of the faculty member's duties at the postsecondary level, yet graduate schools do little to prepare graduate students to teach (Cerbin, 1993). Fink (1992) explained the problem as follows:

> . . . It seems unrealistic to expect that new faculty members will know everything necessary to fulfill their responsibilities effectively. . . . Graduate schools have not accepted any significant level of responsibility for the fuller preparation of those graduate students who intend to enter the academic profession. (p. 39)

With no formal requirements for the preparation of faculty to teach at the postsecondary level, the lack of teaching experience has been shown to be a major source of problems for the novice faculty member (Boice, 1991; Weimer, 1990; Whitt, 1991). The problems that result from this lack of experience are illustrated in the following statement made in 1912 by a member of the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education:

> The common practice of placing an inexperienced teacher in charge of a class and permitting him to drift until, by chance in the course of years, he discovers his inefficiency, is wrong to the individual, the student, and the institution. (Eble, 1971, p. 19)

Issues of Preparation

More than 20 years ago, Eble (1971) recognized the need to provide some type of teacher preparation for faculty at the postsecondary level when he asked, "With little or no attention to teaching in the graduate school, where does a college professor acquire skill as a teacher?" (p. 17). The Commission on Undergraduate Education in the Biological Sciences (cited in Eble, 1971) made the following recommendation: "The university is the only place where future teachers in universities and in colleges of all types can learn to teach undergraduates. If the job is not done by the universities, it is not done" (p. 18).

In a recent study, Whitt (1991) found new faculty members experienced a great deal of frustration as a result of not only their lack of teacher preparation but also the expectation by their employing institution that they are prepared to teach. This frustration is illustrated in the following comment by a new faculty member: "It doesn't make sense for [this university] to produce doctoral students who haven't been intentionally trained to be faculty, but then think that our sister institutions are producing students who are trained to do that" (Whitt, 1991, p. 186).

Boice (1991) found that new and junior faculty simply "were not confident that they knew how to teach" (p. 155). Weimer (1990) explained that the teaching frustrations experienced by faculty are not due to their lack of content knowledge, but rather their lack of pedagogical knowledge. She said that this results in a lack of effective teaching by many faculty members simply "because they really do not

know how to teach otherwise" (1991, p. 28). Weimer (1990) believed that it is the tendency of higher education to focus on content rather than the teaching abilities of their faculty.

Zemsky (1992) illustrated the effect of the lack of preparation of faculty in stating, "The faculty member who teaches badly does a disservice not just to the student but to the quality of the department and ultimately of the institution" (p. 6a). There is a need to make an investment in instruction, to change the attitudes of faculty to account for their instructional deficiencies, and for faculty collectively to take greater responsibility for their students' learning (Zemsky, 1992).

Current training practices. According to Cerbin (1993), "teaching is viewed as hard but simple work that instructors should be able to figure out how to do on their own" (p. 1). Teaching-assistant programs are typically the only form of teacher preparation available for graduate students preparing for an academic career. However, Boice (1991) found in his study of new and junior faculty that this group had "minimal experience as classroom teachers during graduate school" (p. 152), with fewer still reporting any systematic teacher training whatsoever. Fink (1992) found it to be common for orientation programs for new faculty to be the only training provided to prepare these people to be teachers.

A national study to determine the extent of training provided by colleges and universities for teaching assistants found that only 25% of the institutions surveyed that used teaching assistants provided them with any type of training, and only 13% required the training of their teaching assistants (Rhem, 1991, p.

10). Cerbin (1993) indicated the need for more extensive and formal preparation of college-level teachers and predicted that someday there will be postsecondary institutions that will provide such training.

Eble (1970) pointed out the common misconceptions surrounding the preparation of faculty and effective teaching as follows:

> . . . that the Ph.D. is a license to teach; that scholarly assiduity ensures good teaching or makes up for bad; that the popular teacher can't be profound and the profound one popular; that teaching can't be taught; and that, however deficient a professor may appear, he will turn out to be, for some student, some time, a superior teacher. (p. 3)

Issues of Experience

It has been estimated that 30,000 to 40,000 new full-time faculty (with the vast majority of these being new and junior faculty) are being hired each year at institutions of higher education (Fink, 1992). In addition, 11,000 to 20,000 part-time, adjunct faculty are also being hired each year in America (Fink, 1992). Given their lack of teacher preparation and teaching experience, these new faculty members encounter many problems and challenges during their first years of teaching.

Studies of faculty at the postsecondary level have been conducted to determine the problems and challenges new and junior faculty are faced with, and comparisons have been drawn between these less experienced faculty and the more experienced senior faculty in regard to teaching abilities and performance. What constitutes an experienced teacher is difficult to define, however. No prescribed number of courses taught or amount of time served in the classroom

has been identified as producing an experienced faculty member. Various studies have indicated that the first one to three years of teaching are the typical length of time necessary to develop as a teacher and gain the necessary experience (Baldwin, 1979; Boice, 1991). For example, Boice (1991) found in his work on new faculty that it is during the first two years of teaching in which the inexperienced teacher "shows a surprisingly slow pattern of establishing comfort and student approval, of moving beyond defensive strategies including overpreparation of lecture content, and of looking for supports in improving teaching" (p. 150). Baldwin (1979) indicated that it is during the first one to three years of teaching that faculty experience a lack of confidence in their teaching abilities, which is one of the main causes of stress for the inexperienced new and junior faculty.

Teaching problems. One of the most common problems for new and junior faculty is teaching-related problems due to their lack of teaching experience (Boice, 1991; Whitt, 1991). In his study of new faculty in the late 1970s, Fink (cited in Finkelstein & LaCelle-Peterson, 1992) found that "new faculty were often overwhelmed by their teaching responsibilities" (p. 11) but expressed the desire to teach well. New faculty in one study described their enthusiasm and enjoyment of teaching as their greatest strength and their lack of experience as their greatest weakness (van der Bogert, 1991). Baldwin (1979) found that those faculty with little or no teaching experience characterized their first years as faculty as consisting of high levels of stress and low levels of job satisfaction.

Teaching, by definition, is considered a communal activity, according to Austin and Baldwin (1991), but it "is commonly understood as highly autonomous, with the individual in complete control and totally responsible for the success or failure of what goes on in the classroom" (p. 7). Whitt (1991) explained that the institutional expectation for new and junior faculty is to "hit the ground running," making the challenge for these faculty not only to survive but to excel in their first years of teaching (Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992). In his research, Boice (1991) found that new faculty had discovered teaching to be more demanding than they expected and had little, if any, idea of how to improve their teaching effectiveness.

Teaching-related problems for less experienced faculty were compounded in Boice's (1991) study, where "no new faculty were in departments where colleagues met occasionally to discuss teaching" (p. 155). According to Boice, fewer than 5% of new faculty could identify any sort of social network for discussing teaching during their first semester's teaching. New faculty tend to find consolation only with other new faculty; "it's like the blind leading the blind," with good teaching consisting of little more than content and enthusiasm (Boice, 1991, p. 163).

Overall, new faculty thought senior faculty possessed the attitude that the best new faculty will figure out what they need to know on their own (Boice, 1991). Whitt (1991) also found new faculty to be frustrated at "being expected to already know everything an effective faculty member" needs to know (p. 186).

Teaching differences. According to Finkelstein and LaCelle-Peterson (1992), new and junior faculty work differently than do their more experienced colleagues. Studies by Boice (1991) and van der Bogert (1991) indicated that new faculty spent a much greater amount of time on teaching than senior faculty, which, in turn, contributed to increased frustration with the demands of teaching. According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (cited in Finkelstein & LaCelle-Peterson, 1992), new faculty are also "more likely to experience severe time constraints" than are senior faculty (p. 10).

New faculty "are generally less satisfied overall than are senior faculty," according to Finkelstein and LaCelle-Peterson (1992, p. 10). Issues concerning the lack of collegiality for new faculty are also a major area of dissatisfaction (Boice, 1991). Senior faculty tend to work more independently, whereas less experienced faculty look for assistance from the more experienced faculty (Baldwin, 1979). Sorcinelli (1992) found new faculty to be "surprisingly passive about taking the initiative in interacting with colleagues. . . . They rarely sought help, advice, or mentoring" (p. 31).

Researchers on faculty teaching styles also have found differences between experienced and less experienced faculty. As Fink (cited in Finkelstein & LaCelle-Peterson, 1992) found, "new faculty were often overwhelmed by their teaching responsibilities," which resulted in the lack of time to reflect on their teaching (p. 11). In his research, Boice (1991) found that new faculty taught primarily by lecturing, with most of them overpreparing for lectures. Another

researcher found that 83% of inexperienced new faculty described their teaching style as "lecturer/interactive," and none reported using a "facilitator/class discussion" style of teaching (van der Bogert, 1991). Only 25% of experienced faculty described their teaching style as "lecturer/interactive," whereas 25% reported using a "facilitator/class discussion" style of teaching.

In a longitudinal study of new faculty for the first five years of their appointment, Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992) found that as new faculty gained teaching experience they were able to spend less time on teaching. "The reduction in teaching time appeared to reflect greater efficiency in lecture preparation and grading with experience" (p. 16). The decline in the number of new courses taught also contributed to the decrease in time spent on teaching activities, where "only 40 percent of faculty reported new teaching preparations, as compared to nearly 100 percent in year one" (p. 16).

Summary

Because most faculty spend most of their time in teaching-related activities, it seems that the majority of their studies and preparation for an academic career should involve teaching. Instead, there are no requirements for faculty at this level to be formally prepared as teachers. Formal studies and credentials gained by most faculty focus on content. Some career academics gain some teaching experience as teaching assistants in graduate school, but overall, the current system consists of a trial-and-error, on-the-job training approach to learning how to teach effectively.

As a result of this lack of teacher preparation, new faculty, both full-time and part-time, often feel overwhelmed by the reality of their lack of preparation and teaching experience when they first begin teaching (Boice, 1991; Fink, 1992; Whitt, 1991; Zemsky, 1992). Often unexpected, the frustrations and problems connected with their teaching responsibilities and lack of effectiveness are compounded by feelings of isolation and a sense of not knowing how to improve their teaching (Boice, 1991). Such experiences for new and junior faculty are typical and all too well accepted by their more experienced colleagues and the employing institution. Meanwhile, the result of the lack of teacher preparation and teaching experience for faculty has a detrimental effect on the individual faculty member, his or her students, and the reputation of the institution.

Bok (1992) pointed out that it is a "lack of effort to examine the effectiveness of our educational programs--to really find out which methods of teaching work well and which do not" (p. 18) that has resulted in the teaching profession's becoming one of the few professions that has not improved significantly from one generation to the next. Cross (1987), in explaining the problems and challenges of teaching, also pointed out that little progress has been made in the advancement of knowledge in the teaching profession.

Lack of Effective Teaching

Teachers at all levels are experiencing the problems and accusations that are calling into question their teaching competence (AAHE, 1991; Beck, Seifert, & Smith, 1984). Studies have shown that most college and university faculty

spend the majority of their time in teaching-related activities (Rice, 1986), making the need to improve teaching effectiveness a crucial issue. Derek Bok (1992), president emeritus of Harvard University, explained how the incentives in today's colleges and universities "are not weighted in favor of teaching and education--indeed, quite the contrary is true" (p. 16).

Student complaints concerning faculty most often focus on teaching (Gaff & Wilson, 1971). As far back as 1949, Paul Klapper, president emeritus of Queens College, reported a need for the improvement of teaching at the postsecondary level (Eble, 1970). Upon completion of his examination of undergraduate instruction, Klapper made two recommendations: "(1) the need for better preparation of graduate students as teachers, and (2) effective in-service programs for improving the quality of instruction" (Eble, 1970, p. 2).

Identifying Effective Teaching

Since the 1930s, research has been conducted to identify the components of effective instruction. What has resulted is a list of abstract characteristics that lack tangible form and vary from one individual to another (Weimer, 1990). Part of the problem is that defining or evaluating competence in teaching is difficult to do (Hodgkinson, 1970). Brown (1975) illustrated the problem with evaluating good teaching in stating, "Good teaching is a direct function of the judges' value systems . . . and judges do not always agree" (p. 10).

Dill (1990) defined effective teaching as "a product of a complex multivariate equation including knowledge about pedagogy, knowledge about

subject matter, and knowledge about the student" (p. 12). Dill stated that "a knowledge base now exists as a foundation for both teacher preparation and teacher assessment" (p. 11). However, it is the abstract nature and individuality of teaching that makes it difficult to prescribe a specific set of skills that would guarantee effective teaching (Boyer, 1990; Eble, 1970; Tobin & Fraser, 1991).

According to Seldin (1991), "more than 10,000 studies have been published on one phase or another of teaching effectiveness" (p. 1). Other findings concerning effective teaching "suggest that exemplary teaching is in the eye of the beholder" (Tobin & Fraser, 1991, p. 231). Classroom research is highly subjective, and many aspects of teaching are abstract. Eble (1970) described teaching as a great art, "a silent, secret art" (p. 3).

Miller (1974) stated that "the teaching-learning process is too complex to be captured by any set of words (p. 33). Shulman (1987) explained this abstract nature of teaching in stating that "teachers themselves have difficulty in articulating what they know and how they know it" (p. 6). Boyer believed that some skills can be taught in the traditional sense, but "working with master teachers in the classroom" may develop some "skills more effectively" (Dill, 1990, p. 6).

According to Pratt, effective teaching is difficult to define because of its contextual nature (Brookfield, 1991). What works in one situation with one group of students may not work in another context. Brookfield also explained how effective teaching is value laden, based on certain judgments and interpretations.

A student's perception of what is happening in the classroom may vary greatly from other students' perceptions or the teacher's own perception. Weimer (1990) pointed out that teaching styles vary from one individual to another, with effective instructors using "widely different techniques and strategies" (p. 5).

A review of Barr's (1961) studies on teacher effectiveness found some of the teachers were preferred by administrators, some were liked by students, and some taught classes in which there were substantial student gains, but in most cases, these were not the same teachers (Brown, 1975). Studies on the evaluation of teaching also have found such disparities. Stone and Morris (1972) found little agreement on the important criteria of teaching "in their survey of the assessment of teaching practice in over 120 institutions" (Brown, 1975, p. 10). In the end, however, the ultimate measurement of effective teaching is student learning (Brookfield, 1991; Ericksen, 1984; Hayes, 1989).

Knowledge base for teaching. Although teaching is one of the oldest professions, "it is devoid of a history of practice" (Shulman, 1987, p. 12). Lortie (1975) also pointed out that there are no historical records "crystallizing" the teaching process as there are in other professions. Overall, models of pedagogical excellence are rare (Shulman, 1987). The existing knowledge base for teaching "does not say what teachers should know, do, understand, or profess" (Shulman, 1987, p. 4). Shulman believed there exists an elaborate knowledge base of teaching for which "much, if not most . . . remains to be discovered, invented, and refined" (p. 12).

The four major sources for the teaching knowledge base according to Shulman (1987) are (a) scholarship in content disciplines, (b) educational materials and structures, (c) formal educational scholarship, and (d) the wisdom of practice. Growth in teacher knowledge has been slow because it has been "conducted without an audience of peers" and without "a system of notation and memory" (Shulman, 1987, p. 12). The systematic study of teaching is a new endeavor in which such research as the study of gifted teachers to establish standards of practice is just beginning to take place. In such a study, Tobin and Fraser (1991) found the investigations of exemplary teachers "led to the development of rich descriptions of teaching and learning and of models for what teachers do and why they do what they do" (p. 235).

Shulman's (1987) categories of required knowledge for teaching "content knowledge," "general pedagogical knowledge," and "knowledge of learners and their characteristics" (p. 8) are similar to what Knox identified as the three categories of knowledge that an adult educator should possess: "knowledge of content, knowledge of learners, and knowledge of methods" (Galbraith, 1990, p. 4). Boyer also identified "three components of outstanding teachers: their powers of expression and abilities to relate to students, their abilities to assess the nuances of student potential, and their skills in coaching" (Dill, 1990, p. 12). Seldin (1991) explained how the findings from research on teaching have suggested that effective teachers are not only "masters of their subject," but also must possess what is referred to as "pedagogical content-knowledge" (p. 1).

Shulman (1987) explained that pedagogical content knowledge is a special blend of "content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers" (p. 8). Edgerton (1989) concurred with Shulman's findings, stating that "teaching is highly context specific" (Seldin, 1991, p. 2). Grossman (1991) also indicated the significance of pedagogical content knowledge and suggested "the logical link between courses on subject-specific methods and the acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge" (p. 211). Dill (1990) also recognized a relationship between a "teacher's knowledge of subject matter and a teacher's techniques of pedagogy" (p. 13) and the need to know more about these relationships within specific fields of study.

Shulman (1987) identified the three major elements of effective teaching as content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and knowledge of learners and their characteristics. Grossman (1991) also indicated that "what teachers know about their content and about how to teach that content [pedagogical content knowledge] is central to instructional practice" (p. 211). Grossman explained pedagogical content knowledge as not only the knowledge of instructional strategies, but also the knowledge of students and of learning. A further explanation by Shulman of these elements of effective teaching and how they interact is illustrated in the following statement:

> . . . The key to distinguishing the knowledge base of teaching lies at the intersection of content and pedagogy, in the capacity of a teacher to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students. (p. 15)

In his work, Shulman (1987) outlined a model of pedagogical reasoning and action to illustrate the teaching process. The sequence of steps in his model is as follows: comprehension, transformation, instruction, evaluation, reflection, and new comprehensions. Through the study and understanding of the teaching process via the understanding of the knowledge base of teaching, the sources for that knowledge, and the complexities of the pedagogical process, effective teachers are more likely to emerge (Shulman, 1987).

Characteristics of effective teaching. Numerous studies have been conducted since 1930 in an attempt to identify the skills or characteristics of effective teaching (Weimer, 1990). According to Brookfield (1991), "one of the characteristics students value the most in their teachers is authenticity" (p. 205). Eble (1984) explained the center of teaching to be the interaction between the learner and the teacher. Brookfield (1991) believed the most crucial emotional interaction between teachers and students is that of building trust. Weimer (1991) stated that "empirical inquiries into the nature of effective instruction repeatedly result in lists of characteristics or dimensions" (p. 4). From such research, two things have been determined: First, one of the most frequently identified characteristics of effective instruction is enthusiasm. Second, good teachers are not born; the components of effective instruction are acquirable skills (Weimer, 1990).

Sherman and others (1987) developed a list of the characteristics attributed to excellent teachers, based on a large collection of studies. The five

characteristics that were most consistently attributed to excellent instructors were "enthusiasm, clarity, preparation/organization, ability to stimulate, and knowledge (implying both content competence and love of the subject matter)" (Weimer, 1990b, p. 13). In their research, Musella and Rusch (1968) found that "instructor enthusiasm and involvement in the content may be more important than the factual knowledge of it" (Weimer, 1991, p. 4).

In interviews with distinguished teachers, Beidler (1986) found a variety of characteristics, skills, and abilities among these professors that they noted had been critical in their success. A few of those mentioned are: to know your students; to respect students; to be honest, humane, and flexible; to keep learning; to move about the classroom; and to center teaching on the student. In his book on teaching, Brookfield (1991) also included his version of the skills and abilities that characterize skillful teaching. Some of those mentioned were: expect ambiguity, remember that perfection is impossible, attend to how students learn, trust your instincts, talk to your colleagues, create diversity, and take risks.

Following an analysis of 31 studies in which students and faculty specified the instructional characteristics they considered to be particularly important to good teaching and effective instruction, Feldman (1988) compiled the following list of the 22 most frequently cited characteristics:

1. Teacher's knowledge of the subject.
2. Teacher's enthusiasm (for subject or for teaching).
3. Teacher's sensitivity to, and concern with, class level and progress.

4. Teacher's preparation; organization of the course.

5. Clarity and understandableness.

6. Intellectual challenge and encouragement of independent thought (by the teacher and the course).

7. Instructor's fairness; impartiality of evaluation of students; quality of examinations.

8. Teacher motivates students to do their best; high standards of performance required.

9. Teacher's availability and helpfulness.

10. Teacher's concern and respect for students; friendliness of the teacher.

11. Nature and value of the course material (including its usefulness and relevance).

12. Teacher's encouragement of questions and discussion, and openness to opinions of others.

13. Teacher's stimulation of interest in the course and its subject matter.

14. Teacher's intellectual expansiveness (and intelligence).

15. Perceived outcome or impact of instruction.

16. Teacher's encouragement of self-initiated learning.

17. Nature, quality, and frequency of feedback from the teacher to students.

18. Clarity of course objectives and requirements.

19. Teacher's elocutionary skills.

20. Nature and usefulness of supplementary materials and teaching aids.

21. Personality characteristics ("personality") of the instructor.

22. Teacher's productivity in research and related activities. (pp. 303-309)

Sherman and others (1987) indicated that such lists have been generated since the 1930s by research into the components of effective teaching and contain the same basic characteristics. Weimer (1990b) explained that even though we know what makes teaching good, the "dilemma is that we have hundreds of answers" (p. 13). Weimer (1991) explained that "research has done a good job of identifying the general elements of effective instruction. It has done less well clarifying their relationship to each other" (p. 7).

Weimer (1990a) explained that some of the difficulty in acquiring the skills of good teachers derives from the fact that these characteristics are highly abstract. The idea that teaching is a gift some are born with is a fallacy; we know from the research that teaching can be taught.

Some studies have suggested that certain characteristics like instructor enthusiasm and involvement in the content "may be more important than the factual knowledge" (Weimer, 1991, p. 4). In her research on the improvement of teaching, Weimer stated, "to know the content is not enough" (p. 4). The mistake most faculty make when teaching is not going well is to assume their content knowledge is lacking. In a survey of college students, in which they were asked to rate a list of ways college teaching could be improved, Weimer found that the improvement of content knowledge was rated last.

Galbraith (1990) outlined the necessary skills and attributes of an effective adult educator as follows:

> Acquiring technical proficiency in a content area is not enough, nor is just having a friendly personality and a wealth of interpersonal and human relation skills. The literature indicates that an adult educator must play many different roles, must have an understanding of adult learners, must be knowledgeable in the content area, must be technically proficient, must utilize a variety of instructional methods and formats, must understand principles of effective practice, and must possess interpersonal and human relation skills that enhance the teaching and learning transaction. (p. 7)

Based on their observations of exemplary teachers, Tobin and Fraser (1991) found a great diversity of teaching approaches. In a 1968 study, Crawford and Bradshaw asked students to "describe their most effective college teacher" (Miller, 1974, p. 31). The four characteristics of effective teachers most frequently mentioned by students were "thorough knowledge of subject matter; well-planned and organized lectures; enthusiastic, energetic, lively interest in teaching; and student-oriented, friendly, willing to help students" (p. 31).

In an interview with a group of award-winning professors, questions were asked concerning their views on teaching (Beidler, 1986). In a summary of their advice on teaching, Beidler found "the most consistent piece of advice given was to center teaching on the student" (p. 77). Beidler found little agreement in the overall responses of the professors, "aside from the two large pieces of advice--showing concern for students and being utterly honest and open in dealings with them" (p. 80). Beidler summarized the remaining advice relating to a variety of skills and characteristics such as flexibility, to keep learning, to move about the classroom, to be energized, to prepare carefully, and to have faith in the greatness of teaching as a vocation.

Brookfield (1991) warned against standardized models and approaches for effective teaching because of the complex processes and contextual nature of teaching. He wrote, "Sometimes what most hinders students' learning is a teacher's determination to behave according to some well-defined notion of effectiveness" (p. 193). Teachers and learners are complex individuals, making it impossible for any one model of practice to be applicable in all settings. Brookfield explained how "a lot of fruitless time and energy can be spent trying to find the holy grail of pedagogy, the one way to instructional enlightenment" (p. 197).

Summary

The complexities and subjectivity of the teaching process contribute to the lack of effective teaching at the postsecondary level. Student complaints continue to focus on effective teaching (Gaff & Wilson, 1971). However, more recent trends show an increasing concern with effective teaching by faculty as well as the employing institution (AAHE, 1991; Zemsky, 1992). Teaching is an acquirable skill, but no matter what amount of research has been and continues to be conducted on effective teaching, a single model of how an individual can best teach cannot be identified because of the abstract and individualistic nature of teaching (Shulman, 1987; Tobin & Fraser, 1991).

Boyer (1990) explained that those who teach must be knowledgeable about their fields, but it is the successful use of pedagogical procedures that not only transmits, but extends, the knowledge to the learners. "Without the teaching

function, the continuity of knowledge will be broken and the store of human knowledge dangerously diminished" (Boyer, 1990, p. 24). Until teaching is accepted as authentic scholarship, as a "complex, problematic, intellectually challenging, and creative work," it will not be taken seriously nor will faculty be "drawn to teaching for the same reasons they are drawn to scholarship and research" (Cerbin, 1993, p. 1).

Profile of Faculty

According to Gappa and Leslie (1993), the context of the academic career has been one of rapid change. Currently, the profession is facing economic hardships as well as major demographic changes. Projections for the 1990s include "the prospect of dramatically increasing enrollments, prospective retirements of large cohorts of senior faculty in a short period of time, the wearing out of infrastructures, and a host of other problems" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 1).

An increasing dependence on part-time and temporary faculty has also became a way of life for many institutions. Lombardi (1976) and Yang and Zak (1981) estimated that part-time faculty can be used at "between 50 and 80 percent of the direct cost of comparable instruction by full-time faculty" (Gappa, 1984a, p. 4). If institutions can "reduce their instructional costs by hiring part-timers without paying fringe benefits, this creates an incentive for them to increase the proportion of part-timers on their payrolls" (Tuckman & Vogler, 1978, p. 73). In the end, part-timers conserve institutional dollars and "constitute a valuable source of contingent labor in periods of unstable enrollments and shifting

program demand" (Gappa, 1984a, p. 4). What has resulted, however, is an academic profession that has become undeniably divided into two faculties: the tenured "haves" and the temporary, part-time "have-nots" (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; National Education Association, 1988).

Current predictions forecast a shortage of qualified persons to fill vacant faculty positions beginning in the year 2000 (Tack & Patitu, 1992). Tack and Patitu indicated that current faculty are becoming dissatisfied with their career choice due to lagging salaries (behind those of other professions), combined with the lack of status of the teaching profession.

Full-Time Faculty

The U.S. Department of Education statistics showed 356,350 "regular full-time" faculty employed during 1987. According to projections by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), by 1995 there will be 431,000 full-time faculty employed by American colleges and universities. Fink (1992) estimated that 30,000 to 40,000 new full-time faculty (with the vast majority of these being new and junior faculty) are hired each year by institutions of higher education.

According to Leslie (1978), full-time faculty members work approximately 50 hours per week (Gappa, 1984a). Their two most important activities are teaching and research (Tack & Patitu, 1992). However, there are many roles and responsibilities of full-time faculty members, and, as a result, many factors that can contribute to their satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Tack and Patitu identified several major factors as "salary, tenure, rank, supervision, interpersonal

relationships, working conditions, policies and administration, person-environment fit, and collective bargaining" (p. 31).

Eble and McKeachie (1985) warned against generalizations about the entire group of full-time faculty. However, from their analysis of the data gathered on full-time faculty employed at those institutions participating in the Bush Foundation Faculty Development Program, they were able to determine some general characteristics of this group. Their overall consensus is as follows:

> The generalized picture that accompanied most proposals was that of an aging, stable faculty with reduced chance for mobility. At the majority of these institutions it also revealed low salaries, heavy teaching loads, and limited opportunities for professional growth. Despite this, . . . faculty morale was high. (p. 162)

The median age of full-time faculty among all participating institutions was in the mid-40s, with male faculty far outnumbering female faculty with few exceptions (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). In the small private colleges the average length of service for full-time faculty was ten years, with turnover rates of only 6% annually (p. 160). "In the smaller schools, 25% to 30% may hold such degrees [Ph.D. or equivalent degrees]; among the selective private colleges and the large public universities, the figure approaches 75 percent" (p. 160). Salaries were lowest among the small denominational colleges, and teaching loads for most institutions seemed to be inversely related to salaries. A typical teaching load for full-time faculty in private colleges was three courses per term.

The Carnegie Foundation's research in 1989 involving more than 5,000 faculty from all types of postsecondary institutions identified three issues that

define the optimisms and concerns of faculty. The first of these issues related to academic quality, with faculty indicating a commitment to liberal learning. The second issue related to teaching and research, where more than 70% of the faculty stated that their interests lay in teaching; a significant percentage also stated that "teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion" (p. xix). The third issue related to how faculty felt about their employing institution; more than 90% said their institution was a "very good" or "fairly good" place to work (p. xx).

Part-Time Faculty

Gappa (1984a) defined part-time faculty as "anyone who (1) teaches less than the average full-time teaching load, or (2) has less than a full-time faculty assignment and range of duties, or (3) may have a temporary full-time assignment" (p. 5). Gappa estimated that part-time faculty carry about 15% of the total teaching load, "and some work full time by teaching at two or three different schools" (p. 1). In one study it was found that part-time faculty taught as many as 28% of all undergraduate courses and 21% of all graduate-level courses (Gappa, 1984a). According to a study conducted by Tuckman and Vogler (1978), part-time faculty spent an average of 17.5 hours per week on activities related to their part-time teaching.

According to the NCES (1989), approximately 270,000 part-time faculty are teaching in colleges and universities. Part-time faculty represent between 35% and 38% of all faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). According to Gappa and Leslie,

these individuals "remain [a] largely unrecognized, underrewarded, and invisible part of the academic profession" (p. 2).

Little research has been conducted on part-time faculty, and information on this group is scarce, according to Gappa (1984a). Part of the problem is the identification of a standard definition of what constitutes a part-time teacher, making even a precise count of part-time faculty impossible. Gappa stated that "no aspect of higher education has been more neglected than part-time teaching, and as a result virtually all the available statistics are out of date" (p. 2). What data are available "are not comparable or compatible," and "community colleges are disproportionately represented in the literature" (p. 2).

Fink (1992) estimated that 11,000 to 20,000 part-time faculty are being hired each year in America's colleges and universities. Gappa (1984a) estimated that "nearly one in every three faculty is employed part time" (p. 1). Just how significant their presence has been and continues to be within higher education cannot be clearly defined because so little research or evaluation is done on part-time faculty (Gappa, 1984a).

Many part-time faculty are fully employed elsewhere in business and industry. Whatever the number of hours worked or courses taught, part-time faculty play an important role and have a significant influence on "the quality and relevance of instructional programs" (Gappa, 1984a, p. 1). According to Gappa, "the full-time, campus-based faculty member has been the predominant figure in American higher education" (p. 3). After World War II, the number of part-time

faculty greatly increased due to the rapid growth in all areas of higher education during this period. Financial stresses experienced by higher education during the 1970s led to the enhancement, "in the eyes of administrators," of "the value of the part-time teacher" (p. 3). Still, with low pay and few if any benefits, the number of Ph.D.'s who were "unable to find full-time academic employment . . . settled for part-time positions . . . if only because to do so confirmed their professional status" (p. 4).

Problems concerning part-time faculty. Gappa (1984a) highlighted six problem areas concerning part-time faculty that require improvement, such as the qualifications of part-time faculty, the integration of part-time and full-time faculty, the compensation structure, job security, the need for special programs to assist in their development, and increasing the support services available to part-time faculty.

In particular, Gappa (1984a) explained how "the lack of office space and support services was one of the most persistent sources of frustration and anger found in the interviews with part-time faculty" (p. 4). Tuckman and Vogler (1978) pointed out the problems caused by the lack of office space for part-timers, such as limited access to students and the tendency to "reinforce the inability of part-timers to interact with other faculty" (p. 74). However, Tuckman and Vogler found that 78% of the part-time faculty in their study "believed that the facilities available to them were adequate" (p. 74).

The integration of part-time faculty into the instructional design of the institution is crucial, according to Parsons (1980). Part-time faculty are hired for their subject-matter expertise and are not as well prepared in the instructional process as full-time faculty (Parsons, 1980). A needs-assessment study conducted at 35 two-year colleges found that faculty development activities for part-time faculty were the number one concern of all participating institutions (Parsons, 1980). According to Fink (1992), part-time faculty "are not career academics" (p. 45). As a result, they are not professionally prepared to teach, having little or no formal preparation or prior teaching experience. According to Friedlander (1979), "part-time teachers have less teaching experience, use less media support instruction, require less reading of their students, and are less involved in educationally related activities than are their full-time colleagues" (Parsons, 1980, p. 48).

Leslie and Associates (cited in Gappa, 1984a) found that 52% of the institutions they studied hired part-time faculty primarily on the basis of enrollment. As a result, their appointments were very tenuous, dependent on minimum enrollment standards and guarantees of full-time faculty loads. Leslie and Associates found that 75% of the institutions had "bumping" policies to guarantee full-time faculty teaching assignments. It was therefore not unusual for part-timers to receive their teaching assignments just "a few days before (or even after) a semester or term begins" (Gappa, 1984a, p. 4). Such practices make it

difficult for part-time faculty to have adequate time to prepare and develop appropriate teaching materials.

Keller (1983) explained that the acquisition of part-time faculty by four-year colleges and universities gave them the flexibility to "quickly mount new programs and update established ones . . . while limiting the involvement of expensive regular faculty" (Gappa, 1984a). The typical institutional attitude toward part-time faculty is as follows: "Colleges and universities have been content, by and large, to pay them poorly, use them as needed with little concern for their long-term welfare, and keep them outside traditional academic governance" (Gappa, 1984a, p. 1).

Three major salary patterns exist for part-time faculty, according to Gappa (1984a): (a) hourly rate, based on in-class hours; (b) semester rate, based on credit hours or contact hours; and (c) pro rata schedule, based on a fraction of full-time faculty members' current salaries. Their compensation per course is usually one-half to four-fifths the amount paid to full-time faculty on a yearly salary regardless of what method of compensation is being used (Gappa, 1984a). "The department which hires a part-timer is purchasing teaching services and little else" (Tuckman & Vogler, 1978).

According to Tuckman and Vogler (1978), part-timers not only teach "at a per course rate less than that paid to full-time faculty" but also "receive fewer fringe benefits" (p. 71). Gappa (1984a) stated that "part-time faculty are paid 25 to 35 percent less than full-time faculty" (p. 75). Nontenured, nonpermanent, with

little or no job security, part-timers' motivation to continue teaching can be attributed to the "other rewards they associate with teaching" (Gappa, 1984a, p. 1). However, part-time faculty typically are not required to engage in activities other than teaching which are required of full-time faculty (Tuckman & Vogler, 1978). From their research on part-time faculty, Tuckman and Vogler also found the following to be typical regarding part-time faculty:

> . . . Part-timers are often not as well credentialed as full-timers, sometimes are not as abreast of the literature in their field, and almost always have less awareness of the policies and directions of the departments that hire them than their full-time colleagues. They also offer comparatively few services to students beyond those provided during the classroom period, and they contribute little to the national reputation of their employing department. (p. 72)

As a result of such disparities, part-timers have been found to be resentful and frustrated; yet, rarely complaining, they are satisfied enough to continue (Gappa, 1984a). Tuckman and Vogler (1978) also found that "more part-timers in our study reported that they were satisfied than were dissatisfied" (p. 77).

Albert and Watson (1980) indicated that the use of part-time faculty has a definite influence on the educational process. With the obligation of colleges and universities to provide quality learning environments while staying within budgetary constraints, "the use of part-time faculty is one of the most potentially volatile issues in higher education today" (p. 73). The increasing use of part-time faculty "has led to considerable criticism of the trend on pedagogical, financial, and legal levels" (Albert & Watson, 1980, p. 74). Full-time faculty tend to think the use of part-time faculty is a trade-off between quality and financial savings,

according to Gappa (1984a). Although full-time faculty look on part-time faculty as less qualified, studies comparing their effectiveness are not cited (Gappa, 1984). These attitudes contribute to the notion that part-time faculty should earn less because of these supposed deficiencies (Mayhew, 1979). Tuckman and Vogler (1978) found that although "part-timers may consider themselves properly credentialed for what they do, they nonetheless are less well credentialed than their full-time counterparts" (p. 74).

Only two national surveys have been conducted on part-time faculty. In one of those surveys, the following conclusions were drawn:

> Full-time faculty and their organizations worry about their waning power implied by use of a more temporary workforce. Quality control is a focus of concern for all sides. And the swelling ranks of part-time faculty express anger and frustration over their treatment as outsiders. (Leslie, Kellams, & Gunne, 1982, pp. 1-2)

Differences Between Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty

Perhaps the most significant differences between full-time and part-time faculty relate to employment practices. The treatment and support provided to part-time faculty by their employing institution are hardly comparable to those of full-time faculty. However, differences in teaching-related areas such as teaching experiences and instructional practices have been found to exist between full-time and part-time faculty, according to Friedlander (1980). The extent to which part-time faculty are prepared to teach and other developmental needs are different from those of the full-time, career academician.

With the growing numbers of part-time faculty in institutions of higher education, many have indicated concern for the quality of instruction provided by part-time faculty. Friedlander (1980) pointed out that "few, if any, studies have been conducted to determine whether, in general, students who enroll in courses taught by adjunct faculty receive instruction inferior to that offered by full-time instructors" (p. 28). In one such study it was found that "the quality of instruction provided by a college is likely to be adversely affected as the proportion of part-time to full-time faculty increases" (Friedlander, 1980, p. 35).

In his study, Friedlander (1980) used data obtained from various nationwide surveys and research studies on full-time and part-time instructors at two-year colleges. Findings on teaching experience were that "the full-time faculty had much more teaching experience than the part-time staff" (p. 29). Ninety percent of the full-time faculty had three or more years of teaching experience, compared to 55% of the part-time faculty. Four percent of the full-time faculty had less than one year of teaching experience, compared to 18% of the part-time faculty. Part-timers also were found to differ from full-time faculty when comparing the length of time employed at their current institution. Only 13% of the full-time faculty had taught at their current institution for two years or less, compared to 55% of the part-time faculty. Friedlander summarized his findings on the teaching-related differences between full-time and part-time faculty as follows:

> When compared to their full-time counterparts, part-time instructors were found to have less teaching experience, to have taught fewer years at their

> current institution, and to hold lower academic credentials. . . . [The part-time instructor] had less choice in selection of materials to be used in his course, assigned fewer pages to read, used less instructional media, recommended or required students to attend fewer out-of-class activities, and placed less emphasis on written assignments in determining student grades. . . . Part-timers were less aware of campus activities and events, were less likely to have access to or to use instructional support services, were less likely to have out-of-class contacts with student[s], colleagues, or administrators, and were likely to have less determination of such matters as departmental affairs, course content, curriculum development, and textbook selection. (p. 34)

In terms of professional-development activities, Friedlander (1980) found the following differences between part-time and full-time faculty:

> . . . Part-timers differed from full-timers in that they read fewer scholarly and educational journals, were less likely to hold memberships in professional associations or to attend or participate in professional meetings, and were less likely to express a desire for release time to develop their course or to participate in professional growth programs. (p. 34)

Summary

The problems due to the lack of equitable employment policies and practices relating to the treatment and support of part-time faculty by their employing institutions have resulted in a "second-rate status" for part-timers (Gappa, 1984a). According to Gappa, "part-timers are neither good nor bad for academe in their own right" (p. 3). The status and well-being of part-time faculty, "and especially their teaching performance, should be a matter of high concern to everyone who worries about quality in higher education, from policy makers to students" (Gappa, 1984a, p. 3).

Gappa (1984a) warned that current employment practices concerning part-time faculty can be detrimental to their performance. Gappa's recommendations include the improved status, compensation, and services provided part-time faculty, as well as making the hiring and responsibility for part-timers one of central responsibility rather than departmental. Each institution should develop flexible employment practices that recognize not only the differences between full-time and part-time faculty, but also the different part-time classifications (Gappa, 1984a).

As Parsons (1980) and Friedlander (1980) both indicated, part-time faculty have less teaching experience, and it is the responsibility of the employing institution to determine their needs and how best they can provide part-timers with the necessary skills to become effective teachers. Improvements focusing on teaching effectiveness, such as the development of evaluation systems for part-time faculty, orientation programs, and faculty development programs must be implemented "to help part-time faculty become and remain effective instructors" (Gappa, 1984a, p. 7).

Faculty Development

According to McKeachie (1991), faculty development "emerged as a field in the early 1960's" (p. 1). Higher education has experienced a phenomenal growth in formalized faculty development programs since the middle of the 1970s. Albright (1988) pointed out that the list of terms used to label faculty development activities is lengthy: instructional development, instructional improvement,

professional development, organizational development, and many more. However, "the kinds of services that fall under these rubrics all have one general purpose--enhancing the teaching and learning processes at the institution" (Albright, 1988, p. 3).

Programs and Activities

Wright (1988) identified a common theme for all faculty development programs as "the improvement of the quality of undergraduate education by working with faculty" (p. 13). Weimer (1991) defined instructional development as "the performance of faculty members in the classroom" (p. xv). Confusion among terminologies is common, but what is important is that the service, in one form or another, is being provided (Albright, 1988).

In his research on faculty development programs, Wright (1988) found that "the one consistency is in the variation among them" (p. 13). Wright identified five contextual factors that contribute to the uniqueness of programs from one institution to another: (a) "leadership of key people such as supportive administrators or faculty developers," (b) characteristics of the campus community, (c) local faculty members' influence, (d) "age and historical evolution of faculty development in a given locale," and (e) "availability of resources, financial, human, and informational" (p. 13).

Different approaches are used in providing faculty development activities. Some focus on students, some on curriculum, some on faculty skills and attitudes, and some "are more interested in the environment in which the faculty

member operates" (Albright, 1988, p. 3). As a result of several studies and reviews, a list of effective practices for such programs consists of the following:

* Programs conducted in school settings and linked to schoolwide efforts.

* Teachers participating as helpers to each other and as planners, with administrators, of inservice activities.

* Emphasis on self-instruction, with differentiated training opportunities.

* Teachers in active roles, choosing goals and activities for themselves.

* Emphasis on demonstration, supervised trials, and feedback: training that is concrete and ongoing over time.

* Ongoing assistance and support available on request. (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989, p. 40)

Many institutions fund fully staffed centers devoted to some or all aspects of these various faculty development areas. Diamond (1988) pointed out that the success of such programs "requires the commitment of dedicated and talented faculty working within a supportive environment" (p. 9).

Problems and Needs

Barriers do exist in institutional attempts to improve faculty teaching. According to Weimer (1990), these barriers include the following: (a) faculty resist changing their beliefs and attitudes about teaching, (b) "certain characteristics of the academic profession as a whole impede the process," and (c) certain institutional environments hinder increased instructional effectiveness (p. 3).

These barriers "add up to serious motivational problems and outright resistance to improvement initiatives" (p. 3).

Additional concerns result from the various career stages faculty experience. Baldwin (1979) explained that "the policies and practices of colleges and universities must be flexible enough to accommodate the different vocational situations of professors at successive career stages" (p. 18). Baldwin's findings on faculty development suggest there are times when faculty may be more receptive to developmental activities and opportunities. Finkelstein and LaCelle-Peterson (1992) explained that research has documented the institution's "need to support the work and budding careers of new and junior faculty" (p. 12).

In his research, Baldwin (1979) found that "older faculty are less likely to participate in formal faculty development activities" than are younger faculty (p. 17). Young faculty are typically receptive to assistance by more experienced colleagues, and new faculty are more receptive to faculty development activities, but older faculty tend to have fewer developmental interests and prefer to work more independently.

According to Gaff (1978), the role of faculty development is the improvement of the education of students. To accomplish such a goal, faculty development activities "must involve students more actively" (p. 61). Gaff indicated that "teaching improvement programs have often been launched without careful study of the needs they are to satisfy" (p. 60). Part of this assessment process includes the assessment of student needs. From his research involving

the assessment of faculty by students, Gaff developed a ranked list of the 20 most needed areas of teaching improvements for faculty. Such lists can prove invaluable for targeting faculty development programs. Gaff found that by involving students in faculty development, "teaching improvement programs have considerable potential not only for improving student learning, but also for enhancing their satisfaction with both the instruction they receive and their overall college experience" (p. 65).

Recent findings on teaching effectiveness imply that "teaching improvement efforts should be centered in the departments where professors teach" (Seldin, 1991, p. 2), rather than through faculty development activities or centers that focus on generic methodologies. Dill's (1990) research indicated a need to know more about the relationships of subject-matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge within specific fields of study.

Before training for the improvement of college teaching can occur, "college teachers must be convinced that there is something of value to learn about instruction" (Weimer, 1990, p. 10). "Efforts to enhance faculty performance will be most effective if professors are comfortable with the development techniques employed," according to Baldwin (1979, p. 18). Thus, the institution must have flexibility in order to accommodate the different needs and career stages of its faculty members (Baldwin, 1979).

Research by NCRIPTAL (1988) found some consensus among all types of institutions concerning problems relating to improving teaching and learning.

According to their survey results, "the biggest problems administrators say their institutions face relate to finances, faculty, and students" (p. 6). Zemsky (1992) pointed out that during the 1980s, revenues from tuition increases "went less often to improve teaching and learning," indicating the priorities by which institutions of higher education spend resources (p. 2A).

Baldwin (1979) explained how "older faculty are less likely to participate in formal faculty development activities" than are younger faculty (p. 17). The largest expenses for institutions are facilities and personnel, resulting in serious limitations in funding the facilities and programs necessary for the improvement of teaching and learning (NCRIPTAL, 1988).

Socialization Issues

Feldman (1976) identified three distinct stages of socialization among occupations: (a) anticipatory socialization, comprised of the prior learning necessary for the occupation; (b) accommodation, that period of time when the individual learns what the organization is like and attempts to become a cooperating member; and (c) role management, when the individual needs to mediate and reach resolutions for problems within his or her work group. Lortie (1975) identified three similar basic components he said are found in the system of orientation to all occupations: "(1) formal schooling, (2) mediated entry, and (3) learning-while-doing" (p. 57).

According to Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992), little is known about the socialization or development of faculty during their early years of appointment.

Little research has been conducted on the experiences of "pretenure" faculty relating to specific career tasks, the stresses they experience, and what satisfies and motivates them. Evidence has indicated "a strong positive relationship between professional socialization and long-term satisfaction, commitment, motivation, and productivity" (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992, p. 15).

Fink (1992) referred to the abruptness with which college faculty assume their responsibilities, particularly their teaching responsibilities, as a "sink-or-swim" approach. Although the majority of new faculty have some teaching-assistant experience, according to Fink (1984), "the majority have not had total responsibility for a course. The role of graduate education in facilitating that transition is a critical issue that remains to be addressed" (Finkelstein & LaCelle-Peterson, 1992, p. 12).

Baldwin (1979) found that faculty careers follow an evolutionary path consisting of four major types of critical events: (a) "the process of education and professional socialization"; (b) "early professional employment"; (c) "opportunities for professional growth"; and (d) "status and role changes" (p. 18). Researchers also have identified particular "strengths and weaknesses (interests, knowledge, skills) which are prevalent at different career times" (p. 18). As a result, "different professional experiences and needs characterize college teachers at various career stages" (p. 18).

In their study of new faculty during the first five years of their academic appointments, Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992) found that work-related stress

increased dramatically, overall job satisfaction declined, and the time spent on teaching preparation steadily declined, while teaching became less stressful and more satisfying. They advocated the "need to cultivate the kind of milieu in which an understanding of expectations and professional values can grow" (p. 24).

Faculty cultures. According to Austin (1992), the culture in which faculty work is also an important factor to be considered by sociologists who study higher education. Austin defined culture as "a group's shared values and beliefs" (p. 1). Snow (1964) defined culture as individuals who share "common habits, common assumptions, and a common way of life" (p. 62). "Faculty experience work in different ways" because of the "diverse situations and circumstances" that make up their cultures (Austin, 1992, p. 1). Clark (1984) explained this diversity of cultures as the faculty member's "multiple memberships." Austin (1992) explained this situation as the "four dominant cultures that affect faculty members: the cultures of the disciplines, of the employing university or college, of the national system, and of the scholarly profession" (p. 3).

With multiple memberships comes membership in several cultures, each with "a set of shared values, beliefs, and assumptions," and each with the potential for conflict as a result of the interaction between cultures (Austin, 1992, p. 2). Sorcinelli and Near (1989) also pointed out how "the all-consuming nature of academic work, the difficulty in balancing multiple and complex roles, and the decline of supportive institutional environments" all contribute to faculty discontent (p. 60).

Summary

Many questions still exist for institutions of higher education concerning the development of faculty, such as why faculty members of one institution, subject to the same basic system of incentives and rewards, do not behave or respond to these incentives in the same ways (Lawrence, 1988), or why faculty seldom use services provided for them to improve teaching (NCRIPTAL, 1988). Baldwin (1979) stated that the steady growth of faculty development activities in colleges and universities indicates that a "greater concern has emerged for the general welfare, personal growth, and professional performance of college professors" (p. 13).

Given the lack of formal teacher preparation for faculty at the postsecondary level, faculty development programs provided by the employing institution are perhaps the most crucial and effective way to address the developmental needs of all faculty. Faculty development activities are particularly crucial for part-time faculty. For many part-time faculty, teaching is a secondary activity; as a result, they are not professionally prepared to teach. Their only opportunity to improve teaching may be through the effective design and implementation of faculty development activities at their employing institution.

At the same time, faculty development programs can also have a positive effect on the socialization of faculty, particularly new and part-time faculty, by reducing the stress caused by the pressures of teaching in bringing faculty together, promoting collegiality, and developing a focus on teaching. Specifically,

"orientations, mentoring, and research and teaching resources" can help to better socialize new faculty, according to Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992, p. 24). If institutions can devise effective ways to support the long-term instructional development of faculty, "a very different academic culture might emerge" (Cerbin, 1993, p. 2).

Assessment of faculty needs using faculty as well as students to better provide worthwhile faculty development opportunities is necessary for all institutions, according to Cerbin (1993). The creation of a community of scholar-teachers through more effective means of assessment, rewards, and support would result in institutions that are teaching-centered and learning-centered (Cerbin, 1993).

Campus Expansion

Institutions of higher education continue to expand, not only through programs and course offerings, but also through campus expansions. The building of extended or "satellite" campuses as extensions of the main campus is commonplace among almost all colleges and universities today. According to Vermilye (1972), these extended campuses are not necessarily designed to replicate the main campus, but more likely are intended to try to "reach out to new students in new ways" (p. x).

Minimal research has been conducted on the evaluation or comparison of the various campuses within an institution, particularly at the undergraduate level. Existing research primarily has examined the on-campus versus off-campus

experiences of students. In a study of graduate and upper-division students, Spike and Mason (1977) found that "students age 51 or older were generally more satisfied with courses regardless of their location" (Marciniak, 1980, p. 7). Wilde (1963) examined the quality of off-campus courses by surveying almost 5,000 graduate students. Overall, students rated on-campus courses as having higher quality in areas such as "instructional equipment and supplies, reference materials and library facilities, degree and amount of student participation and overall quality of instruction" (Marciniak, 1980, p. 6). Student ratings of off-campus courses showed significantly more satisfaction "in the areas of classroom conditions, textbook availability, instructor availability, course offerings, quality of instructors and the degree to which courses served the goals of the students" (Marciniak, 1980, p. 6). Frandson's (1973) study had similar results relating to learner motivation, student participation, and the quality of instruction (Marciniak, 1980). In a University of Wisconsin study it was found that "off-campus courses may be different from the campus courses," and "some of these differences may be positive factors" (Croftchik, 1975, p. 13).

Summary

Because little is known about any differences that may exist specifically between the main campus and any satellite campuses of an institution, only generalizations can be drawn from the existing research. Perhaps the most important thing to consider is what the goal or purpose of a satellite campus is. Because replication of the main campus is not always desirable, planned

differences among the campuses may be more advantageous to all involved. As a result, not all forms of evaluation or comparison among campuses of the same institution may be relevant.

Summary

Due to the lack of formal requirements for teacher preparation at the postsecondary level, institutions of higher education must recognize the need to provide faculty with development activities that focus on teaching. Assessing faculty needs and differences using faculty as well as students can contribute to more worthwhile faculty development activities. Employing institutions must also be aware of the sometimes overwhelming problems and challenges new and part-time faculty are faced with. Included in these problems are those relating to equitable employment policies and practices dealing with part-time faculty. Since the current employment practices concerning part-time faculty are often detrimental to these faculty, the improved treatment and increased support of part-time faculty must become a priority within higher education as well.

The procedures used for this study in order to identify the faculty development needs of full-time and part-time faculty relating to effective teaching at the four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College are outlined in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

In this study the perceptions of full-time and part-time faculty, as related to effective teaching, were determined in order to identify their faculty development needs. It was also determined whether these needs differed between full-time and part-time faculty, between experienced and less experienced faculty, and between the main campus and satellite campuses of the four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College, an independent, nonprofit institution in Michigan.

The procedures that were used for this study are explained in this chapter. The chapter is organized into five sections: (a) type of research, (b) the population, (c) development of the instrument, (d) data collection, and (e) data analysis.

Type of Research

A descriptive survey method was used in this study in order to identify the perceived faculty development needs related to effective teaching of the full-time

and part-time faculty at the four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College.

The Population

The population included all full-time and part-time faculty employed during Fall Term 1993 at the three four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College. Table 3.1 shows the number of questionnaires overall and by each campus that were distributed during Fall Term 1993 to each group of faculty at the three campuses. Also shown is the number of questionnaires that were returned by each group at each campus.

Table 3.1: Number of questionnaires distributed and returned, by campus, Fall Term 1993.

Campus	Full-Time Faculty		Return Rates	Part-Time Faculty		Return Rates
	Returned	Total		Returned	Total	
Grand Rapids	34	38	90%	71	115	62%
Kalamazoo	15	23	65%	14	65	22%
Lansing	11	12	92%	21	45	47%
Total	60	73	82%	106	225	47%

Overall, 166 questionnaires were received from 298 respondents, for a return rate of 56%. Sixty of the 73 full-time faculty surveyed completed the questionnaire, for a return rate of 82%. One hundred six of the 225 part-time faculty surveyed completed the questionnaire, for a return rate of 47%.

Davenport College is "an independent, non-profit, degree-granting college of business, fully accredited by the North Central Association for Colleges and Secondary Schools" (Moceri, 1990, p. 107). Throughout its history, the focus and purpose of Davenport College have been to provide training and education for careers in business and related careers. Davenport offers bachelor's and associate degrees in a variety of business-related fields such as accounting; business management; computer information systems; fashion merchandising; hotel, restaurant, and institutional management; paralegal; retail management; sales and marketing; administrative assistant; and medical assistant, as well as specialized nondegree programs.

The main campus of Davenport College is located in Grand Rapids, Michigan, where it was established in 1866. In 1985, Davenport College acquired the Detroit College of Business in Dearborn, Michigan, with branches in Flint and Warren, making Davenport College the largest independent college in Michigan. The Davenport/Detroit system consists of 11 locations throughout Michigan and northern Indiana, with enrollments exceeding 16,000 students. Table 3.2 shows the breakdown of enrollment figures for the three four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College for Fall Term 1993.

Table 3.2: Day school/night school enrollment figures, by campus, Fall Term 1993.

Campus	Day School	Night School	Total
Grand Rapids	1,119	2,336	3,455
Kalamazoo	968	822	1,790
Lansing	473	1,019	1,492
Total	2,560	4,177	6,737

The Davenport system consists of seven campuses throughout Michigan and Indiana. The Grand Rapids, Lansing, and Kalamazoo campuses offer four-year degrees in a variety of business and related areas. The Holland campus was established in 1992 and offers two-year degrees in various business areas. A second location in Grand Rapids consists of an accredited career center, which offers certification in business and related areas, whereas the campuses located in Merrillville and South Bend, Indiana, offer two-year degrees.

A unique aspect of Davenport College is its ability to offer courses and degree programs at a variety of geographic locations, at various campuses, and industry sites, while using a variety of formats. In 1992, an adult accelerated learning program was developed and exemplifies Davenport's commitment to the nontraditional student. Such a variety of locations and programs has resulted in a mature student population and a diverse faculty.

Number of Faculty

According to data compiled by the institution for Fall Term 1993, the total number of faculty for the three four-year, degree-granting campuses (Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, and Lansing) was 73 full-time faculty and 225 part-time faculty. Table 3.3 shows the number of faculty at each campus for Fall Term 1993.

Table 3.3: Number of faculty, by campus, Fall Term 1993.

Campus	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Grand Rapids	38	115
Kalamazoo	23	65
Lansing	12	45
Total	73	225

Part-Time Faculty

Davenport College relies heavily on part-time faculty to meet the needs of the institution. The majority of part-time faculty are professional people from the surrounding communities who teach primarily evening courses both on and off campus. Some individual campuses may rely more heavily on part-time faculty than others, as can be seen when the percentage of courses taught by part-time faculty at each campus is computed. When these percentages are computed for day, evening, and off-campus classes, part-time faculty at the main campus teach 58% of all classes. The percentages for the two satellite campuses for part-time

faculty are 44% of all classes at the Kalamazoo campus and 74% at the Lansing campus.

The typical part-time faculty member at Davenport College teaches two or more courses per term and is paid roughly 30% less per class than full-time faculty. At the Grand Rapids campus, some part-time faculty recently have been hired on a part-time provisional status, which primarily gives them seniority over other part-time faculty in scheduling classes.

Because the majority of Davenport's part-time faculty are professional people hired from the surrounding communities, many have limited teaching experience. Many part-time faculty are employed to teach at off-campus locations, such as on-site classes in business and industry. Some of these locations are more than 100 miles from the home campus. As a result, these faculty members may visit their employing campus only for the initial orientation program and the inservice program offered once per term. Only part-time faculty at the Grand Rapids campus are paid for their attendance at orientation and inservice programs, but attendance is not mandatory. The faculty development activities provided for part-time faculty at the Grand Rapids campus are held separately from those provided for full-time faculty. Faculty development activities at the satellite campuses are offered once per term, with both full-time and part-time faculty in attendance.

Full-Time Faculty

Full-time faculty at all campuses primarily teach day classes but are required to teach one evening class per term as a part of their regular teaching load. However, full-time faculty at the satellite campuses are more likely to teach more than one night per week due to lower day school enrollments than the Grand Rapids campus. Formal department meetings are held at least two to three times per term at each campus and are required of full-time faculty. Part-time faculty are welcome to attend. Typically, those part-time faculty who have been teaching regularly in a department, such as those with a part-time provisional contract, are the only part-time faculty in attendance at department meetings.

Several variations exist between the full-time faculty at the three four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College relating to faculty organization, salary schedules, teaching loads, and various job requirements and expectations for these faculty. Specifically, these differences in employment practices and working conditions exist for faculty employed at the main campus in Grand Rapids versus those faculty employed at the satellite campuses in Kalamazoo and Lansing.

Only the full-time faculty at the Grand Rapids campus have formally organized a faculty senate and are recognized as a bargaining unit by the institution's administrative body. As a result of their bargaining power, the full-time faculty at the Grand Rapids campus have benefited from serving as active

participants in their biennial contract negotiations. In particular, the full-time faculty at the main campus have higher base salaries, a lower teaching load, and a higher overload rate of pay than full-time faculty at the satellite campuses. The teaching load for full-time faculty at the main campus is 12 classes, which consists of four classes per term (fall, winter, spring). Classes taught by full-time faculty during the summer term are optional and result in additional earnings at the overload rate of pay. The teaching load for full-time faculty at the satellite campuses is 14 classes, which consists of four classes per term (fall, winter, spring) and two classes for the summer term at no additional pay.

Faculty Development Issues

As Michigan's largest independent college, the Davenport/Detroit system of colleges is no exception to the problems facing other institutions regarding effective teaching. Faculty development activities continue to consist of administratively mandated programs designed with little assessment of, or input from, the faculty themselves. The following statement, voiced by an associate professor at one of the campuses, illustrates the tensions and attitudes that currently exist among the full-time faculty at this campus:

> Rather than being forced to participate in inservices based on administrative agendas, the faculty need to take ownership of their own development and create forums in which to share formally and informally in dialogues, symposiums, or simply discussion groups centered on pertinent topics or books that concern us all or help us be better teachers. (M. Hess, personal communication, June 3, 1993)

resear

by teac

cevelo

Development of the Instrument

Survey instruments (Appendices A and B) were developed by the researcher to obtain data about the acquisition of teaching skills and knowledge by teachers at the postsecondary level. Specifically, the survey instrument was developed to answer the following questions:

1. How important do faculty think certain teaching-related skills or abilities are to effective teaching?

    a. Do full-time and part-time faculty rate the importance of these skills or abilities differently?

    b. Do experienced faculty and less experienced faculty rate the importance of these skills or abilities differently?

    c. Do faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus and faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses rate the importance of these skills differently?

    d. Do full-time faculty at the main campus and full-time faculty at the satellite campuses rate the importance of these skills differently?

    e. Do part-time faculty at the main campus and part-time faculty at the satellite campuses rate the importance of these skills differently?

2. To what extent do faculty feel proficient in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

    a. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between full-time and part-time faculty at all four-year campuses?

    b. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty?

    c. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses?

d. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

e. Does the extent of these proficiencies differ between part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

3. To what extent do faculty perceive they need further development in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

   a. Do these perceptions differ between full-time and part-time faculty at all four-year campuses?

   b. Do these perceptions differ between experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty at all four-year campuses?

   c. Do these perceptions differ between faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses?

   d. Do these perceptions differ between full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

   e. Do these perceptions differ between part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

4. What methods for acquiring certain teaching-related skills and abilities do faculty most prefer?

   a. Do these preferences differ between full-time and part-time faculty at all four-year campuses?

   b. Do these preferences differ between experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty at all four-year degree campuses?

   c. Do these preferences differ between faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses?

d. Do these preferences differ between full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

e. Do these preferences differ between part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

5. What three skills or abilities associated with effective teaching are the most important to faculty at Davenport College in order to further develop their teaching abilities?

   a. Do these three skills or abilities differ between full-time and part-time faculty?

   b. Do these three skills or abilities differ between experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty?

   c. Do these three skills or abilities differ between faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses?

   d. Do these three skills or abilities differ between full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

   e. Do these three skills or abilities differ between part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses?

Two pilot studies were conducted at the Grand Rapids campus. Survey instruments were distributed in both pilot studies to the same random sample of 6 full-time and 12 part-time faculty. Recommendations were made to improve comprehension, readability, and format. Upon modification of the questionnaire to reflect the recommended changes suggested by the pilot studies, the revised questionnaire consisted of four sections. Part I contains six demographic questions. Part II consists of a list of 13 teaching-related skills or abilities derived

from the research on teaching for which faculty are asked three questions: to rate the importance of each skill for effective teaching, to what extent they feel proficient in each skill or ability, and to what extent they feel they need further development in this skill or ability. Part III consists of a list of the same 13 skills or abilities, for which faculty are asked to select from a list of six choices which way they would most prefer to learn more about each skill or ability. Part IV asks faculty to rank the three skills or abilities that are most important to them in order to further develop their teaching skills from the same list of 13 skills or abilities contained in Parts II and III.

Data Collection

The Vice President of Academic Affairs at the main campus in Grand Rapids was contacted to seek the cooperation of Davenport College in the research. Once permission was received from Davenport College, two cover letters were drafted, using Davenport College letterhead (Appendices A and B). The cover letters were signed by both the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the researcher. The appropriate dean at each campus was notified of the research to be conducted during Fall Term 1993 by the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The researcher contacted the appropriate staff member at each of the satellite campuses to explain the procedures to be carried out in distributing the questionnaire.

The final survey instrument and appropriate cover letter were distributed to 73 full-time faculty and 225 part-time faculty during the months of October and

r

ti

a

la

ap

ac

we

as

No

fac

me

facu

app

eac

was

after

November, of Fall Term 1993. At the Grand Rapids campus the questionnaire was distributed to full-time and part-time faculty at their respective fall inservices. The appropriate cover letter and questionnaire (Appendix A) were explained and distributed by the researcher and/or the dean of part-time faculty at these meetings for those faculty in attendance to voluntarily complete and return at that time. A list of those full-time and part-time faculty members who were not present at these inservices was compiled. A staff member was asked to prepare mailing labels for these absentee faculty. These faculty members were then mailed the appropriate cover letter and the questionnaire (Appendix B) at their home addresses. A second mailing was conducted to these same faculty members one week after the requested return dates for the first mailing. Respondents were asked to complete and return the questionnaire if they had not yet done so by November 30, 1993.

At the Lansing campus the questionnaire was initially distributed to all faculty at their fall inservice conducted during November 1993, by the staff member in charge of faculty development. A list of those full-time and part-time faculty members who were not present at the inservice was compiled. The appropriate cover letter and questionnaire (Appendix B) were then distributed to each of these faculty members in their on-campus mailboxes. A second mailing was sent to these same faculty members in their on-campus mailboxes one week after the requested return dates for the first mailing. Respondents were asked to

complete and return the questionnaire if they had not yet done so by November 30, 1993.

At the Kalamazoo campus the appropriate cover letter and questionnaire (Appendix B) were initially distributed to all faculty in their on-campus mailboxes by the staff members in charge of faculty development. A second mailing was sent to these same faculty members in their on-campus mailboxes one week after the requested return dates for the first mailing. Respondents were asked to complete and return the questionnaire if they had not yet done so by November 30, 1993.

Data Analysis

The data were tabulated using STATGRAPHICS and Minitab statistical software. Frequency counts and percentages were computed for each question. T-tests and chi-square tests were used to determine whether any significant differences existed between groups as indicated by the five primary research questions of this study and according to the following criteria: (a) full-time and part-time faculty at all four-year campuses, (b) full-time versus part-time at all four-year campuses, (c) all faculty at the main campus versus all faculty at the satellite campuses, (d) experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty at all four-year campuses, (e) full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses, and (f) part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

Summary

A descriptive survey method was used in this study to identify the perceived faculty development needs of full-time and part-time faculty related to effective teaching at the four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College. Survey instruments were used to determine the importance of 13 teaching-related skills or abilities to faculty, their proficiency in these skills or abilities, and their need for further development in each skill or ability. In addition, faculty were asked to indicate their preferred method of development for each of the 13 skills or abilities and the three skills or abilities most important to them to further develop their teaching abilities. The results of the analysis of these data are reported in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The specific objective of this study was to determine the faculty development needs of full-time and part-time faculty relating to effective teaching, whether these needs differ between full-time and part-time faculty, between experienced and less experienced faculty, and between full-time and part-time faculty at the main campus versus the satellite campuses of Davenport College. The developmental needs of these faculty were determined by asking faculty for their perceptions and preferences relating to the following five primary research questions:

1. How important do faculty think certain teaching-related skills or abilities are to effective teaching?

2. To what extent do faculty feel proficient in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

3. To what extent do faculty perceive they need further development in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

4. What methods for acquiring certain teaching-related skills and abilities do faculty most prefer?

5. What three skills or abilities associated with effective teaching are the most important to faculty at Davenport College in order to further develop their teaching abilities?

For each of these five primary research questions, the data were also analyzed and compared according to the following groupings of faculty:

1. Full-time faculty versus part-time faculty.
2. Experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty.
3. Faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses.
4. Full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses.
5. Part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

This study surveyed 298 full-time and part-time faculty employed during Fall Term 1993 at the three four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College. Sixty of the 73 full-time faculty and 106 of the 225 part-time faculty responded to the survey. This represented a return rate of 56% overall, an 82% return rate for full-time faculty, and a 47% return rate for part-time faculty. In Table 4.1 the number of full-time and part-time faculty surveyed at each campus during Fall Term 1993 is summarized, along with the number of faculty responding to the questionnaire and the relevant percentages.

Chapter IV contains the results of the study. The results are presented in tabular form, accompanied by descriptions of significant components of the tables.

Tab

G	
Ka	
La	

fac

the

ha

of

is

ex

Fu

tea

Ca

Table 4.1: Number and percentage of responses to questionnaire by campus: full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

Campus	Full-Time Faculty		Part-Time Faculty	
	Responses/ Sample Size	Return Rate	Responses/ Sample Size	Return Rate
Grand Rapids	34/38	90%	71/115	62%
Kalamazoo	15/23	65%	14/65	22%
Lansing	11/12	92%	21/45	47%
Total	60/73	82%	106/225	47%

Faculty Experience

To determine the amount of teaching experience of the respondents, faculty were asked how many years of teaching experience they had had at both the secondary and postsecondary levels, as well as the number of courses they had taught at the postsecondary level. In Table 4.2 the average number of years of teaching experience for full-time and part-time faculty at the three campuses is summarized.

Overall, Grand Rapids faculty had substantially higher levels of teaching experience than faculty at the satellite campuses in Kalamazoo and Lansing. Full-time faculty at the main campus in Grand Rapids had nearly twice the teaching experience (19 years) as did the full-time faculty at the satellite campuses (10.3 years, Kalamazoo; 6.6 years, Lansing).

Table

Gra
Ka
La
T

con

wer

pos

exp

Bas

and

of e

the

Table 4.2: Average number of years of teaching experience, by campus: Full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

Campus	Avg. No. Years Taught at Postsecondary Level		Avg. No. Years Taught at Secondary Level	
	Full-Time n = 60	Part-Time n = 106	Full-Time n = 60	Part-Time n = 106
Grand Rapids	15.9	6.8	3.1	5.0
Kalamazoo	8.8	5.8	1.5	0.8
Lansing	6.1	7.0	0.5	1.2
Total	10.3	6.5	1.7	2.3

In Table 4.3 the percentage of full-time faculty and part-time faculty considered experienced versus less experienced is summarized. Full-time faculty were considered experienced if they had taught ten or more classes at the postsecondary level in the last three years. Part-time faculty were considered experienced if they had taught three or more years at the postsecondary level. Based on these criteria, 85% of all full-time faculty were considered experienced and 72% of all part-time faculty were considered experienced. The percentage of experienced faculty at all campuses, both full-time and part-time, was 77% of the 166 respondents.

Table 4.3:

Campu
Grand Rapi
Kalamazoo
Lansing
Total

Career Pat

Due

and for de

identify the

were given

career prof

(teaching

professor (

college pro

In T

career patt

percent of

profession

Table 4.3: Percentage of experienced and less experienced faculty, by campus: Full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

Campus	Full-Time Faculty		Part-Time Faculty	
	Experienced (%)	Less Experienced (%)	Experienced (%)	Less Experienced (%)
Grand Rapids	97	3	69	31
Kalamazoo	60	40	57	43
Lansing	82	18	90	10
Total	85	15	72	28

Career Patterns

Due to the variety of avenues from which Davenport College hires faculty and for detail purposes rather than data analysis, the faculty were asked to identify their career pattern. The following descriptions of possible career patterns were given for the respondents to choose from: (a) career college professor; (b) career professional in a noneducation area, i.e., lawyer, banking, business, etc. (teaching is a part-time activity); (c) career professional to career college professor (teaching is now a full-time activity); (d) secondary teacher to career college professor; and (e) other.

In Table 4.4 a summary of the numbers and percentages of the possible career patterns of full-time and part-time faculty at each campus is given. Fifty percent of the full-time faculty indicated their primary career pattern to be "career professional to college professor where teaching is a full-time activity." Forty-nine

Table 4.4: Career patterns, by campus: Full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

Descriptions of Possible Career Patterns	Grand Rapids				Kalamazoo				Lansing				All Campuses Combined			
	Full-Time Faculty (n = 34)		Part-Time Faculty (n = 71)		Full-Time Faculty (n = 15)		Part-Time Faculty (n = 14)		Full-Time Faculty (n = 11)		Part-Time Faculty (n = 21)		Full-Time Faculty (n = 60)		Part-Time Faculty (n = 106)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Career college professor	13	38	3	4	3	20	3	21	2	18	4	19	18	30	10	9
Career professional--teaching is a part-time activity	0	0	35	49	1	7	3	21	0	0	11	52	1	2	49	46
Career professional to college professor--teaching is a full-time activity	15	44	8	11	7	46	3	21	8	73	1	5	30	50	12	11
Secondary teacher to college professor	6	18	11	16	3	20	1	8	0	0	4	19	9	15	16	15
Other	0	0	13	19	1	7	4	29	1	9	1	5	2	3	18	17

percent of th

professional

Academic D

To de

purposes ra

degrees the

the highest

and the perc

are shown.

faculty and

To fu

faculty who

number an

Kalamazoo

education.

had an ed

proportion

percent of the part-time faculty indicated their primary career pattern to be "career professional in a noneducation area where teaching is a part-time activity."

Academic Degrees

To determine the educational background of the respondents and for detail purposes rather than data analysis, faculty were asked to list any academic degrees they had completed and the field of study for each degree. In Table 4.5 the highest degree held by full-time faculty and part-time faculty at each campus and the percentage of full-time faculty and part-time faculty who held each degree are shown. The highest degree held by the vast majority of both groups, full-time faculty and part-time faculty, was a master's degree.

To further understand the academic background of the respondents, those faculty who held a degree in a field of education were tabulated. In Table 4.6 the number and percentage of faculty who had an education degree are given. The Kalamazoo campus had the greatest percentage of all faculty with a degree in education. Nearly the majority of the full-time faculty at the Grand Rapids campus had an education degree. Across all campuses, all faculty combined, the proportion of faculty who had a degree in an education field was 35%.

Table 4.5: Highest academic degree earned by faculty, by campus: Full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

Highest Degree Held	Grand Rapids				Kalamazoo				Lansing				All Campuses Combined			
	Full-Time Faculty (n = 34)		Part-Time Faculty (n = 71)		Full-Time Faculty (n = 15)		Part-Time Faculty (n = 14)		Full-Time Faculty (n = 11)		Part-Time Faculty (n = 21)		Full-Time Faculty (n = 60)		Part-Time Faculty (n = 106)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Ph.D.	5	15	1	1	1	7	2	14	2	18	2	9.5	8	13	5	5
Juris doctorate	1	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9.5	1	2	7	7
Specialist	0	0	1	1	2	14	0	0	0	0	2	9.5	2	3	1	1
Masters	28	82	45	63	9	65	8	57	5	45	13	62	42	70	66	62
Bachelors	0	0	18	26	2	14	4	29	3	27	2	9.5	5	8	24	23
Associates	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	1	2	1	1

Table 4.6:

Campu
Grand Ra
Kalamazo
Lansing
Total

Ana

three crite

faculty), (b

(c) campu

tabulated

question.

significan

were two-

intervals.

values for

mean resp

Table 4.6: Number and percentage of education degrees, by campus: Full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

Campus	Full-Time Faculty		Part-Time Faculty		Each Campus Combined	
	No./Total	%	No./Total	%	No./Total	%
Grand Rapids	15/34	44	22/68	31	37/102	36
Kalamazoo	7/14	50	7/14	50	14/28	50
Lansing	2/11	18	4/21	19	6/32	19
Total	24/59	40	33/103	32	57/162	35

Research Questions: Responses and Analysis

Analysis and various comparisons of the data were computed based on three criteria: (a) employment status of faculty members (full-time or part-time faculty), (b) level of teaching experience (experienced or less experienced), and (c) campus location (main campus or satellite campuses). The data were tabulated by frequency counts, and percentages were computed for each question. T-tests or chi-square tests were conducted to determine whether any significant difference existed between the various groups' responses. All t-tests were two-sided and computed at a significance level of 5% with 95% confidence intervals. All chi-square tests were computed at the 5% level of significance. P-values for all t-tests and chi-square tests are given in tabular form, along with the mean responses for each question for each of the comparison groups.

Importance, Proficiency, and Further Development

In this section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rate each of the 13 skills or abilities for effective teaching, based on the following three research questions:

1. How important do faculty think certain teaching-related skills or abilities are to effective teaching?

2. To what extent do faculty feel proficient in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

3. To what extent do faculty perceive they need further development in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

In addition to these three primary research questions, the data were also analyzed to determine whether the preferences of faculty differed when based on the following criteria: (a) full-time faculty versus part-time faculty, (b) experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty, (c) faculty at the main campus versus faculty at the satellite campuses, (d) full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses, and (e) part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses. Faculty used a ranking system of 1 to 5 to rate their responses as follows: 1 = Not at all, 2 = A little, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = High, and 5 = Very high. Mean ratings were rounded up to the nearest whole number for values of .50 or greater.

In Table 4.7 the mean responses of all faculty at Davenport College are summarized, indicating (a) their perceived importance of each of the 13 skills and abilities for effective teaching, (b) their perceived proficiency in each of these skills

Table 4.7: Mean ratings (standard deviations) of specific teaching-related skills or abilities--importance (Imp.), proficiency (Prof.), and further development (Dev.): All Davenport College faculty (N = 166).

Skill or Ability	Faculty Mean Ratings		
	Imp.	Prof.	Dev.
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	4.82 (.519)	4.44 (.629)	2.69 (1.198)
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	4.28 (.786)	3.86 (.828)	3.04 (1.035)
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	4.34 (.737)	3.86 (.790)	3.03 (1.075)
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	4.27 (.744)	3.76 (.784)	3.09 (1.046)
5. Developing courses	3.75 (.994)	3.61 (.943)	2.99 (1.189)
6. Development and selection of course materials	4.12 (.922)	3.75 (.849)	2.93 (1.146)
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	4.37 (.821)	3.89 (.810)	3.06 (1.175)
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	4.72 (.610)	4.27 (.693)	2.80 (1.182)
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	4.27 (.797)	3.77 (.758)	3.13 (1.129)
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	4.27 (.804)	4.10 (.737)	2.71 (1.143)
11. Motivating students to learn	4.54 (.744)	3.98 (.731)	3.08 (1.126)
12. Involving students in the learning process	4.64 (.653)	4.02 (.829)	2.99 (1.197)
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	4.60 (.680)	4.35 (.723)	2.57 (1.159)

Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = A little, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = High, 5 = Very high

or abilities.

<u>development</u>

Ove

campuses

"very high"

to be "very

importance

these skills

The

both impor

in each ski

rated high

to which th

All

each of th

faculty for

skills or a

students.

skill or ab

or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they thought they needed further development in each skill or ability.

Overall, all faculty at Davenport College's four-year, degree-granting campuses rated all of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities to be "high" or "very high" in importance. All faculty combined rated 5 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 8 of these skills or abilities to be "high" in importance. Faculty also rated the extent to which they felt proficient in each of these skills or abilities to be "high."

The skill or ability, "developing courses," was rated lowest by all faculty for both importance for effective teaching and the extent to which they felt proficient in each skill or ability. The skill or ability, "knowledge of the subject matter," was rated highest by faculty for both importance for effective teaching and the extent to which they felt proficiency in each skill or ability.

All faculty rated the extent to which they needed further development in each of the 13 skills or abilities to be "somewhat." The lowest mean rating by faculty for the extent to which they needed further development in each of the 13 skills or abilities was for the skill or ability, "interact and establish rapport with students." The highest mean rating by faculty for further development was for the skill or ability, "evaluation and measurement of student learning."

Full-Time Faculty and Part-Time Faculty: Mean Ratings

In Table 4.8 the mean ratings of faculty are summarized for (a) the importance of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they felt they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities when grouped by employment status.

Importance. Overall, full-time faculty and part-time faculty rated all of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities to be "high" or "very high" in importance. The full-time faculty rated 6 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 7 of these skills or abilities to be "high" in importance. The part-time faculty rated 5 of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 8 of these skills or abilities to be "high" in importance.

The skills or abilities rated highest and lowest in importance were the same for both groups, ranging from a low for "developing courses" to a high for "knowledge of the subject matter."

Proficiency. Overall, full-time faculty rated the extent to which they felt proficient in all of the 13 skills or abilities to be "high." Part-time faculty rated their proficiency to be "high" for 12 of the 13 skills or abilities and rated their proficiency lowest for "developing courses," with a mean rating of "somewhat" by part-time faculty.

Part-time faculty rated their proficiency highest for the skill or ability "knowledge of the subject matter." The highest mean rating by full-time faculty

Table 4.8: Mean ratings (standard deviations) of specific teaching-related skills or abilities–importance, proficiency, and further development: Full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Full-Time Faculty (n = 60)	Part-Time Faculty (n = 106)	Full-Time Faculty (n = 60)	Part-Time Faculty (n = 106)	Full-Time Faculty (n = 60)	Part-Time Faculty (n = 106)
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	4.88 (.324)	4.78 (.602)	4.40 (.558)	4.46 (.665)	2.88 (1.223)	2.57 (1.184)
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	4.36 (.737)	4.24 (.811)	3.98 (.783)	3.80 (.852)	2.97 (1.025)	3.08 (1.040)
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	4.37 (.736)	4.32 (.737)	3.90 (.796)	3.84 (.786)	2.90 (1.227)	3.10 (.980)
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	4.23 (.745)	4.29 (.743)	3.85 (.847)	3.70 (.746)	2.95 (1.524)	3.16 (.925)
5. Developing courses	3.88 (.993)	3.67 (.994)	3.87* (.892)	3.46* (.972)	2.97 (1.364)	3.01 (1.076)
6. Development and selection of course materials	4.20 (.805)	4.08 (.982)	4.02* (.777)	3.60* (.887)	2.83 (I.248)	2.98 (1.084)
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	4.52 (.701)	4.28 (.881)	4.00 (.759)	3.83 (.837)	3.12 (1.316)	3.03 (1.087)
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	4.77 (.465)	4.70 (.678)	4.34 (.545)	4.24 (.763)	2.71 (1.260)	2.85 (1.136)

Table 4.8: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Full-Time Faculty (n = 60)	Part-Time Faculty (n = 106)	Full-Time Faculty (n = 60)	Part-Time Faculty (n = 106)	Full-Time Faculty (n = 60)	Part-Time Faculty (n = 106)
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	4.39 (.695)	4.20 (.848)	3.75 (.685)	3.78 (.796)	3.20 (1.171)	3.10 (1.105)
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	4.39 (.743)	4.21 (.836)	4.19 (.656)	4.06 (.779)	2.66 (1.178)	2.74 (1.124)
11. Motivating students to learn	4.60 (.616)	4.50 (.808)	4.10 (.681)	3.92 (.757)	2.95 (1.333)	3.15 (1.145)
12. Involving students in the learning process	4.70 (.497)	4.60 (.726)	4.07 (.710)	3.99 (.889)	3.02 (1.372)	2.98 (1.087)
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	4.58 (.619)	4.60 (.713)	4.37 (.637)	4.34 (.767)	2.42 (1.169)	2.66 (1.154)

Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = A little, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = High, 5 = Very high

*Significant at the .05 level (see Table 4.9 for p-values).

was their proficiency for the skill or ability to "interact and establish rapport with students," and their lowest mean rating was for the skill or ability "evaluation and measurement of student learning."

Further development. Overall, part-time faculty rated the extent to which they thought they needed further development to be "somewhat" for all of the 13 skills or abilities. Full-time faculty rated their need for further development to be "somewhat" for 12 of the 13 skills or abilities.

The lowest rating by full-time faculty for the extent to which they needed further development was for the skill or ability, "interact and establish rapport with students," with an overall rating of "a little." The skill or ability rated highest by full-time faculty for further development was "evaluation and measurement of student learning." Part-time faculty rated their need for further development highest for "applying the theories and practices of how adults learn" and lowest for "knowledge of the subject matter."

Full-Time Faculty Versus Part-Time Faculty: T-Test Analysis

In Table 4.9 the results of the t-test analysis based on the mean responses of full-time faculty versus part-time faculty are given for (a) the importance of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they felt they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities.

Table 4.9: T-test results for mean ratings of specific teaching-related skills or abilities--importance, proficiency, and further development: Full-time faculty and part-time faculty.[a]

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.2334	No	.5752	No	.1096
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	No	.3481	No	.1755	No	.5121
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	No	.7002	No	.6288	No	.2396
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	No	.6233	No	.2467	No	.2112
5. Developing courses	No	.1878	Yes	.0090	No	.8225
6. Development and selection of course materials	No	.4014	Yes	.0028	No	.4239
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	No	.0799	No	.1927	No	.6438
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.4878	No	.3610	No	.4759
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	No	.1450	No	.7758	No	.5570
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	No	.1648	No	.2799	No	.6662
11. Motivating students to learn	No	.4070	No	.1193	No	.3078
12. Involving students in the learning process	No	.3631	No	.5707	No	.8544
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	No	.8527	No	.8172	No	.1950

[a]See Table 4.8 for mean ratings of full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

No significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of each group in rating the importance of the 13 skills or abilities or the extent to which faculty thought they needed further development. A significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of full-time faculty and part-time faculty in rating the extent to which they felt proficient in "developing courses" and "development and selection of course materials." In both cases, full-time faculty rated their proficiency in each of these skills or abilities significantly higher than did part-time faculty.

Experienced Faculty and Less Experienced Faculty: Mean Ratings

In Table 4.10 the mean ratings of faculty are summarized for (a) the importance of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they thought they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities when grouped only by level of experience.

Importance. Overall, regardless of their level of experience, all faculty rated all of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities to be "high" or "very high" in importance. The experienced faculty rated 4 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 9 of these skills or abilities to be "high" in importance. The less experienced faculty rated 5 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 8 of these skills or abilities to be "high" in importance.

Table 4.10: Mean ratings (standard deviations) of specific teaching-related skills or abilities–importance, proficiency, and further development: Experienced faculty and less experienced faculty.

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Exp. Faculty (n = 127)	Less Exp. Faculty (n = 39)	Exp. Faculty (n = 127)	Less Exp. Faculty (n = 39)	Exp. Faculty (n = 127)	Less Exp. Faculty (n = 39)
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	4.80 (.564)	4.87 (.339)	4.43 (.650)	4.45 (.555)	2.68 (1.195)	2.71 (1.250)
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	4.29 (.799)	4.26 (.751)	3.98* (.770)	3.50* (.923)	2.92* (.984)	3.42 (1.106)
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	4.31 (.763)	4.41 (.637)	3.91 (.735)	3.68 (.933)	2.93* (1.013)	3.37* (l.217)
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	4.26 (.769)	4.31 (.655)	3.77 (.717)	3.71 (.984)	3.02 (1.020)	3.32 (1.118)
5. Developing courses	3.74 (1.037)	3.78 (.854)	3.67 (.930)	3.42 (1.052)	2.97 (1.232)	3.09 (1.011)
6. Development and selection of course materials	4.17 (.922)	3.97 (.915)	3.82 (.856)	3.53 (.893)	2.94 (1.174)	2.89 (1.060)
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	4.34 (.838)	4.46 (.789)	3.94 (.794)	3.74 (.860)	2.98 (1.130)	3.34 (1.279)
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	4.72 (.651)	4.72 (.456)	4.29 (.510)	4.23 (.393)	2.73 (1.169)	3.03 (1.203)

Table 4.10: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Exp. Faculty (n = 127)	Less Exp. Faculty (n = 39)	Exp. Faculty (n = 127)	Less Exp. Faculty (n = 39)	Exp. Faculty (n = 127)	Less Exp. Faculty (n = 39)
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	4.29 (.828)	4.21 (.704)	3.77 (.761)	3.76 (.751)	3.12 (1.136)	3.18 (1.111)
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	4.26 (.828)	4.32 (.739)	4.13 (.724)	4.03 (.788)	2.65 (1.116)	2.92 (1.211)
11. Motivating students to learn	4.47* (.785)	4.74* (.549)	4.01 (.707)	3.90 (.821)	2.98 (1.175)	3.38 (1.310)
12. Involving students in the learning process	4.59 (.705)	4.79 (.409)	4.05 (.825)	3.92 (.839)	2.86* (1.153)	3.44* (1.231)
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	4.60 (.716)	4.59 (.549)	4.34 (.726)	4.38 (.711)	2.52 (1.174)	2.74 (1.117)

Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = A little, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = High, 5 = Very high

*Significant at the .05 level (see Table 4.11 for p-values).

The skills or abilities rated highest and lowest in importance were the same for both groups, ranging from a low for "developing courses" to a high for "knowledge of the subject matter."

Proficiency. Overall, experienced faculty rated their proficiency in all of the 13 skills or abilities to be "high." Less experienced faculty rated their proficiency to be "high" for 12 of the 13 skills or abilities.

The skill or ability rated highest by both experienced and less experienced faculty was "knowledge of the subject matter." The skill or ability rated lowest by both groups was "developing courses." However, experienced faculty rated the extent to which they felt proficient in "developing courses" to be "high," whereas less experienced faculty rated their proficiency to be "somewhat."

Further development. Overall, regardless of experience level, all faculty rated the extent to which they thought they needed further development to be "somewhat" for all of the 13 skills or abilities.

The lowest rating by experienced faculty for the extent to which they need further development was for the skill or ability "interact and establish rapport with students." Experienced faculty rated their need for further development highest for the skill or ability "evaluation and measurement of student learning." Less experienced faculty rated their need for further development lowest for "knowledge of the subject matter" and highest for "involving students in the learning process."

Experienced Faculty Versus Less Experienced
Experienced Faculty: T-Test Analysis

In Table 4.11 the results of the t-test analysis based on the mean responses of experienced faculty versus the less experienced faculty are given for (a) the importance of the specific teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they thought they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities.

A significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of experienced faculty and less experienced faculty in rating the importance of "motivating students to learn." Less experienced faculty rated the importance of this skill or ability significantly higher than did experienced faculty.

A significant difference also was found when comparing the mean responses of both groups in rating their proficiency and their need to further develop the skill or ability of "applying the theories and practices of teaching." Experienced faculty rated their proficiency for this skill or ability significantly higher than did less experienced faculty and rated their need for further developing this skill significantly lower.

A significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of experienced faculty and less experienced faculty in their rating of the extent to which they needed further development in "understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles" and "involving students in the learning process." In both cases, less experienced faculty rated the extent to which they

Table 4.11: T-test results for mean ratings of specific teaching-related skills or abilities–importance, proficiency, and further development: Part-time faculty, main campus and part-time faculty, satellite campuses.[a]

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.1311	No	.5364	No	.4868
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	Yes	.0349	No	.3406	No	.6474
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	No	.8297	No	.4851	No	.6243
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	No	.5367	No	.9268	No	.7463
5. Developing courses	No	.1285	No	.5669	Yes	.0070
6. Development and selection of course materials	No	.9485	No	.9751	No	.4822
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	No	.6572	No	.6233	No	.1838
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.8957	No	.4600	No	.1869
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	No	.3525	No	.6864	No	.9644
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	No	.7565	No	.1877	Yes	.0237
11. Motivating students to learn	No	.8990	No	.7925	No	.3973
12. Involving students in the learning process	No	.8063	No	.9393	No	.2841
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	No	.9697	No	.6138	No	.0766

[a]See Table 4.16 for mean ratings of part-time faculty at the main campus and part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

needed further development in these skills or abilities significantly higher than did experienced faculty. Overall, there was a tendency for these two groups to rate the majority of the 13 skills or abilities differently, although not all were significantly different at the .05 level.

Faculty, Main Campus and Faculty, Satellite Campuses: Mean Ratings

In Table 4.12 the mean ratings of faculty are summarized for (1) the importance of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they thought they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities when grouped only by campus location.

Importance. Overall, all faculty, regardless of campus location, rated all of the 13 skills or abilities as "high" or "very high" in importance. The main campus faculty rated 5 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 8 of these skills or abilities to be "high" in importance. Faculty at the satellite campuses also rated 5 of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 8 of the skills or abilities to be "high" in importance.

The skills or abilities rated highest and lowest in importance were the same for both groups, ranging from a low for "developing courses" to a high for "knowledge of the subject matter."

Proficiency. Overall, all faculty, regardless of campus location, rated the extent to which they felt proficient in 12 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "high."

Table 4.12: Mean ratings (standard deviations) of specific teaching-related skills or abilities--importance, proficiency, and further development: All faculty, main campus (MC) and all faculty, satellite campuses (Sat.).

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	MC Faculty (n = 105)	Sat. Faculty (n = 61)	MC Faculty (n = 105)	Sat. Faculty (n = 61)	MC Faculty (n = 105)	Sat. Faculty (n = 61)
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	4.86 (.426)	4.75 (.650)	4.38 (1.095)	4.38 (.687)	2.63 (1.430)	2.66 (1.182)
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	4.38* (.767)	4.10* (.790)	3.78 (1.486)	3.70 (.823)	2.93 (1.516)	2.95 (1.040)
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	4.38 (.685)	4.26 (.814)	3.87 (.764)	3.85 (.833)	3.01 (1.340)	2.93 (1.063)
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	4.32 (.740)	4.18 (.742)	3.69 (1.133)	3.72 (.859)	3.07 (1.323)	2.85 (1.447)
5. Developing courses	3.59 (1.524)	3.59 (1.553)	3.41 (1.714)	3.39 (1.486)	2.69 (1.717)	3.00 (1.667)
6. Development and selection of course materials	3.96 (1.531)	4.10 (.986)	3.60 (1.465)	3.72 (.922)	2.89 (1.128)	2.98 (1.182)
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	4.38 (.801)	4.34 (.873)	3.90 (.807)	3.87 (.826)	2.98 (1.352)	3.07 (1.289)
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	4.72 (.563)	4.72 (.686)	4.24 (.675)	4.33 (.724)	2.79 (1.138)	2.82 (1.258)

Table 4.12: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	MC Faculty (n = 105)	Sat. Faculty (n = 61)	MC Faculty (n = 105)	Sat. Faculty (n = 61)	MC Faculty (n = 105)	Sat. Faculty (n = 61)
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	4.29 (.769)	4.08 (1.465)	3.81 (.722)	3.55 (1.383)	3.18 (1.090)	2.92 (1.576)
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	4.31 (.776)	4.20 (.860)	4.15 (.662)	4.02 (.854)	2.61 (1.101)	2.88 (1.195)
11. Motivating students to learn	4.53 (.694)	4.54 (.828)	3.99 (.727)	3.97 (.752)	3.10 (1.240)	3.03 (1.183)
12. Involving students in the learning process	4.64 (.637)	4.64 (.684)	4.08 (.768)	3.92 (.918)	3.00 (1.209)	2.98 (1.176)
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	4.61 (.612)	4.57 (.784)	4.33 (.675)	4.38 (.799)	2.54 (1.135)	2.62 (1.213)

Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = A little, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = High, 5 = Very high

*Significant at the .05 level (see Table 4.13 for p-values).

For one skill or ability, "developing courses," both groups rated their level of proficiency to be "somewhat." The skill or ability rated highest by faculty at the main campus for their level of proficiency was "knowledge of the subject matter." Faculty at the satellite campuses also rated their level of proficiency highest for this skill or ability, along with the skill or ability "interact and establish rapport with students."

Further development. Overall, both groups, regardless of campus location, rated the extent to which they thought they needed further development in all of the 13 skills or abilities to be "somewhat." The skill or ability rated highest by faculty at the main campus for further development was "evaluation and measurement of student learning."

The skill or ability rated highest by faculty at the satellite campuses for further development was "using a variety of teaching strategies." The skill or ability rated lowest by both groups for further development was "interact and establish rapport with students."

Faculty, Main Campus Versus Faculty, Satellite Campuses: T-Test Analysis

In Table 4.13 the results of the t-test analysis based on the mean responses of faculty at the main campus versus faculty at the satellite campuses are summarized for (a) the importance of the specific teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities,

Table 4.13: T-test results for mean ratings of specific teaching-related skills or abilities–importance, proficiency, and further development: All faculty, main campus and all faculty, satellite campuses.[a]

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.2192	No	.9800	No	.9002
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	Yes	.0234	No	.6944	No	.9320
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	No	.3174	No	.9193	No	.7086
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	No	.2307	No	.8630	No	.3318
5. Developing courses	No	.9989	No	.9513	No	.2548
6. Development and selection of course materials	No	.5311	No	.5785	No	.6323
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	No	.7836	No	.7901	No	.6930
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.9798	No	.4353	No	.8703
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	No	.2460	No	.1151	No	.2064
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	No	.3830	No	.2569	No	.1337
11. Motivating students to learn	No	.9493	No	.8447	No	.7143
12. Involving students in the learning process	No	.9906	No	.2362	No	.9323
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	No	.7445	No	.7076	No	.6698

[a]See Table 4.12 for mean ratings of all faculty at the main campus and all faculty at the satellite campuses.

and (c) the extent to which they thought they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities.

A significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of faculty at the main campus and faculty at the satellite campuses in rating the importance of one of the skills or abilities. Faculty at the main campus rated the importance of "applying the theories and practices of teaching" significantly higher than did faculty at the satellite campuses.

No significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of each group in the ratings of their proficiency in the 13 skills or abilities or the extent to which faculty thought they needed further development in the 13 skills or abilities.

Full-Time Faculty, Main Campus and Full-Time Faculty, Satellite Campuses: Mean Ratings

In Table 4.14 the mean ratings of faculty are summarized for (a) the importance of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they thought they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities when grouped by employment status and campus location.

Importance. Overall, all faculty, regardless of employment status or campus location, rated all of the 13 skills or abilities as "high" or "very high" in importance. Full-time faculty at the main campus rated 8 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 5 of these skills or abilities to be

Table 4.14: Mean ratings (standard deviations) of specific teaching-related skills or abilities–importance, proficiency, and further development: Full-time faculty, main campus (FTM) and full-time faculty, satellite campuses (FTS).

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	FTM Faculty (n = 34)	FTS Faculty (n = 26)	FTM Faculty (n = 34)	FTS Faculty (n = 26)	FTM Faculty (n = 34)	FTS Faculty (n = 26)
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	4.88 (.327)	4.88 (.326)	4.44 (.561)	4.35 (.562)	3.09 (1.264)	2.62 (1.134)
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	4.45 (.666)	4.23 (.815)	4.19 (.644)	3.73* (.874)	3.19 (.998)	2.69 (1.011)
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	4.53* (.615)	4.15* (.834)	4.00 (.778)	3.77 (.815)	3.12 (1.317)	2.62 (1.061)
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	4.32 (.768)	4.12 (.711)	3.94 (.747)	3.73 (.962)	3.16 (1.322)	2.69 (1.087)
5. Developing courses	4.15* (.784)	3.54* (1.140)	3.97 (.758)	3.73 (1.041)	3.12 (1.343)	2.76 (1.393)
6. Development and selection of course materials	4.26 (.790)	4.12 (.833)	4.12 (.686)	3.88 (.881)	2.82 (1.193)	2.84 (1.344)
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	4.53 (.662)	4.50 (.762)	4.00 (.816)	4.00 (.693)	3.32 (1.224)	2.85 (1.405)
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	4.76 (.431)	4.77 (.514)	4.33 (.540)	4.35 (.562)	2.88 (1.244)	2.50 (1.273)

Table 4.14: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	FTM Faculty (n = 34)	FTS Faculty (n = 26)	FTM Faculty (n = 34)	FTS Faculty (n = 26)	FTM Faculty (n = 34)	FTS Faculty (n = 26)
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	4.35 (.691)	4.44 (.712)	3.82 (.716)	3.64 (.638)	3.35 (1.070)	3.00 (1.291)
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	4.50 (.707)	4.24 (.779)	4.21 (.641)	4.16 (.688)	2.70 (1.159)	2.60 (1.225)
11. Motivating students to learn	4.62 (.493)	4.58 (.758)	4.18 (.626)	4.00 (.748)	3.15 (1.329)	2.69 (1.320)
12. Involving students in the learning process	4.74 (.448)	4.65 (.562)	4.26* (.567)	3.81* (.801)	3.21 (1.388)	2.77 (1.336)
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	4.62 (.493)	4.54 (.761)	4.26 (.666)	4.50 (.583)	2.59 (1.209)	2.19 (1.096)

Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = A little, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = High, 5 = Very high

*Significant at the .05 level (see Table 4.15 for p-values).

"high" in importance. Full-time faculty at the satellite campuses rated 6 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 7 of these skills or abilities to be "high" in importance.

The skills or abilities rated highest and lowest in importance were the same for both groups, ranging from a low for "developing courses" to a high for "knowledge of the subject matter."

Proficiency. Full-time faculty at the main campus rated the extent to which they felt proficient in all of the 13 skills or abilities to be "high." Full-time faculty at the satellite campuses rated the extent to which they felt proficient in 12 of the skills or abilities to be "high."

For one of the skills or abilities, "interact and establish rapport with students," full-time faculty at the satellite campuses rated the extent to which they felt proficient to be "very high." The skill or ability rated highest by full-time faculty at the main campus for the extent to which they felt proficient was "knowledge of the subject matter." The lowest mean rating for both groups for the extent to which they felt proficient was for the same skill or ability, "evaluation and measurement of student learning."

Further development. Full-time faculty at the main campus rated the extent to which they needed further development in all of the 13 skills or abilities to be "somewhat." Full-time faculty at the satellite campuses rated the extent to which they needed further development in 12 of the skills or abilities to be "somewhat."

The lowest mean rating for both groups for the extent to which they needed further development was for the same skill or ability, "interact and establish rapport with students." However, full-time faculty at the satellite campuses rated the extent to which they needed further development in this skill or ability to be "a little," whereas full-time faculty at the main campus rated their need for further development in this skill or ability to be "somewhat." The skill or ability rated highest by both groups for the extent to which they needed further development was "evaluation and measurement of student learning."

Full-Time Faculty, Main Campus Versus Full-Time Faculty, Satellite Campuses: T-Test Analysis

In Table 4.15 the results of the t-test analysis based on the mean responses of full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses are summarized for (a) the importance of the specific teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they thought they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities.

A significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of full-time faculty at the main campus and full-time faculty at the satellite campuses for their rating of the importance of two of the skills or abilities. Full-time faculty at the main campus rated the importance of "understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles" and "developing courses" significantly higher than did full-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

Table 4.15: T-test results for mean ratings of specific teaching-related skills or abilities--importance, proficiency, and further development: Full-time faculty, main campus and full-time faculty, satellite campuses.[a]

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.9789	No	.5183	No	.1390
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	No	.2505	Yes	.0259	No	.0669
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	Yes	.0492	No	.2695	No	.1169
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	No	.2873	No	.3521	No	.1563
5. Developing courses	Yes	.0173	No	.3060	No	.3239
6. Development and selection of course materials	No	.4997	No	.2489	No	.9606
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	No	.8736	No	1.000	No	.1657
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.9706	No	.9294	No	.2552
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	No	.6387	No	.3131	No	.2562
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	No	.1866	No	.7932	No	.7592
11. Motivating students to learn	No	.8022	No	.3244	No	.1928
12. Involving students in the learning process	No	.5343	Yes	.0122	No	.2247
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	No	.6273	No	.1579	No	.1960

[a]See Table 4.14 for mean ratings of full-time faculty at the main campus and full-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

A significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of both groups in their rating of their proficiency in "applying the theories and practices of teaching" and "involving students in the learning process." Full-time faculty at the main campus rated their proficiency in both of these skills significantly higher than did full-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

No significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of each group in their ratings of the extent to which they needed further development in the 13 skills or abilities.

Part-Time Faculty, Main Campus and Part-Time Faculty, Satellite Campuses: Mean Ratings

In Table 4.16 the mean ratings of faculty are summarized for (a) the importance of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they thought they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities when grouped by employment status and campus location.

Importance. Overall, all faculty, regardless of employment status or campus location, rated all of the 13 skills or abilities to be "high" or "very high" in importance. The main campus part-time faculty rated 4 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 9 of these skills or abilities to be "high" in importance. Part-time faculty at the satellite campuses rated 5 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "very high" in importance and 8 of these skills or abilities to be "high" in importance.

Table 4.16: Mean ratings (standard deviations) of specific teaching-related skills or abilities–importance, proficiency, and further development: Part-time faculty, main campus (PTM) and part-time faculty, satellite campuses (PTS).

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	PTM Faculty (n = 71)	PTS Faculty (n = 35)	PTM Faculty (n = 71)	PTS Faculty (n = 35)	PTM Faculty (n = 71)	PTS Faculty (n = 35)
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	4.85 (.467)	4.66 (.802)	4.49 (.608)	4.40 (.775)	2.51 (1.164)	2.69 (1.231)
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	4.35* (.812)	4.00* (.767)	3.86 (.879)	3.69 (.796)	3.04 (1.049)	3.14 (1.033)
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	4.31 (.709)	4.34 (.802)	3.80 (.754)	3.91 (.853)	3.07 (.968)	3.17 (1.014)
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	4.32 (.732)	4.23 (.770)	3.70 (.729)	3.71 (.789)	3.14 (.921)	3.21 (.946)
5. Developing courses	3.57 (.962)	3.88 (1.038)	3.50 (.970)	3.38 (.985)	2.81* (.966)	3.41* (1.184)
6. Development and selection of course materials	4.07 (.929)	4.09 (1.095)	3.59 (.863)	3.60 (.946)	2.93 (1.102)	3.09 (1.055)
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	4.31 (.855)	4.23 (.942)	3.86 (.804)	3.77 (.910)	2.93 (1.026)	3.23 (1.190)
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	4.70 (.619)	4.69 (.796)	4.20 (.729)	4.31 (.832)	2.75 (1.092)	3.06 (1.211)

Table 4.16: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	PTM Faculty (n = 71)	PTS Faculty (n = 35)	PTM Faculty (n = 71)	PTS Faculty (n = 35)	PTM Faculty (n = 71)	PTS Faculty (n = 35)
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	4.25 (.806)	4.09 (.933)	3.80 (.729)	3.74 (.931)	3.10 (1.097)	3.09 (1.138)
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	4.23 (.796)	4.17 (.923)	4.13 (.675)	3.91 (.951)	2.56* (1.079)	3.09* (1.147)
11. Motivating students to learn	4.49 (.772)	4.51 (.887)	3.90 (.759)	3.94 (.765)	3.08 (1.204)	3.29 (1.017)
12. Involving students in the learning process	4.59 (.709)	4.63 (.770)	3.99 (.837)	4.00 (1.000)	2.90 (1.110)	3.14 (1.033)
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	4.61 (.665)	4.60 (.812)	4.37 (.681)	4.29 (.926)	2.52 (1.107)	2.94 (1.211)

Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = A little, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = High, 5 = Very high

*Significant at the .05 level (see Table 4.17 for p-values).

The lowest mean rating of both groups was for the same skill or ability, "developing courses." Part-time faculty at the main campus rated "knowledge of the subject matter" highest in importance, whereas part-time faculty at the satellite campuses rated "using effective communication and interpersonal skills" highest in importance.

Proficiency. Part-time faculty at the main campus rated the extent to which they felt proficient in all of the 13 skills or abilities to be "high." Part-time faculty at the satellite campuses rated their proficiency in 12 of the 13 skills or abilities to be "high."

The skills or abilities rated highest and lowest in proficiency were the same for both groups, ranging from a low for "developing courses" to a high for "knowledge of the subject matter." However, part-time faculty at the main campus rated their proficiency for "developing courses" as "high," whereas the mean rating for part-time faculty at the satellite campuses was "somewhat."

Further development. Overall, all faculty, regardless of employment status or campus location, rated the extent to which they needed further development in all of the 13 skills or abilities to be "somewhat."

The highest mean rating for the extent to which part-time faculty at the main campus needed further development was for "applying the theories and practices of how adults learn." The highest mean rating for the extent to which part-time faculty at the satellite campuses needed further development was for "developing courses." The skill or ability rated lowest for the extent to which

faculty needed further development was the same for both groups, "knowledge of the subject matter."

Part-Time Faculty, Main Campus Versus Part-Time Faculty, Satellite Campuses: T-Test Analysis

In Table 4.17 the results of the t-test analysis based on the mean responses of part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses are given for (a) the importance of the specific teaching-related skills or abilities, (b) the extent to which they felt proficient in each of the skills or abilities, and (c) the extent to which they thought they needed further development in each of the skills or abilities.

A significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of part-time faculty at the main campus and part-time faculty at the satellite campuses for their rating of the importance of "applying the theories and practices of teaching." Part-time faculty at the main campus rated the importance of this skill or ability significantly higher than did part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

No significant difference was found when comparing the mean responses of each group in their ratings of the extent to which they felt proficient in the 13 skills or abilities.

A significant difference was found in the mean responses of each group in rating the extent to which they thought they needed further development in "developing courses" and "managing classroom environment and learning." In

Table 4.17: T-test results for mean ratings of specific teaching-related skills or abilities–importance, proficiency, and further development: Part-time faculty, main campus and part-time faculty, satellite campuses.[a]

Skill or Ability:	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value	Signif.? Yes/No	p-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.1311	No	.5364	No	.4868
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	Yes	.0349	No	.3406	No	.6474
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	No	.8297	No	.4851	No	.6243
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	No	.5367	No	.9268	No	.7463
5. Developing courses	No	.1285	No	.5669	Yes	.0070
6. Development and selection of course materials	No	.9485	No	.9751	No	.4822
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	No	.6572	No	.6233	No	.1838
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.8957	No	.4600	No	.1869
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	No	.3525	No	.6864	No	.9644
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	No	.7565	No	.1877	Yes	.0237
11. Motivating students to learn	No	.8990	No	.7925	No	.3973
12. Involving students in the learning process	No	.8063	No	.9393	No	.2841
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	No	.9697	No	.6138	No	.0766

[a]See Table 4.16 for mean ratings of part-time faculty at the main campus and part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

both cases, part-time faculty at the satellite campuses rated the extent to which they needed further development in these skills or abilities significantly higher than did part-time faculty at the main campus.

Preferred Methods of Development

4. What methods for acquiring certain teaching-related skills and abilities do faculty most prefer?

In addition to this primary research question, the data were also analyzed to determine whether these preferences differed between the following groups of faculty: (a) full-time faculty versus part-time faculty, (b) experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty, (c) faculty at the main campus versus faculty at the satellite campuses, (d) full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses, and (e) part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

A list of six development methods was given for faculty to choose from and consisted of the following methods: (a) formal coursework; (b) preparing and presenting a scholarly lecture, paper, or presentation at workshops, seminars, or conferences; (c) documented self-study; (d) a single in-service conducted on this skill or ability; (e) more than one in-service conducted on this skill or ability; and (f) Other appropriate activities.

In Table 4.18 the percentage of responses for each method by all faculty at Davenport College are summarized, indicating their preferred method of development for each of the 13 skills and abilities for effective teaching. Overall,

Table 4.18: Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: All Davenport College faculty (N = 166).

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method						Total (%)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	39	9	23	11	10	8	100
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	7	8	14	30	35	6	100
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	6	3	15	41	33	2	100
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	5	5	15	41	30	4	100
5. Developing courses	12	7	21	31	21	8	100
6. Development and selection of course materials	8	7	22	35	19	9	100
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	7	6	11	33	37	6	100
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	9	6	17	37	25	6	100
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	12	4	10	44	28	2	100
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	8	4	15	52	16	5	100
11. Motivating students to learn	5	5	14	39	30	7	100
12. Involving students in the learning process	5	6	13	42	28	6	100
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	4	6	14	49	15	12	100
TOTAL	10	6	16	37	25	6	100

Key: A = Formal coursework, B = Preparing and presenting a scholarly work, C = Documented self-study, D = A single in-service, E = More than one in-service, F = Other activity

faculty chose "a single in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as the method of development they preferred most to learn more about a specific skill or ability related to effective teaching. Faculty chose "a single in-service" as their first choice for 10 of the 13 skills or abilities and chose this method 779 times or 37% overall.

Thirty-five percent and 37% of all faculty chose "more than one in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as their preferred method of development for the skills or abilities "applying the theories and practices of teaching" and "using a variety of teaching strategies," respectively. Thirty-nine percent of all faculty chose "formal coursework" as their preferred method of development for the skill or ability "knowledge of the subject matter."

Although not selected as a most preferred method by faculty, the development methods "documented self-study" and "other appropriate activities" were chosen 328 times or 16% of the time and 135 times or 6% of the time, respectively, by all faculty. The most common "other appropriate activities" listed by faculty were "sitting in on colleagues," "attendance at workshops, seminars, and conferences," "practice in the field," "discussions with other faculty," and "working with a mentor or peer group."

The development method chosen least overall by faculty was "preparing and presenting a scholarly lecture, paper, or presentation at workshops, seminars, or conferences." This method was chosen 121 times or 6% overall.

Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty:
Percentage of Responses

In Table 4.19 the percentage of responses for each method for each skill or ability are given, indicating the preferred method of development for each of the 13 skills or abilities for effective teaching by faculty when grouped by employment status.

Overall, all faculty, regardless of employment status, chose "a single in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as the method of development they preferred most often to learn more about the majority of the 13 skills or abilities. Full-time faculty and part-time faculty chose "a single in-service" as their first choice for 10 of the 13 skills or abilities. Full-time faculty chose this method 263 times or 35% overall, and part-time faculty chose this method 516 times or 38% overall.

Both groups selected "formal coursework" as their preferred method of development for the skill or ability, "knowledge of the subject matter." Thirty-seven percent of the full-time faculty chose this method, and 40% of the part-time faculty chose this method.

Both groups selected "more than one in-service" as their preferred method of development for the skill or ability "using a variety of teaching strategies." Twenty-seven percent of the full-time faculty chose this method, and 42% of the part-time faculty chose this method. Forty-one percent of the part-time faculty also chose "more than one in-service" as their preferred method of development for the skill or ability "applying the theories and practices of teaching."

Table 4.19: Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Full-time faculty (F-T) (n = 60) and part-time faculty (P-T) (n = 105).

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	37	40	7	10	27	20	8	13	8	12	13	5	100	100
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	10	6	10	7	17	12	31	29	23	41	9	5	100	100
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	7	5	7	1	12	16	43	40	28	36	3	2	100	100
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	5	5	7	4	19	12	42	40	23	34	4	5	100	100
*5. Developing courses	9	13	12	4	30	17	26	33	9	29	14	6	100	100
*6. Development and selection of course materials	7	9	7	7	30	17	38	33	5	26	13	8	100	100
*7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	9	6	12	2	16	9	26	37	27	42	10	4	100	100
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	12	7	7	5	21	14	39	36	12	33	9	5	100	100
*9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	19	9	8	1	14	8	37	47	22	31	0	4	100	100
*10. Managing classroom environment and learning	7	8	5	3	25	11	49	53	11	19	3	6	100	100
*11. Motivating students to learn	3	6	9	4	20	11	34	41	20	35	14	3	100	100

Table 4.19: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T	F-T	P-T
12. Involving students in the learning process	5	5	5	7	19	9	40	43	21	32	10	4	100	100
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	5	3	5	7	19	11	44	52	9	18	18	9	100	100 2
TOTAL	10	9	8	5	21	13	35	38	17	30	9	5	100	100

Key: A = Formal coursework, B = Preparing and presenting a scholarly work, C = Documented self-study, D = A single in-service, E = More than one in-service, F = Other activity

*Significant at the .05 level (see Table 4.20 for p-values).

For the skill or ability "developing courses," 30% of the full-time faculty chose their most preferred method of development to be "documented self-study." The development method chosen least by both full-time faculty and part-time faculty was "preparing and presenting a scholarly lecture, paper, or presentation at workshops, seminars, or conferences." This method was chosen 59 times or 8% overall by full-time faculty and 62 times or 5% overall by part-time faculty.

Full-Time Faculty Versus Part-Time Faculty: Chi-Square Tests

In Table 4.20 the results of the chi-square tests for the preferred methods of development are given for each of the 13 skills or abilities by full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

A significant difference was found when comparing the responses of full-time faculty and part-time faculty for six of the skills or abilities, indicating that the responses of full-time faculty were significantly different from those of part-time faculty for these items. These six skills or abilities and their corresponding significance levels are as follows: (a) "developing courses," .0046; (b) "development and selection of course materials," .0310; (c) "using a variety of teaching strategies," .0009; (d) "evaluation and measurement of student learning," .0141; (e) "managing classroom environment and learning," .0396; and (f) "motivating students to learn," .0163.

Table 4.20: Chi-square results for preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Full-time faculty versus part-time faculty.[a]

Skill or Ability	Signif.? Yes/No	P-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.3476
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	No	.2801
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	No	.2756
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	No	.5836
5. Developing courses	Yes	.0046
6. Development and selection of course materials	Yes	.0310
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	Yes	.0009
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.4656
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	Yes	.0141
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	Yes	.0396
11. Motivating students to learn	Yes	.0163
12. Involving students in the learning process	No	.1774
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	No	.1623

[a]See Table 4.19 for percentage of responses for each method for each skill or ability by full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

Experienc
Faculty: F

In

or ability

each of th

experien

E

ability" a

majority

their firs

or 38% o

L

this skil

more a

"more t

chose t

one in-

"applyi

strateg

their p

Experienced Faculty and Less Experienced Faculty: Percentage of Responses

In Table 4.21 the percentage of responses for each method for each skill or ability are summarized, indicating the preferred method of development for each of the 13 skills or abilities for effective teaching by faculty when grouped by experience level.

Experienced faculty chose "a single in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as the method of development they preferred most to learn more about the majority of skills or abilities. Experienced faculty chose "a single in-service" as their first choice for 11 of the 13 skills or abilities and chose this method 605 times or 38% overall.

Less experienced faculty chose "more than one in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as the method of development they preferred most to learn more about the majority of skills or abilities. Less experienced faculty chose "more than one in-service" as their first choice for 7 of the 13 skills or abilities and chose this method 169 times or 33% overall.

Thirty-two percent and 33% of the experienced faculty chose "more than one in-service" as their preferred method of development for the skills or abilities "applying the theories and practices of teaching" and "using a variety of teaching strategies," respectively.

All faculty, regardless of level of experience, chose "formal coursework" as their preferred method of development for the skill or ability, "knowledge of the

Table 4.21: Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Experienced faculty (Exp) (n = 127) and less experienced faculty (Less) (n = 39).

Table 4.21: Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Experienced faculty (Exp) (n = 127) and less experienced faculty (Less) (n = 39).

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	39	39	8	11	23	21	12	8	9	16	9	5	100	100
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	6	13	7	10	16	8	32	23	32	43	7	3	100	100
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	5	8	3	3	16	10	43	36	31	40	2	3	100	100
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	4	8	3	10	19	3	40	43	29	33	5	3	100	100
5. Developing courses	12	11	8	5	23	16	30	32	18	28	9	8	100	100
6. Development and selection of course materials	6	16	7	8	23	18	37	26	16	29	11	3	100	100
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	7	8	6	5	14	3	33	31	33	50	7	3	100	100
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	10	5	4	10	18	13	40	28	21	39	7	5	100	100
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	13	10	4	3	12	5	43	46	26	33	2	3	100	100
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	9	5	4	5	22	8	62	54	16	25	7	3	100	100

Table 4.21: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less	Exp.	Less
11. Motivating students to learn	4	8	6	5	15	13	41	30	26	41	8	3	100	100
12. Involving students in the learning process	4	8	7	5	14	8	44	35	24	41	7	3	100	100
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	3	5	6	8	16	8	48	54	15	15	12	10	100	100
TOTAL	9	11	6	7	17	10	38	35	23	33	7	4	100	100

Key: A = Formal coursework, B = Preparing and presenting a scholarly work, C = Documented self-study, D = A single in-service, E = More than one in-service, F = Other activity

subject m

experienc

Att

faculty, th

or 17% o

experien

presenta

87 times

experien

20 times

Experie

Faculty:

I

of dev

experie

respon

indica

from t

subject matter." Thirty-nine percent of both experienced faculty and less experienced faculty chose this method for this skill or ability.

Although not selected as a preferred method overall by experienced faculty, the development method "documented self-study" was chosen 277 times or 17% overall by this group. The development method chosen least by experienced faculty was "preparing and presenting a scholarly lecture, paper, or presentation at workshops, seminars, or conferences." This method was chosen 87 times or 6% overall. The development method chosen least by less experienced faculty was "other appropriate activities." This method was chosen 20 times or 4% overall.

Experienced Faculty Versus Less Experienced Faculty: Chi-Square Tests

In Table 4.22 the results of the chi-square tests for the preferred methods of development are summarized for each of the 13 skills or abilities by experienced faculty and less experienced faculty.

No significant difference was found when comparing the number of responses for each method for each group for any of the 13 skills or abilities, indicating that the responses of experienced faculty were not significantly different from those of less experienced faculty.

Table 4.2

1. Kn
2. Ap
3. Un and lea
4. Ap acults
5. De
6. De
7. Us
8. U interpe
9. E learni
10. M
11. M
12. I
13. I

or abili

Table 4.22: Chi-square results for preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty.[a]

Skill or Ability	Signif.? Yes/No	P-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.7708
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	No	.8096
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	No	.8360
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	No	.6334
5. Developing courses	No	.7251
6. Development and selection of course materials	No	.6371
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	No	.2555
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.1728
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	No	.8252
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	No	.2897
11. Motivating students to learn	No	.3749
12. Involving students in the learning process	No	.2578
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	No	.8299

[a]See Table 4.21 for percentage of responses for each method for each skill or ability by experienced faculty and less experienced faculty.

Faculty, Main Campus and Faculty, Satellite Campuses: Percentage of Responses

In Table 4.23 the percentage of responses for each method for each skill or ability are summarized, indicating the preferred method of development for each of the 13 skills or abilities for effective teaching by faculty when grouped only by campus location.

Overall, all faculty, regardless of campus location, chose "a single in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as the method of development they preferred most to learn more about a specific skill or ability related to effective teaching. Main campus faculty chose "a single in-service" as their first choice for 10 of the 13 skills or abilities and chose this method 463 times or 35% overall. Faculty at the satellite campuses chose "a single in-service" as their first choice for 9 of the 13 skills or abilities and chose this method 316 times or 41% overall.

Both groups chose "more than one in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as their most preferred method of development for the skill or ability "applying the theories and practices of teaching." Thirty-six percent of the faculty at the main campus and 32% of the faculty at the satellite campuses chose this method. Thirty-five percent of the faculty at the main campus also chose "more than one in-service" as their preferred method of development for the skill or ability "using a variety of teaching strategies." Forty percent and 38% of the faculty at the satellite campuses also chose "more than one in-service" as their preferred method of development for the skills or abilities "understanding learners,

Table 4.23: Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Faculty, main campus (MC) (n = 105) and faculty, satellite campuses (Sat.) (n = 61).

Table 4.23: *Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Faculty, main campus (MC) (n = 105) and faculty, satellite campuses (Sat.) (n = 61).*

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	40	37	9	8	22	23	8	17	11	10	10	5	100	100
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	9	5	9	7	12	18	28	31	36	32	6	7	100	100
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	7	3	4	2	12	18	44	37	29	40	4	0	100	100
*4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	7	2	5	5	12	20	44	35	25	38	7	0	100	100
5. Developing courses	17	3	7	7	21	21	27	36	19	24	9	9	100	100
6. Development and selection of course materials	11	3	7	7	25	18	28	46	20	16	9	10	100	100
*7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	9	3	5	7	15	5	28	42	35	40	8	3	100	100
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	10	7	6	5	18	15	33	43	25	27	8	3	100	100
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	15	8	4	3	10	10	40	50	28	27	3	2	100	100
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	9	5	5	2	12	22	52	52	16	16	6	3	100	100

Table 4.23: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.	MC	Sat.
*11. Motivating students to learn	6	3	6	5	10	22	36	43	31	27	11	0	100	100
12. Involving students in the learning process	6	3	7	5	11	15	39	47	27	30	10	0	100	100
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	4	3	6	7	12	17	48	51	14	17	16	5	100	100
TOTAL	12	7	6	5	15	17	35	41	24	27	8	3	100	100

Key: A = Formal coursework, B = Preparing and presenting a scholarly work, C = Documented self-study, D = A single in-service, E = More than one in-service, F = Other activity

*Significant at the .05 level (see Table 4.24 for p-values).

their b

of hov

devel

perce

facul

facu

15%

can

at v

6%

by

m

E
C

c

c

their backgrounds, and learning styles" and "applying the theories and practices of how adults learn," respectively.

Both groups chose "formal coursework" as their most preferred method of development for the skill or ability, "knowledge of the subject matter." Forty percent of the faculty at the main campus chose this method, and 37% of the faculty at the satellite campuses chose this method for this skill or ability.

Although not selected as a preferred method of development overall by faculty at the main campus, "documented self-study" was chosen 194 times or 15% of the time. The development method chosen least by faculty at the main campus was "preparing and presenting a scholarly lecture, paper, or presentation at workshops, seminars, or conferences." This method was chosen 80 times or 6% overall by faculty at the main campus. The development method chosen least by faculty at the satellite campuses was "other appropriate activities." This method was chosen 28 times or 3% overall by faculty at the satellite campuses.

Faculty, Main Campus Versus Faculty, Satellite Campuses: Chi-Square Tests

In Table 4.24 the results of the chi-square tests for the preferred methods of development are given for each of the 13 skills or abilities by faculty at the main campus and faculty at the satellite campuses.

Table

1.
2.
3. and
4 ad
5
6
7
8 in
le
1
1

or

Table 4.24: Chi-square results for preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Faculty, main campus versus faculty, satellite campuses.[a]

Skill or Ability	Signif.? Yes/No	P-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.2728
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	No	.5018
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	No	.0933
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	Yes	.0132
5. Developing courses	No	.0743
6. Development and selection of course materials	No	.0543
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	Yes	.0336
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.4436
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	No	.4938
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	No	.1953
11. Motivating students to learn	Yes	.0100
12. Involving students in the learning process	No	.0508
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	No	.1970

[a]See Table 4.23 for percentage of responses for each method for each skill or ability by faculty at the main campus and faculty at the satellite campuses.

A

faculty a

skills or

significa

items.

are as

.0132;

studer

Full-T
Satell

or ab

each

empl

in-se

pref

facu

of th

time

skil

the

A significant difference was found when comparing the responses of faculty at the main campus and faculty at the satellite campuses for three of the skills or abilities, indicating that the responses of main campus faculty were significantly different from those of faculty at the satellite campuses for these items. These three skills or abilities and their corresponding significance levels are as follows: (a) "Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn," .0132; (b) "Using a variety of teaching strategies," .0336; and (c) "Motivating students to learn," .0100.

Full-Time Faculty, Main Campus and Full-Time Faculty, Satellite Campuses: Percentage of Responses

In Table 4.25 the percentage of responses for each method for each skill or ability are summarized, indicating the preferred method of development for each of the 13 skills or abilities for effective teaching by faculty when grouped by employment status and campus location.

Overall, all full-time faculty, regardless of campus location, chose "a single in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as the method of development they preferred most to learn more about the majority of skills or abilities. Full-time faculty at the main campus chose "a single in-service" as their first choice for 9 of the 13 skills or abilities and chose this method 136 times or 32% overall. Full-time faculty at the satellite campuses chose "a single in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as their first choice for 9 of the 13 skills or abilities and as one of their first choices for three more of the skills or abilities.

Table 4.25: Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Full-time faculty, main campuses (FTS) (n = 26); and full-time faculty, satellite campuses (FTS) (n = 24).

Table 4.25: Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Full-time faculty, main campus (FTM) (n = 34) and full-time faculty, satellite campuses (FTS) (n = 26).

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	44	23	6	8	18	38	6	12	6	11	20	8	100	100
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	12	8	16	4	18	15	24	38	21	27	9	8	100	100
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	12	0	9	4	6	20	46	40	21	36	6	0	100	100
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	9	0	9	4	16	24	47	36	13	36	6	0	100	100
5. Developing courses	12	4	15	8	31	29	24	29	6	13	12	17	100	100
6. Development and selection of course materials	10	4	10	4	33	27	30	46	3	8	14	11	100	100
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	15	0	12	12	18	12	18	36	21	36	16	4	100	100

Table 4.25: Continued.

Table 4.25: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS	FTM	FTS
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	22	0	3	12	16	28	40	36	3	24	16	0	100	100
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	27	8	12	4	9	19	34	42	18	27	0	0	100	100
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	13	0	6	4	16	35	49	50	10	11	6	0	100	100
*11. Motivating students to learn	6	0	10	8	10	35	30	38	20	19	24	0	100	100
*12. Involving students in the learning process	9	0	6	4	9	31	38	42	19	23	19	0	100	100
*13. Interact and establish rapport with students	9	0	3	8	9	32	38	52	9	8	32	0	100	100
TOTAL	16	4	9	6	16	27	32	38	13	21	14	4	100	100

Key: A = Formal coursework, B = Preparing and presenting a scholarly work, C = Documented self-study, D = A single in-service, E = More than one in-service, F = Other activity

*Significant at the .05 level (see Table 4.26 for p-values).

chose t

for the

course

servic

or abi

a vari

faculf

prefe

teac

the

dev

car

at

9%

th

Ea

Thirty-one percent and 33% of the full-time faculty at the main campus chose their most preferred method of development to be "documented self-study" for the skills or abilities "developing courses" and "development and selection of course materials," respectively.

Full-time faculty at the satellite campuses selected "more than one in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as one of their first choices for two skills or abilities, "applying the theories and practices of how adults learn" and "using a variety of teaching strategies" (36% each). Twenty-one percent of the full-time faculty at the main campus also chose "more than one in-service" as their most preferred method of development for the skill or ability, "using a variety of teaching strategies."

For one of the skills or abilities, "knowledge of the subject matter," 44% of the full-time faculty at the main campus chose their most preferred method of development to be "formal coursework."

The development method chosen least by full-time faculty at the main campus was "preparing and presenting a scholarly lecture, paper, or presentation at workshops, seminars, or conferences." This method was chosen 38 times or 9% overall. Two development methods were chosen least by full-time faculty at the satellite campuses, "formal coursework" and "other appropriate activities." Each of these methods was chosen 12 times or 4% overall.

Full-Time Faculty, Main Campus Versus Full-Time Faculty, Satellite Campuses: Chi-Square Tests

In Table 4.26 the results of the chi-square tests for the preferred methods of development are summarized for each of the 13 skills or abilities by full-time faculty at the main campus and full-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

A significant difference was found when comparing the responses of full-time faculty at the main campus and full-time faculty at the satellite campuses for three of the skills or abilities, indicating that the responses of full-time main campus faculty were significantly different from those of full-time faculty at the satellite campuses for these items. These three skills or abilities and their corresponding significance levels are as follows: (a) "motivating students to learn," .0133; (b) "involving students in the learning process," .0259; and (c) "interact and establish rapport with students," .0095.

Part-Time Faculty, Main Campus and Part-Time Faculty, Satellite Campuses: Percentage of Responses

In Table 4.27 the percentage of responses for each method are summarized for each skill or ability, indicating the preferred method of development for each of the 13 skills or abilities for effective teaching by faculty when grouped by employment status and campus location.

Ta

C
S

Table 4.26: Chi-square results for preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Full-time faculty, main campus versus full-time faculty, satellite campuses.[a]

Skill or Ability	Signif.? Yes/No	P-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.2137
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	No	.6427
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	No	.1002
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	No	.1133
5. Developing courses	No	.7729
6. Development and selection of course materials	No	.6746
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	No	.1207
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.0694
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	No	.1927
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	No	.8912
11. Motivating students to learn	Yes	.0133
12. Involving students in the learning process	Yes	.0259
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	Yes	.0095

[a]See Table 4.25 for percentage of responses for each method for each skill or ability by full-time faculty at the main campus and full-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

Table 4.27: Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Part-time faculty, main and part-time faculty, satellite campuses (PTS) (n = 35).

Table 4.27: Preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Part-time faculty, main campus (PTM) (n = 71) and part-time faculty, satellite campuses (PTS) (n = 35).

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	37	47	10	9	25	12	9	20	13	9	6	3	100	100
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	7	3	6	8	9	20	30	26	44	37	4	6	100	100
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	4	6	1	0	16	17	43	34	33	43	3	0	100	100
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	6	3	3	6	10	17	43	34	31	40	7	0	100	100
5. Developing courses	19	3	3	6	17	15	29	40	25	33	7	3	100	100
6. Development and selection of course materials	12	3	6	8	21	12	26	46	28	23	7	8	100	100
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	6	6	2	3	13	0	32	46	43	42	4	3	100	100

Table 4.27: Continued.

Skill or Ability:	Percentage of Responses for Each Method for Each Group												Total (%)	
	A		B		C		D		E		F			
	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS	PTM	PTS
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	4	12	7	0	19	6	31	46	35	30	4	6	100	100
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	9	8	0	3	10	3	44	56	33	27	4	3	100	100
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	7	8	4	0	10	12	54	53	19	21	6	6	100	100
11. Motivating students to learn	6	6	4	3	10	12	40	46	36	33	4	0	100	100
12. Involving students in the learning process	4	6	7	6	12	3	41	50	30	35	6	0	100	100
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	1	6	7	6	13	6	54	50	16	24	9	8	100	100
TOTAL	9	9	5	5	14	10	36	42	30	30	6	4	100	100

Key: A = Formal coursework, B = Preparing and presenting a scholarly work, C = Documented self-study, D = A single in-service, E = More than one in-service, F = Other activity

Overall, all part-time faculty, regardless of campus location, chose "a single in-service conducted on this skill or ability" as the method of development they preferred most to learn more about for the majority of skills or abilities. Part-time faculty at the main campus chose "a single in-service" as their first choice for 8 of the 13 skills or abilities and chose this methods 328 times or 36% overall. Part-time faculty at the satellite campuses chose this method as their first choice for nine or 69% of the 13 skills or abilities. Part-time faculty at the satellite campuses chose this method 189 times or 42% overall.

Both groups chose their most preferred method of development for the skill or ability "applying the theories and practices of teaching" to be "more than one in-service." Forty-four percent of the part-time faculty at the main campus and 37% of the part-time faculty at the satellite campuses chose this method for this skill or ability. Part-time faculty at the main campus also chose "more than one in-service" for the following three skills or abilities, accompanied by the percentage of these faculty who selected this method for each skill or ability: "development and selection of course materials" (28%), "using a variety of teaching strategies" (43%), and "using effective communication and interpersonal skills" (35%). Forty-three percent and 40% of part-time faculty at the satellite campuses also chose "more than one in-service" as their preferred method of development for the skills or abilities "understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles" and "applying the theories and practices of how adults learn," respectively.

Both groups chose "formal coursework" as the method of development they preferred most for the skill or ability "knowledge of the subject matter." Thirty-seven percent of the part-time faculty at the main campus chose this method, and 47% of the part-time faculty at the satellite campuses chose this method for this skill or ability.

Although not selected as a preferred method overall by part-time faculty at the main campus, the development method, "documented self-study," was selected 127 times or 14% overall by this group. The development method chosen least by part-time faculty at the main campus was "preparing and presenting a scholarly lecture, paper, or presentation at workshops, seminars, or conferences." This method was chosen 42 times or 5% overall. The development method chosen least by part-time faculty at the satellite campuses was "other appropriate activities," chosen 16 times or 4% overall.

Part-Time Faculty, Main Campus Versus Part-Time Faculty, Satellite Campuses: Chi-Square Tests

In Table 4.28 the results of the chi-square tests are given for the preferred methods of development for each of the 13 skills or abilities by part-time faculty at the main campus and part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

No significant difference was found when comparing the number of responses for each skill or ability by either group for any of the 13 skills or abilities, indicating that the responses of part-time faculty at the main campus

Table 4.28: Chi-square results for preferred methods of development for specific teaching-related skills or abilities: Part-time faculty, main campus versus part-time faculty, satellite campuses.[a]

Skill or Ability	Signif.? Yes/No	P-Value
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	No	.3248
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	No	.5625
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	No	.7617
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	No	.3815
5. Developing courses	No	.2128
6. Development and selection of course materials	No	.2765
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	No	.2647
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	No	.1093
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	No	.6066
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	No	.8958
11. Motivating students to learn	No	.8282
12. Involving students in the learning process	No	.4502
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	No	.6793

[a]See Table 4.27 for percentage of responses for each method for each skill or ability by part-time faculty at the main campus and part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

were not significantly different from those of part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

Ranking of Three Skills or Abilities

In this section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to select and rank the three skills or abilities most important to them to further develop their teaching abilities from the list of 13 skills or abilities associated with effective teaching, based on the following research question:

5. What three skills or abilities associated with effective teaching are the most important to faculty at Davenport College in order to further develop their teaching abilities?

In addition to this primary research question, the data were also analyzed to determine whether the preferences of faculty differed when based on the following criteria: (a) full-time faculty versus part-time faculty, (b) experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty, (c) faculty at the main campus versus faculty at the satellite campuses, (d) full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses, and (e) part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses. After reviewing the data when analyzed according to these criteria (level of experience, employment status, and campus location), they were found to be essentially redundant. Accordingly, the only results discussed in this section are for all faculty combined, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty.

In Table 4.29 the number and percentage of responses are summarized for the three skills or abilities most important to faculty to further develop their

Table 4.29: Three most important skills or abilities for faculty to further develop their teaching abilities: All faculty, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty.

Skill or Ability:	All Faculty (n = 166)[a]		Full-Time Faculty (n = 60)[a]		Part-Time Faculty (n = 106)[a]	
	No. Responses	%	No. Response	%	No. Responses	%
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	62 (1)[b]	37	30 (1)[b]	50	32	30
2. Using a variety of teaching strategies	62 (1)[b]	37	19 (3)[b]	32	43 (1)[b]	41
3. Involving students in the learning process	60 (2)[b]	36	20 (2)[b]	33	40 (2)[b]	38
4. Motivating students to learn	58 (3)[b]	35	19 (3)[b]	32	39 (3)[b]	37
5. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	44	27	17	28	27	26
6. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	39	24	16	27	23	22
7. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	35	21	9	15	26	25
8. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	34	21	11	19	23	22
9. Development and selection of course materials	29	18	8	13	21	20
10. Developing courses	24	15	11	19	13	12
11. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	22	13	7	12	15	14
12. Interact and establish rapport with students	15	9	8	13	7	6
13. Managing classroom environment and learning	12	7	4	7	8	7
TOTAL	496	300	179	300	317	300

[a]Totals should equal three times the population except in cases of nonresponse error.

[b]Identifies top three skills or abilities as selected by each group.

teaching abilities for all faculty as one group and for faculty when analyzed based on employment status.

All Faculty

Thirty-seven percent of all faculty selected both "knowledge of the subject matter" and "using a variety of teaching strategies" as two of the skills or abilities most important to them to further develop their teaching abilities. Thirty-six percent of all faculty selected "involving students in the learning process" as one of the skills or abilities most important to them to further develop, and 35% selected "motivating students to learn."

Full-Time Faculty

Fifty percent of the full-time faculty selected "knowledge of the subject matter" as one of the skills or abilities most important to them to further develop their teaching abilities, and 33% selected "involving students in the learning process." Thirty-two percent of the full-time faculty selected both "motivating students to learn" and "using a variety of teaching strategies" as two of the skills or abilities most important to them to further develop.

Part-Time Faculty

Forty-one percent of the part-time faculty selected "using a variety of teaching strategies" as one of the skills or abilities most important to them to further develop their teaching abilities. "Involving students in the learning process" was selected by 38% of the part-time faculty and "motivating students

to learn" was selected by 37% of these faculty as two of the skills or abilities most important to them to further develop.

Summary

In determining the importance of the 13 skills or abilities, it was found that the mean ratings of faculty, regardless of employment status, level of experience, or campus location, were extremely consistent. All of the skills or abilities were rated "high" or "very high" in importance by all faculty across all groups. The skill or ability rated highest in importance by 90% of the groups was "knowledge of the subject matter." The skill or ability rated lowest in importance by 90% of the groups was "developing courses."

In determining faculty's perceived proficiency in the 13 skills or abilities, it was found that the mean ratings of faculty, regardless of employment status, level of experience, or campus location, were very consistent. All of the skills or abilities were rated "high" to "somewhat" for the extent to which faculty felt proficient by all faculty across all groups. The skill or ability rated highest in proficiency by 90% of the groups was "knowledge of the subject matter." The skill or ability rated lowest in proficiency by 70% of the groups was "developing courses."

In determining the extent to which faculty need further development in each of the 13 skills or abilities, it was found that the mean ratings of faculty, regardless of employment status, level of experience, or campus location, were consistent. Eight of the ten groups rated the extent to which they need further

development to be "somewhat" for all of the 13 skills or abilities. The skill or ability rated highest for the extent to which faculty need further development by 60% of the groups was "evaluation and measurement of student learning." The skill or ability rated lowest for the extent to which faculty need further development by 70% of the groups was "interact and establish rapport with students."

In determining the development method by which faculty would prefer most to learn more about each of the 13 skills or abilities, it was found that the preferred methods of faculty, regardless of employment status, level of experience, or campus location, were very consistent. "A single in-service" was the method preferred most by 90% of the groups to learn more about the majority of the 13 skills or abilities.

In determining the three skills or abilities most important to faculty in order to further develop their teaching abilities, it was found that the skills or abilities most important to faculty, regardless of employment status, level of experience, or campus location, were very consistent. "Using a variety of teaching strategies" was selected by all of the groups as one of the skills or abilities most important to them to further develop their teaching abilities. "Involving students in the learning process" and "motivating students to learn" were selected by 70% of the groups as one of the skills or abilities most important to them to further develop their teaching abilities. The specific faculty development needs, including preferred method of development, for each of the ten faculty groups when

analyzed by employment status, level of experience, and campus location are summarized in Table 4.30.

The conclusions, recommendations, and reflections based on these findings are reported in Chapter V.

Table 4.30: Specific faculty-development needs for faculty groups based on employment status, level of experience, and campus location.

Faculty Group	Knowledge of the Subject Matter	Evaluation & Measurement of Student Learning	Using a Variety of Teaching Strategies	Applying the Theories & Practices of How Adults Learn	Involving Students in the Learning Process	Developing Courses
Full-time faculty	CW	IS				
Part-time faculty			MIS	IS		
Experienced faculty	CW	IS				
Less experienced faculty	CW		MIS		MIS	
Faculty, main campus	CW	IS				
Faculty, satellites			IS			
Full-time faculty, main campus	CW		MIS			
Full-time faculty, satellites		IS			IS	
Part-time faculty, main campus				IS	IS	
Part-time faculty, satellites			IS			IS

Key: CW = Coursework, IS = Single in-service, MIS = More than one in-service

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The intent of this chapter is to provide a summary of the study, draw conclusions from the findings, and make recommendations.

Summary

The general purpose of this study was to determine the faculty development needs of full-time and part-time faculty relating to effective teaching at the four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College, a private, nonprofit institution in Michigan. The specific objective of this study was to determine whether these needs differed between full-time and part-time faculty, between experienced and less experienced faculty, and between full-time and part-time faculty at the main campus versus the satellite campuses of Davenport College. The developmental needs of these faculty were determined by asking faculty for their perceptions and preferences relating to the following five primary research questions:

1. How important do faculty think certain teaching-related skills or abilities are to effective teaching?

2. To what extent do faculty feel proficient in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

3. To what extent do faculty perceive they need further development in certain teaching-related skills and abilities?

4. What methods for acquiring certain teaching-related skills and abilities do faculty most prefer?

5. What three skills or abilities associated with effective teaching are the most important to faculty at Davenport College in order to further develop their teaching abilities?

For each of these five primary research questions the data were also analyzed and compared according to the following groupings of faculty:

1. Full-time faculty versus part-time faculty.

2. Experienced faculty versus less experienced faculty.

3. Faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the main campus versus faculty (both full-time and part-time) at the satellite campuses.

4. Full-time faculty at the main campus versus full-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

5. Part-time faculty at the main campus versus part-time faculty at the satellite campuses.

The developmental needs of faculty were determined for the following 13 teaching-related skills or abilities related to effective teaching:

1. Knowledge of the subject matter.

2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching.

3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles.

4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn.

5. Developing a course.

6. Development and selection of course materials.

7. Using a variety of teaching strategies.

8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills.
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning.
10. Managing classroom environment and learning.
11. Motivating students to learn.
12. Involving students in the learning process.
13. Interact and establish rapport with students.

The population (Table 4.1) was composed of 298 full-time and part-time faculty employed during Fall Term 1993 at the three four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College. Sixty of the 73 full-time faculty and 106 of the 225 part-time faculty responded to the survey. This represented a return rate of 56% overall, an 82% return rate for full-time faculty, and a 47% return rate for part-time faculty.

This study used a descriptive survey method in order to identify the perceived faculty development needs related to effective teaching of the full-time and part-time faculty at the four-year, degree-granting campuses of Davenport College. Survey instruments (Appendices A and B) were developed to obtain data about the acquisition of teaching skills and knowledge by teachers at the postsecondary level.

Two pilot studies were conducted at the Grand Rapids campus. Survey instruments were distributed in both pilot studies to the same random sampling of 6 full-time and 12 part-time faculty. At the conclusion of the pilot studies, the survey instrument was modified to reflect the pilot panels' recommendations.

The revised questionnaire consisted of four sections. Part I consisted of six demographic questions. Part II consisted of a list of 13 teaching-related skills or abilities for which faculty were asked three questions: to rate the importance of each skill for effective teaching, to what extent they felt proficient in each skill or ability, and to what extent they thought they needed further development in this skill or ability. Part III consisted of a list of the same 13 skills or abilities for which faculty were asked to select from a list of six choices, which way they would most prefer to learn more about each skill or ability. Part IV asked faculty to rank the three skills or abilities that were most important to them in order to further develop their teaching skills from the same list of 13 skills or abilities contained in Parts II and III.

The data were tabulated using STATGRAPHICS and Minitab statistical software. Frequency counts and percentages were computed for each question. Analysis and various comparisons of the data were computed based on three criteria: (a) employment status of faculty members, (b) level of teaching experience, and (c) campus location. Based on the criteria used for this study, 85% of all full-time faculty and 72% of all part-time faculty were considered experienced (Table 4.3). T-tests and chi-square tests were used to determine whether any significant differences (at the .05 level) existed between the various groups' responses.

Importance of Skills or Abilities

In determining the importance of the 13 skills or abilities, it was found that the mean ratings of faculty, regardless of employment status, level of experience, or campus location, were extremely consistent (Table 5.1). When analyzing the data based on these criteria for faculty groupings, the findings were consistent across nine of the ten groups.

All of the skills or abilities were rated "high" or "very high" in importance by all faculty across all ten groups of faculty. "Knowledge of the subject matter" was rated highest by all faculty, across all groups. "Developing courses" was rated lowest by nine of the ten faculty groups.

When comparing the mean responses of faculty grouped by employment status, level of experience, or campus location, significant differences were found in the ratings for three of the five comparison groups for only 1 of the 13 skills or abilities for each group. These skills or abilities were "motivating students to learn" and "applying the theories and practices of teaching." Significant differences did exist in the mean ratings for one of the five comparison groups for 2 of the 13 skills or abilities. These skills or abilities were "understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles" and "developing courses."

Proficiency in Skills or Abilities

In determining faculty's perceived proficiency in the 13 skills or abilities, it was found that the mean ratings of faculty, regardless of employment status, level of experience, or campus location, were consistent across the vast majority of

Table 5.1: Overall faculty mean ratings of skills or abilities for faculty groups based on employment status, level of

Table 5.1: Overall faculty mean ratings of skills or abilities for faculty groups based on employment status, level of experience, and campus location--importance, proficiency, and further development.

Faculty Group	Importance		Proficiency		Further Development	
	Mean Rating[a]	High Skill/ Low Skill[b]	Mean Rating[a]	High Skill/ Low Skill[b]	Mean Rating[a]	High Skill/ Low Skill[b]
Full-time faculty	VH/H	1/5	H	13/9	SW/L	9/13
Part-time faculty	VH/H	1/5	H/SW	1/5	SW	4/1
Experienced faculty	VH/H	1/5	H	1/5	SW	9/13
Less experienced faculty	VH/H	1/5	H/SW	1/5	SW	12/1
Faculty, main campus	VH/H	1/5	H/SW	1/5	SW	9/13
Faculty, satellites	VH/H	1/5	H/SW	1&13/5	SW	7/13
Full-time faculty, main campus	VH/H	1/5	H	1/9	SW	9/13
Full-time faculty, satellites	VH/H	1/5	H/SW	13/9	SW/L	9/13
Part-time faculty, main campus	VH/H	1/5	H	1/5	SW	9/13
Part-time faculty, satellites	VH/H	8/5	H/SW	1/5	SW	1/5

[a]Mean ratings: VH = Very high, H = High, SW = Somewhat, L = A little

[b]Skills: 1 = Knowledge of the subject matter, 4 = Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn, 5 = Developing courses, 7 = Using a variety of teaching strategies, 8 = Using effective communication and interpersonal skills, 9 = Evaluation and measurement of student learning, 12 = Involving students in the learning process, and 13 = Interact and establish rapport with students.

co

fo

to

"[

o

n

s

i

comparison groups (Table 5.1). When analyzing the data based on these criteria for faculty groupings, the findings were consistent across seven of the ten groups.

All of the skills or abilities were rated "high" to "somewhat" for the extent to which faculty felt proficient by all faculty across all ten groupings of faculty. "Developing courses" was rated lowest in proficiency by eight of the ten groups of faculty. "Knowledge of the subject matter" was rated highest in proficiency by nine of the ten groups.

When comparing the mean responses of faculty grouped by employment status, level of experience, or campus location, significant differences were found in the ratings of their proficiency for one of the five comparison groups for only 1 of the 13 skills or abilities. This skill or ability was "applying the theories and practices of teaching." Significant differences were found in the mean ratings for two of the five comparison groups for 2 of the 13 skills or abilities. These skills or abilities were "developing courses," "development and selection of course materials," "applying the theories and practices of teaching," and "involving students in the learning process."

Further Development in Skills or Abilities

In determining the extent to which faculty need further development in each of the 13 skills or abilities, it was found that the mean ratings of faculty, regardless of employment status, level of experience, or campus location, were consistent (Table 5.1). When analyzing the data based on these criteria for faculty groupings, the findings were consistent across six of the ten groups.

Eight of the ten groups of faculty indicated the extent to which they needed further development to be "somewhat" for all of the 13 skills or abilities. "Interact and establish rapport with students" was rated lowest for further development by the majority of the ten groups of faculty. "Evaluation and measurement of student learning" was rated highest for further development by 50% of the groups.

When comparing the mean responses of faculty grouped by employment status, level of experience, or campus location, significant differences did exist in the ratings of their development needs for 2 of the 13 skills or abilities for one of the five comparison groups. These skills or abilities were "developing courses" and "managing classroom environment and learning." Significant differences did exist in the mean ratings for one of the five comparison groups for 3 of the 13 skills or abilities. These skills or abilities were "applying the theories and practices of teaching," "understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles," and "involving students in the learning process."

Preferred Methods

In determining the development method by which all faculty combined would prefer most to learn more about each of the 13 skills or abilities, it was found that "a single in-service conducted on this skill or ability" was the method preferred most by faculty for 10 of the 13 skills or abilities.

When analyzing the data based on employment status of faculty, their experience level, or campus location, the findings remained consistent across nine of the ten groups, with nine groups selecting "a single in-service conducted

on this skill or ability" as their most preferred method of development for the majority of the 13 skills or abilities. The most preferred method of development for less experienced faculty, for the majority of the 13 skills or abilities, was "more than one in-service conducted on this skill or ability."

When comparing the responses of faculty grouped by employment status, level of experience, or campus location, significant differences in the number of their responses for their preferred methods of development were found between six of the ten groupings of faculty for a minimum number of the skills or abilities. Overall, across all groups of faculty, there was agreement on "a single in-service" as their preferred method of development for the majority of the 13 skills or abilities.

Ranking of Skills or Abilities

In determining the three skills or abilities most important to faculty in order to further develop their teaching abilities, it was found that based on the mean responses for all faculty, "knowledge of the subject matter" and "using a variety of teaching strategies" were selected most frequently as two of the skills or abilities most important for further development by all faculty. The remaining two skills or abilities selected most frequently by all faculty as most important for further development were "involving students in the learning process" and "motivating students to learn."

When analyzing the responses of faculty grouped by employment status, level of experience, or campus location, the findings remained consistent across

each of the ten groupings of faculty in that the same four skills or abilities were selected as the most important to further develop by 70% or more of the ten groups. One skill or ability, "using a variety of teaching strategies," was selected by every group as one of the three skills or abilities most important for them to further develop. Two skills or abilities, "motivating students to learn" and "involving students in the learning process," were selected by 90% of the groups. One skill or ability, "knowledge of the subject matter," was selected by 70% of the groups.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings of this study.

1. **Overall, faculty (full-time, part-time, all levels of experience, and all campus locations) believed that they were proficient in all of the 13 skills or abilities related to effective teaching.** Faculty had no significant weaknesses or areas in which they thought they had a strong need for further development.

2. **Knowledge of the subject matter dominated the value system of teaching-related skills or abilities of faculty.** Faculty were confident of their proficiency in the skill or ability "knowledge of the subject matter" and ranked it as the skill or ability they wanted most to further develop.

3. **Teaching skills were important to faculty**. Overall, faculty thought all of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities were important for effective teaching.

4. **Traditional strategies for improving and learning new skills or abilities dominated faculty preferences.** Overall, faculty preferred learning more about specific teaching-related skills or abilities by having a single in-service conducted on each skill or ability. Administration may cultivate and promote such traditional faculty development activities rather than promoting and supporting creativity in the development of faculty. Familiarity with traditional faculty development activities may promote mediocrity among faculty.

5. **Determining faculty development needs by using generic skills and abilities and through self-perception reporting may not yield accurate information.** A weakness of this study may be attributable to its reliance on the self-perceptions of faculty and the lack of clarification, description, or detail of the 13 teaching-related skills or abilities. Therefore, these 13 skills or abilities may represent only headings or clusters of more detailed skills or abilities.

6. **Results of this study are consistent with those of other research.** It is common for faculty to assume their content knowledge is lacking when teaching is not going well. Faculty have a tendency to resist changing their beliefs about teaching.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made by the researcher, based on the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. Teaching must be considered a discipline to be studied by faculty, promoted by administration, and provided for through the use of a variety of

development methods as determined through the assessment of faculty needs and preferences.

2. The results of this study could be used to provide a basis for the further assessment of faculty development needs and in understanding the obstacles to providing faculty development activities.

3. A means of increasing the awareness of faculty to better identify their weaknesses and faculty development needs must be used before specific faculty development activities will be beneficial. Creative approaches to accomplishing this could include the organization of discussion groups focusing on teaching among faculty.

4. Faculty must be actively involved in the design and implementation of their own faculty development activities to insure the relevance of and their commitment to such activities, accompanied by the support and approval of administration.

5. A replication of this study could be conducted using multiple questionnaires in order to compare the perceptions of faculty with student and/or administration's perceptions of the same faculty.

Reflections

When I decided to conduct my research on faculty development, my decision was based on a great conviction I have for the importance of education and teacher preparation as a field of study. I continue to be disappointed by the attitudes, comments, and policies of my colleagues, postsecondary institutions,

and particularly postsecondary accrediting agencies that refer to a degree in education as "out of field" because these degrees are not in a specific content area.

If teachers at the postsecondary level are not required to have any formal teacher preparation, it is logical to assume that their developmental needs would be greatest in the area of skills or abilities related to effective teaching. What I found in this study, however, appeared to be just the opposite. These faculty, whether full-time or part-time, experienced or less experienced, main campus or satellite campuses, seemed to think they were quite proficient teachers and in no particularly great need of faculty development. At this juncture, I had to ask myself, where did I go wrong? What does this mean? Can these faculty really be this good?

In all actuality, the results of this study were really quite predictable and very similar when compared with what other researchers have found related to faculty development. There are perhaps three common predicaments or obstacles surrounding faculty and their development as teachers that were readily apparent in this study.

First of all, before training for the improvement of college teaching can occur, the faculty must be convinced there is something of value to learn about and study about teaching. The problem, more simply stated, is "ignorance is bliss." Faculty may not be aware of how much there is to learn about teaching and have not thought about or studied teaching in an in-depth manner. In this

regard, a weakness of this study may have been its reliance on the self-perceptions of faculty. Similarly, faculty interpretations of the 13 skills or abilities may have varied.

Second, faculty have a tendency to resist changing their beliefs about teaching. Many faculty have nothing more to base their classroom practices on than to "teach as they were taught." The third obstacle and perhaps most prevalent in this study was the emphasis on content knowledge. It is common for faculty to make the mistake of assuming their content knowledge is lacking when teaching is not going well, not recognizing where the true problems may exist because of their lack of formal teacher preparation.

With all these obstacles to overcome, the basic problem is twofold. First, these faculty are not ready for formal development activities until they are helped to realize what their teaching-related deficiencies are. As long as faculty think they are already proficient in what they do, they are not going to benefit from or be receptive to faculty development experiences. The second part, then, is how to accomplish this task. How does one increase faculty awareness of their own weaknesses and show them there are things about teaching they need to learn more about?

Creativity is necessary to solve these problems and ultimately improve teaching. Organizing "brown bags" or other discussion groups to talk about teaching can result in raising the awareness of faculty. Assessment of faculty by others, such as students or administrators, may also prove beneficial in

increasing faculty awareness of weaknesses and development needs. Overall, the promotion of teaching and the design of programs and reward systems for the improvement and recognition of teaching within the academic community will lead to substantial changes and solutions to the problems with postsecondary teaching today.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COPY OF THE PERSONALLY DISTRIBUTED QUESTIONNAIRE

DAVENPORT FACULTY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA. Please circle the appropriate letter or write in your response where indicated for the following questions:

1. Campus at which you teach:

   a. Grand Rapids b. Holland c. Kalamazoo d. Lansing

2. Employment status:

   a. Full-time faculty b. Part-time faculty

3. What is the total number of years you have taught at least one course:

   _____ at the postsecondary level
   _____ at the secondary level

4. What is the total number of courses you have taught at the postsecondary level in the last three years: _____

5. Below are descriptions of possible career patterns. Circle the letter of the description which best describes your primary career pattern:

   a. Career college professor
   b. Career professional in a noneducation area, i.e., lawyer, banking, business, etc. (teaching is a part-time activity)
   c. Career professional to career college professor (teaching is now a full-time activity)
   d. Secondary teacher to career college professor
   e. Other _____

6. Please list all baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degrees you have completed:

Degree	Field
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

PART 2: Effective teaching has been found to be very personalized and unique from one individual to another. We are interested in determining your perceptions concerning some of the skills or abilities that are associated with effective teaching. Please rate each skill or ability three times by circling the appropriate number in each column for the following three questions:

Column A: **How important do you feel this skill is for effective teaching?**
Column B: **To what extent do you feel proficient in this skill or ability?**
Column C: **To what extent do you feel you need further development in this skill or ability?**

Use the following scale for each of your responses:

1 = Not at all 2 = A little 3 = Somewhat 4 = High 5 = Very high

Skill or Ability	Column A Importance	Column B Proficiency	Column C Development
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Developing courses	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Development and selection of course materials	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

11. Mo

12. Inv
learn

13. Int
por

PART 3
circling c

Select c

A.
B.

C.
D.
E.
F.

1.

2.

3.

4.

Skill or Ability	Column A Importance	Column B Proficiency	Column C Development
11. Motivating students to learn	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12. Involving students in the learning process	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

PART 3: Given the same list of skills or abilities used in Part 2, answer the following question by circling one response for each item:

In what way would you most prefer to learn more about this skill or ability?

Select one from the following choices for each question:

A. Formal coursework
B. Preparing and presenting a scholarly lecture, paper, or presentation at workshops, seminars, or conferences
C. Documented self-study
D. A single in-service conducted on this skill or ability
E. More than one in-service conducted on this skill or ability
F. Other appropriate activities (please list the activity in the space provided)

	Skill or Ability:	Method of Development:
1.	Knowledge of the subject matter	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
2.	Applying the theories and practices of teaching	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
3.	Understanding learners, their background, and learning styles	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
4.	Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	A B C D E F -- list below: _____

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

	Skill or Ability:	Method of Development:
5.	Developing courses	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
6.	Development and selection of course materials	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
7.	Using a variety of teaching strategies	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
8.	Using effective communication and inter-personal skills	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
9.	Evaluation and measurement of student learning	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
10.	Managing classroom environment and learning	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
11.	Motivating students to learn	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
12.	Involving students in the learning process	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
13.	Interact and establish rapport with students	A B C D E F -- list below: _____

PART 4: From the list of skills or abilities associated with effective teaching used in Parts 2 and 3, please rank the three skills or abilities that are most important to you in order to further develop your teaching abilities.

Write the number of the three skills or abilities in rank order in the space provided below:

1st choice _____

2nd choice _____

3rd choice _____

Skill or Ability:

1. Knowledge of the subject matter
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn
5. Developing a course
6. Development and selection of course materials
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning
10. Managing classroom environment and learning
11. Motivating students to learn
12. Involving students in the learning process
13. Interact and establish rapport with students

APPENDIX B

COPY OF THE MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE

DAVENPORT FACULTY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA. Please circle the appropriate letter or write in your response where indicated for the following questions:

1. Campus at which you teach:

   a. Grand Rapids b. Holland c. Kalamazoo d. Lansing

2. Employment status:

   a. Full-time faculty b. Part-time faculty

3. What is the total number of <u>years</u> you have taught at least one course:

   _____ at the postsecondary level
   _____ at the secondary level

4. What is the total number of <u>courses</u> you have taught at the postsecondary level in the last three years: _____

5. Below are descriptions of possible career patterns. Circle the letter of the description which best describes your primary career pattern:

   a. Career college professor
   b. Career professional in a noneducation area, i.e., lawyer, banking, business, etc. (teaching is a part-time activity)
   c. Career professional to career college professor (teaching is now a full-time activity)
   d. Secondary teacher to career college professor
   e. Other _____

6. Please list all baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degrees you have completed:

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Field</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

PART 2: Effective teaching has been found to be very personalized and unique from one individual to another. We are interested in determining your perceptions concerning some of the skills or abilities that are associated with effective teaching. Please rate each skill or ability three times by circling the appropriate number in each column for the following three questions:

Column A: **How important do you feel this skill is for effective teaching?**
Column B: **To what extent do you feel proficient in this skill or ability?**
Column C: **To what extent do you feel you need further development in this skill or ability?**

Use the following scale for each of your responses:

1 = Not at all 2 = A little 3 = Somewhat 4 = High 5 = Very high

Skill or Ability	Column A Importance	Column B Proficiency	Column C Development
1. Knowledge of the subject matter	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Developing courses	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Development and selection of course materials	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. Managing classroom environment and learning	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Skill or Ability	Column A Importance	Column B Proficiency	Column C Development
11. Motivating students to learn	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12. Involving students in the learning process	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
13. Interact and establish rapport with students	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

PART 3: Given the same list of skills or abilities used in Part 2, answer the following question by circling one response for each item:

In what way would you most prefer to learn more about this skill or ability?

Select one from the following choices for each question:

A. Formal coursework
B. Preparing and presenting a scholarly lecture, paper, or presentation at workshops, seminars, or conferences
C. Documented self-study
D. A single in-service conducted on this skill or ability
E. More than one in-service conducted on this skill or ability
F. Other appropriate activities (please list the activity in the space provided)

	Skill or Ability:	Method of Development:
1.	Knowledge of the subject matter	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
2.	Applying the theories and practices of teaching	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
3.	Understanding learners, their background, and learning styles	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
4.	Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn	A B C D E F -- list below: _____

	Skill or Ability:	Method of Development:
5.	Developing courses	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
6.	Development and selection of course materials	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
7.	Using a variety of teaching strategies	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
8.	Using effective communication and inter-personal skills	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
9.	Evaluation and measurement of student learning	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
10.	Managing classroom environment and learning	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
11.	Motivating students to learn	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
12.	Involving students in the learning process	A B C D E F -- list below: _____
13.	Interact and establish rapport with students	A B C D E F -- list below: _____

PART 4: From the list of skills or abilities associated with effective teaching used in Parts 2 and 3, please rank the three skills or abilities that are most important to you in order to further develop your teaching abilities.

Write the number of the three skills or abilities in rank order in the space provided below:

1st choice _____
2nd choice _____
3rd choice _____

Skill or Ability:

1. Knowledge of the subject matter
2. Applying the theories and practices of teaching
3. Understanding learners, their backgrounds, and learning styles
4. Applying the theories and practices of how adults learn
5. Developing a course
6. Development and selection of course materials
7. Using a variety of teaching strategies
8. Using effective communication and interpersonal skills
9. Evaluation and measurement of student learning
10. Managing classroom environment and learning
11. Motivating students to learn
12. Involving students in the learning process
13. Interact and establish rapport with students

Thank you for your participation. Please return your completed survey in the envelope provided by _____.

Nancy Hogg
Davenport College
415 E. Fulton
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Albert, L. S., & Watson, R. J. (1980). Mainstreaming part-time faculty: Issue or imperative? In M. H. Parsons (Ed.), Using part-time faculty effectively (pp. 73-80). New Directions for Community Colleges, 2(8).

Albright, M. J. (1988, October). Faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development: Options and choices. POD: A handbook for new practitioners. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press for POD Network/NCSPOD.

Austin, A. E. (1992). Faculty cultures. In B. R. Clark & G. Neave (Eds.), The encyclopedia of higher education (pp. 1-38). New York: Oxford.

Austin, A. E., & Baldwin, R. G. (1991). Faculty collaboration: Enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7). Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Baldwin, R. (1979). Adult and career development: What are the implications for faculty? In Faculty development (pp. 13-20). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Beck, J. J., Seifert, E. H., & Smith, M. L. (1984, July). Perceived relative importance of content and process to effective teaching (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 146)

Beidler, P. G. (Ed.). (1986). Distinguished teachers on effective teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 28. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boice, R. (1991, March/April). New faculty as teachers. Journal of Higher Education, 62(2), 150-173.

Boice, R. (1992). Lessons learned about mentoring. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty (pp. 51-61). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, D. (1992, July/August). Reclaiming the public trust. Change, 24, 13-19.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brookfield, S. D. (1991). The skillful teacher. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, G. (1975). Micro-teaching: A programme of teaching skills. New York: Harper & Row.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). The condition of the professoriate: Attitudes and trends, 1989. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Centra, J. (1976). Faculty development practices in the United States. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Cerbin, W. (1993, March). Fostering a culture of teaching as scholarship. The Teaching Professor, 7(3), 1-2.

Croftchik, G. J. (1975). Analysis of opinions toward off-campus course work. Unpublished master's thesis, Central Michigan University.

Cross, K. P. (1986, September). A proposal to improve teaching (or--what "taking teaching seriously should mean"). AAHE Bulletin, 39(1), 9-14.

Cross, K. P. (1987, March). The adventures of education in wonderland: Implementing education reform. Phil Delta Kappan, 68(7), 496-502.

Cross, K. P. (1988). Adults as learners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diamond, R. M. (1988, October). Faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development: Options and choices. POD: A handbook for new practitioners. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press for POD Network/NCSPOD.

Dill, D. D., & Associates. (1990). What teachers need to know. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eble, K. E. (1970). The recognition and evaluation of teaching. Salt Lake City, UT: Project to Improve College Teaching.

Eble, K. E. (1971). Career development of the effective college teacher. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges.

Eble, K. E. (1984). The craft of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eble, K. E., & McKeachie, W. J. (1985). Improving undergraduate education through faculty development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Edgerton, R. (1991, December). Uncovering the "closet" teachers in research universities. AAHE Bulletin, 44(4), 3, 6-7.

Ericksen, S. C. (1984). The essence of good teaching: Helping students learn and remember what they learn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Erickson, G. R. (1986). A survey of faculty development practices. In M. Svinicki (Ed.), To improve the academy (pp. 182-196). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press for POD Network/NCSPOD.

Evangelauf, J. (1989, May 24). Odd battle over accreditation of business programs divides colleges, spurs evaluation of standards. Chronicle of Higher Education, 35(37), A13, A15.

Evangelauf, J. (1991, May 1). Business-school accrediting group revises standards in effort to improve teaching and foster innovation. Chronicle of Higher Education, 37(33), A11, A14.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Melnick, S. (1992). Introducing teaching. In S. Feiman-Nemser & H. Featherstone (Eds.), Exploring teaching: Reinventing an introductory course. New York: Teachers College Press.

Feldman, D. C. (1976, September). A contingency theory of socialization. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 433-452.

Feldman, K. A. (1988). Effective college teaching from the students' and faculty's view: Matched or mismatched priorities? Research in Higher Education, 28(4), 291-344.

Fenwick, D. (1992, December 15). Committee on Recognition, Committee on Postsecondary Accreditation, Washington, DC. Telephone interview.

Fink, L. D. (1992). Orientation programs for new faculty. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty (pp. 39-50). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Finkelstein, M. J., & LaCelle-Peterson, M. W. (1992). New and junior faculty: A review of the literature. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty (pp. 5-14). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Friedlander, J. (1980). Instructional practices of part-time faculty. In M. H. Parsons (Ed.), Using part-time faculty effectively (pp. 27-36). New Directions for Community Colleges, 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gaff, J. G. (1978). Involving students in faculty development. In J. G. Gaff (Ed.), Institutional renewal through the improvement of teaching (pp. 59-71). New Directions for Higher Education, 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gaff, J. G., & Wilson, R. C. (1971). Faculty values and improving teaching. In G. K. Smith (Ed.), New teaching, new learning (pp. 39-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gappa, J. M. (1984a, October). Employing part-time faculty: Thoughtful approaches to continuing problems. AAHE Bulletin, 37(2), 3-7.

Gappa, J. M. (1984b). Part-time faculty: Higher education at a crossroads (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). The invisible faculty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gray, P. J., Froh, R. C., & Diamond, R. M. (1991, December). Myths and realities. AAHE Bulletin, 44(4), 4-5.

Grossman, P. (1991). Mapping the terrain: Knowledge growth in teaching. In H. C. Waxman & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Effective teaching: Current research (pp. 203-215). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Hayes, E. (Ed.). (1989). Effective teaching styles. New Directions for Continuing Education, 43. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hipple, T. (1984, May 9). Just knowing the subject doesn't make a good teacher. Chronicle of Higher Education, 28, 34.

Hodkinson, H. L. (1971). Assessment and reward systems. In G. K. Smith (Ed.), New teaching, new learning (pp. 47-54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kerr, D. H. (1983, Spring). Teaching competence and teacher education in the United States. Teacher College Record, 81(3), 525-552.

Knowles, M. (1970). the modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy. New York: Association Press.

Leslie, D. W., Kellams, S. E., & Gunne, G. M. (1982). Part-time faculty in American higher education. New York: Praeger.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marciniak, M. P. (1980). Student satisfaction: Off-campus locations and the main campus of Delta College. Unpublished master's thesis, Central Michigan University.

Mayhew, L. B. (1979). Surviving the eighties. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McKeachie, W. J. (1991). Faculty development: Past, present, future. In K. J. Zahorski (Ed.), To improve the academy. Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, 10. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Miller, R. I. (1974). Developing programs for faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moceri, P. (1990). Davenport: History of an institution. Grand Rapids, MI: Davenport College, Inc.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1980). Digest of education statistics, 1980. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 202 085)

National Center for Education Statistics. (1989). National higher education statistics: Fall 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Education Association. (1988). Report and recommendations on part-time, temporary, and nontenure track faculty appointments. Washington, DC: Author.

Olsen, D., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). The pretenure years: A longitudinal perspective. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty (pp. 15-25). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Parsons, M. H. (1980). Realizing part-time faculty potential. In M. H. Parsons (Ed.), Using part-time faculty effectively (pp. 47-53). New Directions for Community Colleges, 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rhem, J. (1991). A national survey of TA training. National Teaching and Learning Forum (premier issue), 10.

Rice, R. E. (1986). The academic profession in transition: Toward a new social fiction. Teaching Sociology, 14, 12-23.

Seldin, P. (1991). The teaching portfolio. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Seldin, P., & Annis, L. (1991-1992). The teaching portfolio. Teaching excellence: Toward the best in the academy, 3(2).

Sherman, T. M., & others. (1987, January/February). The quest for excellence in university teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 58(1), 66-84.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.

Snow, C. P. (1964). The two cultures: And a second look. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), Developing new and junior faculty (pp. 27-37). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (Eds.). (1992). Developing new and junior faculty (pp. 97-99). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Near, J. P. (1989, January/February). Relations between work and life away from work among university faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 60, 59-81.

Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989, Fall). Five models of staff development for teachers. Journal of Staff Development, 10(4), 40-57.

Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L. (1992). Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4). Washington, DC: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Tobin, K., & Fraser, B. J. (1991). Learning from exemplary teachers. In H. C. Waxman & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Effective teaching: Current research (pp. 217-236). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Trivett, D. A. (1976). Accreditation and institutional eligibility (ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 9). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Tuckman, H. P., & Vogler, W. D. (1978, May). The "part" in part-time wages. AAUP Bulletin, 64(2), 70-77.

Vermilye, D. W. (Ed.). (1972). The expanded campus: Current issues in higher education, 1972. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weimer, M. (1990a). It's a myth: Good teachers are born--not made. In M. Weimer & R. Neff (Eds.). Teaching college: Collected readings for the new instructor (pp. 15-16). Madison, WI: Magna Publications.

Weimer, M. (1990b). It's a myth: Nobody knows what makes teaching good. In M. Weimer & R. Neff (Eds.), Teaching college: Collected readings for the new instructor (p. 13). Madison, WI: Magna Publications.

Weimer, M. (1991). Improving college teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weimer, M. (Ed.). (1992, December). The danger of knowing too much. The Teaching Professor, 6(10), 1.

Weimer, M. (Ed.). (1993, January). Teacher-student turning points. The Teaching Professor, 7(1), 1.

Whitt, E. J. (1991, Winter). "Hit the ground running": Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. Review of Higher Education, 14(2), 177-197.

Winkler, A. M. (1992, July/August). The faculty workload question. Change, 24(4), 36-41.

Zemsky, R. (Ed.). (1992). Testimony from the belly of the whale. Policy perspectives. Philadelphia, PA: PEW Higher Education Research Program.

Zook, G. F., & Haggerty, M. E. (1936). The evaluation of higher institutions: Principles of accrediting higher institutions (Vol. 1). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.