

**CURRENT CHARACTERISTICS OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN PUBLIC
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES IN TEXAS**

A Dissertation

by

JEANNE WESLEY

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2005

Major Subject: Educational Human Resource Development

**CURRENT CHARACTERISTICS OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN PUBLIC
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES IN TEXAS**

A Dissertation

by

JEANNE WESLEY

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved as to content and style by:

Chair of Committee,	Walter Stenning
Committee Members,	Stephen Stark
	Clayton Allen
	Clifford Whetten
Head of Department,	James Scheurich

August 2005

Major Subject: Educational Human Resource Development

ABSTRACT

Current Characteristics of Faculty Development in Public

Two-Year Colleges in Texas. (August 2005)

Jeanne Wesley, B.S. Ouachita Baptist University;

M.A., University of Arizona

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Walter Stenning

This study measured the current characteristics of faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas. Current characteristics were determined by an electronic questionnaire completed by the responding staff or faculty member designated by each Texas two-year college as the person most responsible for faculty development. In the case when faculty development responsibility was divided by technical and academic faculty, both designees at the college were sent electronic questionnaires.

Of the 78 colleges, 6 colleges, or 8 percent, divided faculty development responsibilities between two individuals at the college. Those six identified colleges were sent two questionnaires each for the two selected representatives. Of those 6 colleges, 4 responded or 67 per cent. Overall, of the 78 colleges sent electronic questionnaires, 57 responded, yielding a 73 percent return.

The major results of the study indicate:

1. The majority of colleges studied do not designate a faculty development space at the college.

2. A large percentage of two-year public colleges in Texas, 49.2 percent of the total respondents, had no staff member responsible for faculty development who spent more than 51 percent of the time on faculty development duties.
3. Two-year public colleges budget relatively few funds for faculty development.
4. Of all respondents 42.6 percent report that they did not perform a needs assessment.
5. Most Texas two-year public colleges, 92.7 percent of respondents, claimed that their colleges evaluated faculty development activities. However, almost 25 percent of those respondents did not use an evaluation instrument. Of those respondents using an instrument, the most selected area of measurement was participant satisfaction. Performance outcomes measure was the least selected category at 5.8 percent.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee Dr. Clayton Allen, Dr. Stephen Stark, Dr. Clifford Whetten, and Dr. Walter Stenning for their time and support.

I offer my sincere gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Walter Stenning. With his support, patience and mentorship, I have become a better educator. He is a scholar who values and challenges practitioners. Dr. Stenning has changed many lives throughout his career. His influence extends across this nation and beyond to the far reaches of the world. It has been an honor working with him.

I was fortunate enough to enjoy a supportive learning community consisting of Dr. John E. Miller, Dr. Diane S. Nobles, and Dr. Mike Turpin. I would like to extend special thanks to Diane who shared my experience, driving duties, hotel rooms, projects, world travels, and the map to the back roads to College Station.

My colleagues at Texas State Technical College Marshall have been particularly supportive, as have my friends and family. A special thanks to my husband, Al Durante, for his assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Significance of the Study	5
Research Questions	6
Definition of Terms	6
Assumptions of the Study	7
Limitations of the Study	8
Organization of the Dissertation	8
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	10
The Two-Year Public College Profile.....	10
The Evolution of the Two-Year Public College.....	11
Factors Contributing to the Need for Faculty Development	16
The Texas Two-Year Public College.....	30
The Texas Two-Year Public College: Faculty Development	32
Summary of Literature	33
III METHODOLOGY.....	37
Population.....	37
Instrumentation.....	37
Pilot Test	40
Procedure.....	41
Design and Statistics	43

CHAPTER	Page
IV RESULTS.....	44
Present Position Title Responsible for Faculty Development.....	45
Staff or Faculty Experience in Present Position.....	47
Staff or Faculty Experience in Faculty Development	47
Full-time Enrollment.....	48
College Space Used as a Faculty Development Area	49
Description of Space in Faculty Development.....	50
Identification of Faculty Development Space by Name	51
Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Space	52
College Division That Administers Faculty Development	52
College Faculty Development Staff.....	53
Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Staff	54
Faculty Development in College Budget	55
Estimate of Dollar Amount Used for Faculty Development.....	55
Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Funding.....	57
Faculty Members Involvement in Faculty Development	57
How Faculty Are Involved in Faculty Development	57
Needs Assessment for Faculty Development.....	58
Needs Assessment Methods Used.....	59
Communication of Need for the Faculty Development Activity	60
Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Needs Assessment.....	61
Faculty Development Content.....	61
Other Subjects Areas Offered	63
Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Topics	63
Faculty Members as Presenters	64
Faculty Development Activities from External Entities	64
External Entities Used for Faculty Development.....	65
Distance Learning Use in Faculty Development.....	66
Methods of Distance Learning Delivery	68
Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Delivery.....	68
Evaluation of Faculty Development.....	69
Use of an Evaluation Tool for Faculty Development	70
Evaluation of Areas Measured	70

CHAPTER	Page
Use of Evaluation Results to Determine Future Activities	71
Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Evaluation.....	72
Summary of Results	73
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	77
Summary	77
Conclusions	81
Recommendations	88
REFERENCES.....	92
APPENDIX A	106
APPENDIX B	109
APPENDIX C	111
APPENDIX D	113
VITA	131

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1	Frequency and Percentage of Position Title of Respondents (n=57)46
2	Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Years in Present Position (n=66)47
3	Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Years with Faculty Development Responsibility (n=57)48
4	Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Fall 2002 Full-Time Enrollment (n=56).....49
5	Frequency and Percentage of Faculty Development Area Used 51 Percent or More in Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n=61)50
6	Frequency and Percentage of Descriptions of Faculty Development Facilities in Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n=61)50
7	Faculty Development Space Specified by Name (n=26)51
8	Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Colleges Texas Public Two-Year Divisions Overseeing Faculty Development (n=59)53
9	Frequency and Percentage of Number of Positions Assigned to Faculty Development at Least 51% of Time by Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (59).....54
10	Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Colleges Including Faculty Development in the Texas Public Two-Year College Budget (n=59)55
11	Frequency and Percentage of Estimate of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Faculty Development Funding Used for 2002-2003 Academic Year (n=50)56
12	Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using Faculty Members in Planning Faculty Development (n=61)56

TABLE	Page
13 Frequency and Percentage of How Faculty are Involved in Planning Faculty Development at Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n= 57).....	58
14 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges That Perform Needs Assessment Before Planning Faculty Development (n=61)	59
15 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Methods of Gathering Assessment Data Before Planning Faculty Development (n=35)	60
16 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges That Clearly Defined Need for Faculty Development During Each Activity (n=60).....	61
17 Frequency and Percentage of Faculty Development Topics Offered in Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n=60).....	62
18 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using Faculty Members to Present Faculty Development Activities (n=61)	64
19 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using External Groups for Faculty Development (n=61).....	65
20 Frequency and Percentage of External Groups Used by Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges for Faculty Development (n=54).....	67
21 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using Distance Learning for Delivery of Faculty Development (n=61)	67
22 Frequency and Percentage of Distance Learning Delivery Modes Used by Respondents (n=46).....	68
23 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Who Evaluate Faculty Development Activities (n= 60).....	69
24 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using an Evaluation Instrument for Faculty Development (n=53).....	70

TABLE	Page
25 Frequency and Percentage of Faculty Development Areas Measured by Evaluation Instrument at Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n=40).....	71
26 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using Evaluation Results to Determine Future Faculty Development Activities (n=41).....	72

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The face of American education was transformed in 1901 with the establishment the first public two-year college in Illinois, Joliet Junior College. The road from Joliet to present is paved with social and political changes that are reflected in the classroom and encountered by faculty. The American ideal of equal opportunity, combined with the radical concept of educational access for all, established the path of the two-year public college (Brick, 1994; Diener, 1994; Ratliff, 1994). As the decades passed, legislation coupled with social and political development saw the barriers of class, religion, income, gender, and, finally race and disability, tumble down at the door of the two-year public college (Boulard, 2003; Cohen, 2001; Lovell, 2001; Quigley & Bailey, 2003; Vaughan, 2000). Technological progress and the need for skilled workers (Brick, 1994; Diener, 1994) provided rationale to lofty ideals. The two-year college student body began to reflect the general population (Boulard, 2003), including the economically and educationally disadvantaged, the at-risk, the nontraditional, and the culturally and ethnically diverse. Faculty are scrambling to learn effective approaches to students that are disparate in preparation, intelligences, and, sometimes language. In addition to the change in the student body, technology reached far beyond the imagination of those

The style and format for this dissertation follow that of the *Human Resource Development Quarterly*.

faculty members at Joliet. As the industrial age moved to the digital age, the classroom environment was revolutionized. Faculty now struggle with web-based course assignments, laboratory simulation software, smart boards, and complicated distance learning equipment (US Department of Education, 2003).

O'Banion (2003), President Emeritus of the League for Innovation in the Community College, observed:

Community colleges live and thrive in the crucible of change—always have, always will. Built on the streets far from the Ivory Tower, they confront and embrace, on a daily basis, an ever-changing community, an ever-changing student body, an ever-changing societal demand for new workers and new citizens, an ever-changing technology, and an ever-changing demand for accountability. (p. 13)

With each change, the public two-year college has reinvented itself. Public two-year college faculty are on the front lines of each reformation. If faculty are to meet the challenge, knowledge and skill must be increased to contend with each new development (Gleazer 1994; Murray, 2002; O'Banion 1972, 1989; Parsons, 1992; Smith, 1989).

Educators continue to believe that professional development for faculty can impact their colleges. Faculty have perceived a connection with faculty development programs and the ability to be effective (Fugate & Amey, 2000). Zahorski (2002) sees the faculty developer as a change agent, able to affect an institution wide culture that nurtures scholarship. Oromaner (1997) believes that the more an institution holds and integrates staff development, the more effective and responsive the organization. Rouseff-Baker

(2002) sees her faculty development program as a “major piece in the recruitment and retention of quality faculty” (p. 37). In studying faculty vitality in the community college, Peterson (2003) concludes that “Despite budget constraints that are impacting most community colleges it is imperative that community colleges continue to support faculty training and staff development initiatives” (p. 212). In a study of community colleges in Tennessee, Lefler (1998) reported that a majority of his respondents “indicated that appropriate faculty development would increase their teaching effectiveness and the teaching effectiveness of their colleagues” (p. 92). Nelson and Seigel (1980) prefaced the results of their project for the Association in American Colleges by noting that effective faculty renewal is possible and that programs “can make a positive difference in both the individual lives of many of their faculty and in the collective academic lives of their campuses” (preface).

In addition to the belief that faculty development is an important tool in the improvement of faculty and postsecondary institutions, faculty development is also found in policy and accrediting standards. The Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Title III of the Higher Education Act, and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act of 1998 all specify faculty development. The State of Texas, which is the location of this study, requires professional development for faculty and provides Carl Perkins funds for the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development to coordinate professional development project activities for Texas two-year colleges (Texas Education Agency, 2003).

Regardless of the emphasis placed on faculty development, past studies in Texas reveal a lack of perceived effectiveness in faculty development programs. McQueen's (1980) study of 15 Texas community colleges concluded the faculty perceived that the programs were not very effective and felt that there should be more emphasis on teaching skills. Richardson & Moore (1987) studied Texas two-year public colleges and reported there was some form of faculty development on most campuses, but there was no evidence that programs were being used in a significant way. Paterno's (1994) study of Texas community college faculty development programs found that the programs were evaluated only at the activity level, and then the evaluation was satisfaction-based. Murray's (2000) study concluded that there was a lack of leadership in Texas two-year college faculty development programs and that the programming lacked "coherence and purpose" (p. 264). The previous studies, though valuable, did not provide an overall comprehensive description of the characteristics of faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas.

Statement of the Problem

Faculty development's place in public two-year colleges is set forth in the literature and in state and federal requirements. The problem was that there was little current information regarding faculty development programs in public two-year colleges in Texas. David Couch, Director of Institutional Effectiveness for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), reported that the THECB data, regarding professional development for faculty members, is very limited (personal communication,

October 30, 2003). While professional development for faculty in public two-year colleges is required by the State of Texas, current characteristics of Texas public two-year college faculty development programs were unknown.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine current characteristics of faculty development in two-year public colleges in Texas. A comprehensive study was undertaken to determine the primary components of faculty development programs. The components were space, staffing, funding, assessment, content, delivery, and evaluation.

Significance of the Study

Retirement trends, increasingly complex technology, changing demographics, shifting educational paradigms, and an onslaught of diverse and unprepared students contribute to the desire for faculty development. Information regarding the current state of faculty development programs in public two-year colleges in Texas was limited. The study increased knowledge regarding faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas and provided a baseline of information regarding those characteristics for comparison. Without recent pertinent information regarding faculty development programs in two-year public colleges, college administrators' ability to develop or improve programs was limited. The results of this study provided a resource for two-

year college professional developers and administrators in the development and/or revision of faculty development programs in Texas and nationally.

Research Questions

A study was conducted to determine the characteristics of faculty development programs in public two-year colleges in Texas through the following research questions:

1. How do public two-year colleges in Texas approach faculty development in regards to issues of:
 - a. Space
 - b. Staffing
 - c. Funding
2. How are faculty development needs assessed for public two-year colleges in Texas?
3. What content is offered in faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas?
4. How is faculty development delivered in public two-year colleges in Texas?
5. How is faculty development evaluated in public two-year colleges in Texas?

Definition of Terms

The following terms were utilized in the study:

Current characteristics—A distinctive mark, feature or quality (Simpson & Weiner, 1989) established during the period of the study.

Faculty member—A person who is employed full-time by an institution of higher education as a member of the faculty whose primary duties include teaching, research, academic service, or administration. However, the term does not include a person holding faculty rank who spends a majority of the person’s time for the institution engaged in managerial or supervisory activities, including a chancellor, vice chancellor, president, vice president, provost, associate of assistant provost, or dean. (Texas Administrative Code, § 4.23.8)

Faculty Development—“...a collection of those activities designed to encourage the faculty members to improve and grow by making planned changes in their expertise, skills, attitudes, faculty, career path, or personal lives for the betterment of the individual, the students, and the institution...” (Lunde & Healy, 1991, p. 2).

Texas public two-year colleges—Institutions listed by the THECB as lower division institutions, as defined as “...the sector that includes the state’s public community colleges, Lamar State Colleges, and the Texas State Technical College System...” (THECB, 2003b, Enrollment section, para. 3). These colleges include those using a variety of terms to designate public lower division institutions in Texas, including technical college, community college, and junior college.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made regarding this study:

1. The president of each Texas public two-year college designated an appropriate person to complete the questionnaire.
2. The designated respondents accurately detailed the state of faculty development at their public two-year college.
3. The THECB's database of public two-year colleges represented the population of public two-year colleges in Texas.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study was limited to public two-year colleges in Texas.
2. The study was limited to faculty development activities that were sponsored and funded entirely by the college budget, including state and federal monies, grants, and local funds that flow through the college.
3. The study was limited to faculty development program activities that affected multiple faculty.

Organization of the Dissertation

The dissertation is divided into five chapters as follows: Chapter I includes an introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, definition of terms, assumptions of the study, and limitations of the study.

Chapter II consists of the review of the literature as related to the two year public college. The sections in Chapter II are the factors contributing to the need for faculty development, faculty development from the seventies to present, the Texas two-year public college, the Texas two-year public college: faculty development, and a summary of the literature.

Chapter III describes the methodology and contains information regarding the population, instrumentation, pilot test, procedure, and design and statistics. Chapter IV presents the results of the study through data and analysis. Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions and recommendations for future research, application of the research, and improvements to the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Two-Year Public College Profile

For over one hundred years, two-year public colleges have served an ever-increasing, ever-changing population of students. Since the inception of the two-year college, more than 100 million people have attended (Phillipe & Patton, 2000). Cohen and Brawer (2003) summarize their description of students in America's two-year colleges with two words, "number and variety" (p. 37).

Number and variety, as a description of the two-year college, is confirmed through the Phillipe and Patton (2000) profile:

1. Two-year colleges enroll more than fifty percent of the undergraduates in the United States.
2. From 1965 to 1996, enrollment grew 407 percent as compared to a 98 percent growth for public four-year colleges.
3. There was a 206 percent increase in part-time students under 18 from 1993 and 1997.
4. A half million associate degrees are awarded each year.
5. Two-year colleges serve more minority students than four-year colleges.
6. From 1993 to 1997, there was a 5 percent increase in minority enrollment.
7. Students 25 and older totaled 46 percent.

8. Over 50 percent of those attending did not have parents who attended a postsecondary institution.
9. Over 50 percent work full-time, with over 80 percent working full or part-time.
10. Over 30 percent of those working full-time are full-time students.
11. More than 57 percent of the attendees are female.
12. More females attend two-year colleges than four-year colleges.
13. Compared to any postsecondary institution, two-year colleges serve a higher percentage of students with disabilities.

A profile of the two-year college in the United States depicts a dynamic educational entity that enrolls the majority of students in higher education while serving the needs of a highly diverse student body.

The Evolution of the Two-Year Public College

The two-year public college represented in the figures above is a product of a sequence of sociological and economic forces that are uniquely American (Brick, 1994; Diener, 1994; O'Banion, 1989; Ratliff, 1994). Scholars of higher education history have examined the rise of the two-year public college and noted particular issues that contributed to its evolution. Brick (1994), lists "equal opportunity, use of education to achieve social mobility, technological progress, and acceptance of the concept that education is the producer of social capital" as basic forces leading to the "junior college" (p. 44). Diener (1994) sees industrialization and free enterprise, jobs requiring highly

skilled workers, and a drive for educational access for more citizens. Ratliff (1994) observes the evolution from an educational reform and innovation perspective and includes the rise of adult, continuing, and community education and open public access. Equal opportunity and access contributed to Cohen and Brawer's (2003) notion of "number and variety" (p. 37) and formed the foundation of what was to become the contemporary two-year public college.

While the early two-year public transfer college was a step in the democratization of education in the United States, growth was slow. As late as 1940, private two-year colleges still outnumbered public two-year colleges (Quigley & Bailey, 2003). After World War II, dramatic changes to the two-year public college began to occur.

The passage of the Service Readjustment Act, popularly known as the GI Bill, opened the door to millions of Americans who served in World War II, making college affordable and breaking down social barriers (Bennett, 1996; Cohen 2001; Kerr 1994). With large numbers of citizens returning from the military, college became a destination for those who previously could have never imagined such an opportunity. The GI Bill also marks the first time the federal government gave money directly to an individual, not a college (Cohen, 2001).

Less than one year after the war, President Truman established a commission to examine higher education, including its social role and the expansion of educational opportunity (Quigley & Bailey, 2003). The President's Commission on Higher Education (1947) recommended that a network of low-cost, public, community-based,

comprehensive two-year colleges be established (Boggs & Carter, 1994; Lovell, 2001; Vaughan, 2000). In Quigley and Bailey's (2003) book, regarding the community college movement and the Truman Commission, the President of Teachers College, Columbia University, Arthur Levine writes in the introduction:

The Truman Commission was a radical departure from all that came before it. In a nation that was male dominated, segregated, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic, with deep pockets of urban and rural poverty, the report called for the end of barriers to higher education based on race, gender, religion, income, and geographic location. (p. xi)

With the recommendation of the Truman Commission and the financial support from the GI Bill, the road was prepared for the modern two-year public college.

With the launch in 1957 of the Soviet satellite Sputnik, education took its place as high national priority (Clowse, 1981). The launch was a shock to a complacent nation, sure of its superior place in science, technology, and education. Paranoia reigned and the reaction produced the National Defense Act of 1958, which offered a variety of support to students and educational institutions. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 allotted funds to states based on the number of students enrolled full-time in postsecondary institutions.

As the effect of the renewed educational emphasis was being felt, the 1960s ushered in the results of the baby boom. As the boomers enrolled, the two-year public college experienced incredible growth as 457 institutions were opened in the 1960s

(Boggs & Carter, 1994; Phillippe & Patton, 2000). The draft deferment option during the Viet Nam War also added to the enrollment increase (Phillippe & Patton, 2000).

While the obstacles to attaining a higher education in America appeared to be weakening, the diversity of the student population was still in question. The Truman Commission recommended an end to barriers based on race in 1947, but in 1962, James Meredith was escorted to the University of Mississippi by Federal Marshals (Meredith, 1966). The following year, George Wallace tried to prevent the admission of two African American students to the University of Alabama (Alabama Department of Archives & History, n.d.). That same year, 1963, Martin Luther King gave his “I Have a Dream” speech (Clayborne & Shepard, 2001). In the midst of these national realities, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed, which dealt very specifically with public education of all levels. This achievement gave those seeking admission to public colleges the full strength of the law and provided another step toward equality and open access.

The following year, the Higher Education Act of 1965 and subsequent amendments made education possible for the economically disadvantaged through various grants, loans, and work programs (Cohen, 2001; Lovell, 2001; Vaughan, 2000). The 1972 Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act included Title IX, which prohibited discrimination based on gender, marital, and parental status in admissions, financial aid, health and insurance benefits, career guidance and counseling services, housing facilities, courses, and other educational related areas. The Reauthorization also included the Basic Equal Opportunity Grant, later known as the Pell Grant, which

became a significant influence in equal educational opportunity for the economically disadvantaged. The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 followed, prohibiting age bias. Later the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 legally removed barriers for people with disabilities (Cohen, 2001; Vaughan, 2000). With legal barriers removed for race, gender, and disability, and with many economic barriers removed through loans, grants, and scholarships, the American dream for education for all was being realized. The two-year public college, known as the “peoples” college, was a major contributor to the idea of education for the masses.

Open enrollment, financial support, convenience of location, and affordable educational options attracted a large and diverse population of students. By becoming the institution of equal opportunity and access, the two-year public college was finally becoming a reflection of American society. As the population profile changed in the United States, the contemporary two-year college saw similar shifts (Rendon & Valadez, 1994). In an article titled *Diverse City*, Boulard (2003) compares census figures to the community college population:

In 2000, the latest year for which comparable U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Census statistics are available, 12 percent of the U.S. population was Black. In the same year, 12 percent of all two-year college students were Black. Hispanics and Latino accounted for 13 percent of the population that year, and thirteen percent of the two-year college population. Asians represented 4 percent of Americans and 6 percent of two-year college students. In plainer terms, community colleges – more than any other segment in higher education – looked

like America; the rich ethnic and racial diversity that is America is in plain view on a two-year campus near you. (p. 28)

Minority students make up 30 percent of contemporary community college enrollment with some urban colleges exceeding 50 percent minority enrollment (Phillipe & Patton, 2000). A recent study by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (2003) projected increases in the number of high school graduates by 2008-2009 and projected minority enrollments to surge in at least eleven states by 2014, thereby, adding to the number and variety of future students available to enroll in the two-year public college.

Factors Contributing to the Need for Faculty Development

Factors Contributing to the Need for Faculty Development: Diversity

Recent enrollment figures show the fruition of equal opportunity and access; however, the impact on the two-year public college has been challenging. In the joint project of the Education Commission of the States and the League for Innovation, McClenney (2004), explains:

Community colleges have inarguably the toughest job in American higher education. These are open-admissions institutions. They serve disproportionately high numbers of poor students and students of color. Many of their students are the ones who were least well served by their previous public school education and therefore most likely to have academic challenges as well as fiscal ones. Community college students are three to four times more likely

than students in four-year colleges to reflect factors that put them at risk of not completing their education. (p. 11)

Open admissions offer equal opportunity to the poor and at-risk, but also bring many students who are under-prepared for higher education. Faculty believe that they have seen increased challenges in teaching students in the last decade (Brown 2003). Two-year public colleges enroll more freshmen in remedial courses, 42 percent, than the 12 to 24 percent enrolled by other types of higher education institutions (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003b). Consequently, two-year public colleges offer more remedial courses than other higher education institutions (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003b). Additionally, students in two-year public colleges stay in remedial courses for longer periods of time (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003b).

The large and diverse numbers participating in two-year public higher education come with a variety of issues. Enrollment of immigrants calls for language and cultural considerations (Simmons, 1994). Enrollment of minorities, nontraditional students, and the economically and educationally disadvantaged calls for knowledge in diversity and remedial instruction (Rendon & Mathews, 1994; Richardson 1994; Spann & McCrimmon, 1994).

On the 50th anniversary of Brown vs. the Board of Education, a watershed ruling against segregation in U.S. public schools, the largest association representing two-year public colleges in the United States, approved the following resolution:

...Therefore, be it resolved on the 50th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education decision, we, the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community Colleges, pledge our combined and unwavering commitment to providing equal access to higher education; and Be it further resolved, we call to action the 1173 community colleges to ensure learning equity for all students through institutional, political, personal and civic engagement. (American Association of Community Colleges, 2003)

The student population evidences this commitment to equal access in two-year public colleges. The important component of the American Association of Community College pledge may be the call to action that asks colleges to ensure “learning equity.” Rendon & Valadez (1994) report that there are many challenges for the diverse campus, including the need for inclusiveness in the curriculum and the need to understand multicultural learning styles. Sanchez (2000) agrees that minority student enrollment is increasing, but retention is not improving. Sanchez (2000) states “Most educators would probably agree that the learning styles of white students are most closely aligned with the instructional strategies used at most college campuses across the nation and that the learning preferences of minority students have been ignored until recently” (p. 39).

These demographic shifts had some scholars calling for reform:

The campus enrollment shift—from a predominantly white student population to one that is multicultural in nature—calls for a diversity restructuring program leading to improvements in mission, governance, curriculum, instruction, student support services, and faculty development. (Rendon & Valadez, 1994, p. 576)

As nontraditional students populate the classrooms of the two-year public college faculty, it is the faculty's responsibility to support their success. Rendon and Valadez (1994) note that faculty development programs are needed for assessment of learning and teaching styles and for "varied and active teaching techniques" (p. 577).

Factors Contributing to the Need for Faculty Development: Learning Reform

In their seminal article on the philosophical shift from teaching to learning, Barr and Tagg (1995) suggest that access to education is not adequate. Both the historically under-represented and the traditional student desire learning success, not just right of entry to the classroom (Barr & Tagg, 1995). The two-year college, commonly called the "teaching college," has been asked by reformers to become the "learning college" (Harris, Rouseff-Baker, & Treat, 2002; O'Banion, 1997a, 2000). Faculty have been asked to realign their instructional techniques and curriculum and move from their teaching classroom to a learning environment (Barr & Tagg, 1995). Faculty have been asked to come down from the podium and to facilitate, coach, and mentor (Barr & Tagg, 1995). A survey of members of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education revealed that the top three goals in planning and delivering faculty development are as follows: enhancing the value of teaching effectiveness, improving student learning, and improving the learning environment (King & Lawler, 2003). Terry O'Banion (2003), a leader in the learning movement and President Emeritus of the League for Innovation in the Community College, observes that attempts at "substantive change fail because administrators, faculty, and staff have had few

opportunities to develop the skills and knowledge required for major change. A massive in-house training program is required if the stakeholders are going to manage the change process” (p.14).

Factors Contributing to the Need for Faculty Development: Technology

In 1965, the co-founder of Intel, wrote of a future of personal computers, portable communication, and noted that only a display was needed to produce an electronic wristwatch (Moore,1965). Moore’s predictions of almost forty years ago have gone beyond the home computer, the cell phone, and the electronic watch. Technology is transforming every aspect of contemporary society, and education is no exception. A study conducted by the Center for Digital Education and the American Association of Community Colleges found that in 2004, two-thirds of all responding colleges had automated the registration and payment for enrolled students and 73 percent had created options for viewing class schedules, and grades (Taylor, 2004). In addition, 76 percent of responding colleges provided faculty with access to student records (Taylor, 2004).

Technology is changing the learning environment, and faculty are being asked to use a variety of delivery modes such as CD-ROM, multi-mode packages, two-way interactive video, one-way video with two-way audio, one-way live video, audio/phone conferencing, Internet courses using real time computer-based instruction, and Internet courses using asynchronous computer-based instruction using email and listservs (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003a).

A recent national study indicated that 56 percent of all responding colleges offered distance education courses with 90 percent of public two-year colleges and 89 percent of public four-year colleges as compared to 16 percent and 40 percent respectively in private colleges (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003a). In the academic year 2000-2001, approximately 3,077,000 students were enrolled in distance learning courses with the highest percentage of enrollments in two-year public colleges (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003a). Two-year public colleges also offered the largest number of distance education courses with 44 percent of the total number of courses offered (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003a).

Rapid change in technology requires an ever-changing instructional skill set (O'Banion, 1997b). In discussing technology challenges in the community college classroom, Al-Bataineh and Brooks (2003) report that ultimate success in the integration of instructional technology rests in training and supporting faculty. Participants in a study at one community college "considered obtaining training on using technology as one of their greatest needs" (Quick & Davies, 1999, p.651). Cooley & Johnson (2001) report that professional development is the most important information technology challenge in the nation. Floyd (2003), noted:

The challenges of change (and many questions associated with issues of technology and distance education) can be addressed through the planning and implementation of a comprehensive professional development program that is grounded in well-established, basic principles of effective leadership. (p.346)

However, in a study of Advanced Technology Education programs funded by the National Science Foundation, faculty involved in 200 projects reported that they received little opportunity for faculty development (Lawrenz, Keiser & Lavoie, 2003).

Factors Contributing to the Need for Faculty Development: Retirement

Faculty turn-over and retirement add to the need for systematic renewal of faculty skills (Berry, Hammons & Denny, 2001; Parsons, 1992). As the baby boom faculty are aging, faculty retirement is viewed by scholars as one of the looming crisis in two-year public colleges in the next few years—a crisis that necessitates faculty development programs (Evelyn 2001; Magner, 2000; Mellander & Mellander, 1999). One national study revealed that 94 percent of two-year college faculty respondents planned to retire in the next 10 years producing 25,850 to 30,040 full-time faculty exiting (Berry, Hammons & Denny, 2001). This same study indicated that the majority of Chief Academic officers anticipated a difficult time recruiting prepared faculty replacements (Berry, Hammons & Denny, 2001). New faculty members, at the very minimum, will require extensive faculty orientation and most likely continuous training.

Factors Contributing to the Need for Faculty Development: Directives

While most educators (Burnstad, 1994; Cohen & Brawer, 1977; Fugate & Amey, 2000; O'Banion, 2000) generally agree that faculty development is an important element in the success of the public two-year colleges, it is also an important component in accreditation, federal legislation, and state regulations. The Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (2003) requires “evidence of ongoing

professional development of faculty as teachers, scholars, and practitioners” (see sec. III, 22.). Title III of the Higher Education Act provides special funding consideration to eligible colleges that propose faculty development plans (see Part A., sec.311). The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act of 1998 requires that each state describe its provisions for comprehensive professional development for its teachers and, in turn, states require each postsecondary recipient to do the same in a Local Plan (see sec.122.). Additionally, 10 percent of Perkins state funds are available for specific state leadership activities, including professional development (see sec. 112 & 124).

Faculty Development: The Seventies to Present

The Seventies. After the emphasis on the development of the student in the sixties, the seventies saw attention turn to faculty and faculty development (Hopple, 1991; Murray, 2002; Nelson & Siegel, 1980; Watts & Hammons; 2002). The seventies saw a tremendous growth period in faculty development. In 1971, the National Council on Education Professions Development commissioned Terry O’Banion to prepare a report on the personnel needs of the community-junior college. He recommended a massive effort in preservice and in-service education and noted that there were few programs (O’Banion, 1972). He concluded his recommendations by calling for funding so that development programs could be “implemented, tested, and evaluated” (O’Banion, 1972, p. 173). In 1973 Gaff began a study to identify and examine faculty development programs (Gaff, 1975). Gaff noted that few institutions had programs with participation limited, voluntary, and outside the normal workload (1975). He found that

budgets were “modest” with grant monies as the major source of funding (Gaff, 1975). Gaff (1975) also reported that there was little evidence of effectiveness of the programs. In 1975 Bergquist and Phillips provided the educational community with the first in a classic three-volume set of handbooks for faculty development, which offered goals, activities, exercises, handouts, instruments, and models. The authors recommended a comprehensive faculty development program model that included areas of instructional development, organizational development, and personal development (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975).

Centra’s national study in 1976 surveyed 756 higher education institutions, including 326 two-year colleges. Centra examined the use and effectiveness of various faculty development practices in the categories of institution-wide policies or practices, analysis or assessment practices, workshops, seminars, programs; media technology, course development, and miscellaneous practices (1976). He also studied faculty participation, organization, funding, and evaluation of faculty development program. He strongly suggested that faculty needs and attitudes be assessed for the selection of faculty development activities. Centra (1976) found that of all the responding colleges, 44 percent had a faculty development unit or coordinator. Two-year colleges responding with a faculty development unit or coordinator totaled 49 percent (Centra, 1976). The majority of programs studied had only been established in the last two or three years and had not been evaluated (Centra, 1976). He concluded his study by suggesting that these new programs would only be continued if their effectiveness was proven (Centra, 1976).

Three major faculty development professional organizations were established in the seventies. The Program and Organization Development Network in Higher Education was established in 1975 for colleges and universities. The National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (Brass, 1984), initiated in 1977 as an affiliate of the American Association of Community Colleges, serves as the professional association for two-year college professional development. The following year, the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development was established with an emphasis on teaching excellence.

Cohen and Brawer (1977) wrote *The Two-Year College Instructor Today* from research conducted for the Center of the Study of Community Colleges. The authors performed a national survey of humanities instructors at two-year colleges and concluded that faculty development was not a high priority for community colleges (Cohen and Brawer, 1977). Cohen and Brawer (1977) reported that funds were allocated for faculty development, but noted that monies are often “dissipated in weekend retreats, short term instructional development grants, faculty fellowship, leaves to do graduate study, and a host of uncoordinated experiences” (p.73).

The Eighties. The 1980’s began with the publication of *Effective Approaches to Faculty Development*, the Nelson and Siegel volume of essays for the Association of American Colleges. The publication was intended to examine established development programs in response to the emphasis on faculty development in the seventies (Nelson & Siegel, 1980). The editors of the volume noted that “many colleges are only now at the

beginning stages of faculty development or are now at the point of expanding or reassessing their current programs...” (Nelson & Siegel, 1980, p. 4).

In that same year, Smith (1980) published a study that used part of Centra’s (1976) survey to study staff development in two-year colleges. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges’ National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development sponsored the study (Smith, 1980). Based on his question regarding staff development goals, Smith (1980) noted that community colleges saw faculty development as the “major area for focus in their staff development program” (Smith 1980, p. 7).

Smith found that the majority of respondents received little funding for development in comparison to the college budget and that funding had actually declined since the Centra (1976) study (Smith, 1980). He also determined that in the responding two-year colleges, only 25 percent of the development programs performed program evaluation (Smith, 1980). Both Centra (1976) and Smith (1980) found that 42 percent of the responding colleges conducted no evaluation.

In 1983, Bauske studied outcomes in a sample of public community colleges in the United States. Of the colleges studied, he found that 70 percent had faculty development programs. Bauske (1983) noted that only two-thirds of the program had some evaluation component and most lacked rigor. He also found a positive relationship between the percent of the college budget spent on faculty development and the achievement of long-range outcomes (Bauske, 1983).

In 1985, Eble and McKeachie published *Improving Undergraduate Education through Faculty Development. An Analysis of Effective Programs and Practices*. The authors investigated faculty development at 18 private and 12 public colleges and universities (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). Eble and McKeachie (1985) state at the conclusion of their book, “We believe that faculty development programs not only enhance student learning but can maintain and increase the satisfaction of teaching and of belonging to a community of learners” (p. 223).

Later in the eighties, Centra’s (1976) survey was again adapted when Erickson (1986) was commissioned by the Professional and Organizational Network for a national study of 4-year colleges and universities. Erickson (1986) was asked to conduct the study in response to the perceived waning of the faculty development movement. He found that faculty development, as measured by the presence of a person or unit, had increased (Erickson, 1986). He noted, “Probably half or more of our four-year colleges, universities, and professional schools offer some formal faculty development, instructional development, and/or teaching improvement services” (Erickson, 1986, p. 196).

The Nineties. In 1990, Schuster, Wheeler, and Associates produced a collection of models, resources, and strategies for faculty development. The authors noted that “much of the original promise of faculty development remains unfulfilled” and referred to the “unevenness of faculty development efforts” as the basis for the publication (Schuster, Wheeler & Associates, 1990, p. xiii). Following in the steps of Smith (1980) and Erickson (1986), Hopple adapted Centra’s (1976) survey and conducted research on

professional development policies, procedures and practices in two-year associate degree granting colleges (1991). Hopple (1991) found that 45 percent of the community college respondents had a faculty development unit compared to 49 percent in the Centra (1976) study. In Hopple's (1991) study, 67 percent of the community college respondents received less than 1 percent of the college budget for faculty development, an increase of only 1 percent over the findings of the 1980 Smith study. Overall, 24 percent of respondents reported performing faculty development program evaluation (Hopple 1991), only 5 percent more than in the Centra (1976) study and 1 percent less than the Smith (1980) study.

During the mid-nineties, Burnstad, a past president of National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, made a noteworthy trip to 22 states and 63 colleges to visit faculty and staff development programs (Manzo, 1996). Burnstad, a well-known faculty development professional, was encouraged by her sabbatical travels and felt a growing commitment by colleges for training needs of faculty (Manzo, 1996).

Rubino's (1994) study of 195 faculty developers in higher education found that faculty development evaluation was predominantly satisfaction based. He commented, "universities and colleges in the United States are conducting FD programs without matching the content-topics of such programs to their institutional characteristics" (Rubino, 1994, p. 217). "The type of evaluation most frequently conducted and the time when such evaluation is conducted suggest that there is not a systematic and comprehensive evaluation process" (Rubino, 1994, p. 217).

Murray (1995, 1998, 1999) began his research in faculty development in two-year colleges in the nineties with studies in Ohio, New York, and, then, nationally. Based on his review of literature, Murray (1995, 1998, and 1999) sought to research the faculty development components of formalized structured programs, connection of the reward structure, faculty ownership, colleague support for investments in teaching, and the belief that good teaching is valued by administrators. In each study, Murray (1995, 1998, and 1999) used a 65 item, four-part questionnaire that included demographics, support for faculty development, the reward structure, and faculty development's importance and effects. In his national study, the researcher concluded that while it appeared that good teaching was valued, there was a "lack of commitment on the part of leadership in faculty development" (Murray, 1999, p. 58). The colleges studied "relied on a mix-and-match set of voluntary activities" (Murray, 1999, p. 61). Murray's (1995; 1998) state studies showed similar problems.

The nineties also produced an important study in faculty development when Grubb (1999) and his colleagues undertook an extensive examination of community college teaching by observation and interview of faculty members and administrators. In discussing in-service education and staff development, Grubb and Webb report that "most colleges have used in-service education in unfocused and thoughtless ways" (Grubb, 1999, p. 397). Grubb (1999), also noted that staff development days are "typically one shot activities with outsiders, and do nothing to generate a culture within and institution supporting teaching" (p. 298).

The Year 2000 to Present. Grant's 2000 national study of publicly supported two-year colleges reported that 90 percent of respondents had a formal faculty development program, and 52 percent had a designated faculty development coordinator. Grant's questionnaire related to program practices, content, coordination, participation, funding, and evaluation (2000). Grant (2000) also determined that a formal needs assessment was used to establish content in 58 percent of the responding colleges, but more than 50 percent did not have a formal evaluation process for faculty development programs.

Outcalt's (2002) study of community college professoriate, a follow-up on Cohen and Brawer's (1977) study, profiled faculty from 1975-2000. He noted that faculty isolation could be solved through professional development programs "with the twin goals of increasing interaction and promoting instructional effectiveness" (Outcalt, 2002, p. 264). Citing Grubb and Murray, he further stated, "Such programs would be considerably more effective than the episodic, unfocused offerings currently available" (Outcalt, 2002, p. 264).

The Texas Two-Year Public College

The State of Texas faces issues and standards regarding professional development in two-year public colleges corresponding to national concerns. Texas is second in the nation in numbers of two-year public colleges (Phillippe & Patton, 2000). According to the THECB (2003b), Texas two-year public colleges outnumber public four-year universities, and independent four-year colleges and universities (THECB,

2003b). Texas two-year colleges accounted for the majority of the state's enrollment increase in Fall 2002, with students totaling 519,922 (THECB, 2003b). Texas public community and technical colleges awarded 24,549 associate degrees and 15,908 certificates in 2001 (THECB, 2003b). The THECB reported that in Fall 2001, 41 percent of all first time in college students attending a two-year public college enrolled in one or more remedial courses (2003b). Black students enrolled in remedial courses 56 percent of the time as compared to Hispanics at 50 percent and white students at 33 percent (THECB, 2003b). According to the Texas Association of Community College, 35 percent of Texas community college students received need-based financial aid (2004). The association further notes, that community colleges account for over 80 percent of the enrollments in distance education courses in Texas (Texas Association of Community Colleges, 2004).

The THECB's *Guidelines for Instruction Programs in Workforce Education* requires professional development activities (THECB, 2003a). The THECB *Community and Technical Colleges Institutional Effectiveness Peer Review Guidelines for College Site Coordinators* (n.d.) also requires the availability of documentation and review concerning the college's professional development activities for institutional effectiveness on-site visits. The State Plan, as required by the Carl Perkins Act, requires provision of professional development for workforce education faculty and authorizes the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development to coordinate professional development activities for Texas Community and Technical colleges (Texas Education Agency, 2003). The Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional

Development for public two-year colleges is comprised of projects funded by the 10 percent category of Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology

The Texas Two-Year Public College: Faculty Development

In 1979, Caffey studied faculty development at eight Texas public community colleges. He asked faculty members to rank goals for faculty development (Caffey, 1979). The respondents ranked “improvement of teaching skills” as the number one goal of faculty development (Caffey, 1979). In 1980, research conducted in 15 Texas community colleges reviewed rewards. Institutional innovation, professional development interests, institutional support, and overall impression (McQueen, 1980). The McQueen (1980) study concluded that the faculty perceived that they were getting little or less than moderate help from faculty development programs and expressed a desire for emphasis on the skill of teaching. Richardson and Moore (1987) studied Texas public community college faculty development programs in the fall of 1985. Of the 56 respondents, only 7 percent did not have a faculty development program (Richardson & Moore, 1987). The authors stated, “Development activities seem mired in traditional hit-or-miss schemes that are evaluated more often than not on the basis of audience reaction” (Richardson & Moore, 1987, p. 29).

Paterno’s (1994) study of Texas community colleges listed workshops, meetings/seminars, and video conferences as the most frequently faculty development activities available in the responding colleges. He noted that few faculty development programs had written goals and objectives or formal needs assessments (Paterno, 1994).

Additionally, Paterno's (1994) investigation concluded that the development programs impact was unknown because of the level of evaluation employed.

Murray's (1995, 1998, 1999, 2000) questionnaire, used in Ohio, New York and later nationally was also used in Texas. The Texas study revealed that in 44.9 percent of the two-year colleges, the designated faculty development person spent less than 10 percent of his or her time on faculty development responsibilities (Murray, 2000, p. 255). Further, Murray reported (2000) "Only at seven (14.3%) of the 49 colleges responding did the faculty development officer report spending more than 50% of his or her time on these duties" (p. 263). Based on his study, Murray (2000) concluded that there was a "lack of leadership for faculty development" and that most colleges rely on a "mix and match set of voluntary activities" (p. 266).

Summary of Literature

The two-year public college plays an important role in educating the citizens of the United States. These colleges enroll more than 50 percent of the nation's undergraduates with high percentages of working students, females, minorities, first generation students, older students, and students with disabilities (Phillipe & Patton, 2000). The two-year public college in the United States has evolved with each social, political, scientific, and legislative movement in the last hundred years. With ever-increasing numbers and varieties of students, two-year public college faculty have historically taught in an ever-changing context. A progressive movement of equal opportunity and access changed the two-year public college student body to more

accurately reflect the population, but brought problems to the classroom. As McClenney noted, many of these students face numerous challenges fiscally and academically (2004). Faculty have encountered issues of culture and learning styles (Rendon & Valadez, 1994; Sanchez, 2000; Simmons, 1994). Faculty development programs are needed to help faculty members cope (Rendon & Valadez, 1994). Given a less homogeneous classroom, reform strategies have focused on the learner with faculty expected to make adjustment in teaching methodologies and techniques that include all students (O'Banion, 1997a, 2000, 2003). In addition to changing demographics in the student population, the faculty hired during the baby boom are retiring and new faculty need to be trained (Berry, Hammons & Denny, 2001).

Coupled with the changing student body and faculty turn-over, the faculty has faced a number of other challenges. Technology changed the learning environment. Distance learning, the integration of instructional technology, and multimedia are found in the majority of U.S. public colleges (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2003a). Faculty training or development is expected to help solve the difficulties posed by changing technology (Al-Bataineh & Brooks, 2003; Cooley & Johnson, 2001; Quick & Davies, 1999).

Faculty development is perceived as needed for a variety of factors. It remains in some form, a component of the higher education environment. Faculty development is accepted as a way to increase the skills needed for a successful college. In fact, faculty development is mandated in some instances. However, since the faculty development

movement gained momentum in the seventies, similar concerns persist throughout the decades.

Faculty development has grown throughout the decades. In the early stages of the movement, Gaff (1975) noted that there were few faculty programs. As associations were formed in and handbooks were published, the faculty development movement gained momentum. By 1976, Centra reported that 49 percent of his responding two-year colleges had some form of a faculty development program. Colleges were adding programs, but faculty development was still not a high priority and funds were considered inadequate or ill-spent (Cohen & Brawer, 1977).

By the 1980's, Smith's (1980) study showed the same percentage as Centra's (1976), 42 percent, that did not evaluate faculty development. Smith (1980) also reported decline in faculty development budgets, as compared to the Centra (1976) study. In the 1990's, Hopple's (1991) study found that faculty development programs had declined as compared to the Centra study in 1976 and that budgets had only increased 1 percent over the Smith (1980) study. Evaluation had declined 1 percent since the 1980 Smith study (Hopple, 1991). Both the Grubb (1999) and Murray's (1995, 1998, 1999, 2000) study concluded that faculty development lacked focus. In 2000, Grant noted that 90 percent of two-year public colleges had programs, but that 50 percent did not have a formal evaluation. Outcalt (2002), like Grubb (1999) and Murray (1995, 1998, 1999, 2000), found faculty development programs to be unfocused. Texas studies found similar problems throughout the decades.

Recurring themes of inadequate budget, evaluation, and organization emerge in numerous studies, yet faculty development programs continue to grow and be perceived as an important tool for improvement.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This descriptive study was designed to measure the current characteristics of faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas. In order to accomplish this purpose, this study used a questionnaire as the data collection research method.

Population

This study used a total population, consisting of public two-year colleges in the State of Texas. The THECB database of colleges and college administrators was used to identify each two-year public college and president in the state. According to the THECB (2003b), there are 50 public community college districts (some with multiple campuses), four colleges of the Texas State Technical College System, and three public two-year, lower-division Lamar state colleges. This study's population included 78 public lower division institutions. Appendix A lists public two-year colleges in the colleges in Texas.

Instrumentation

A self-reporting electronic questionnaire with an introductory information sheet was designed to determine the characteristics of faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas. The investigator used a software application package, WebSurveyor[®]

(n.d.), which allowed for the development of a web-based questionnaire. The program provided for electronic completion and submission of the questionnaire, as well as subsequent management of the data. The instrument and data were hosted on a WebSurveyor[®] (n.d.) computer server. The instrument was accessed by each respondent through a URL link located on an information sheet emailed to each college representative.

The information sheet indicated that the respondent was selected by the college president as the staff or faculty member most responsible at his or her college for faculty development activities for academic faculty, for technical faculty, or for both. Information regarding the number of colleges to be contacted, the confidentiality of the responses, contact details, and the approval by the Institutional Review Board-Human Subjects in Research at Texas A&M University was included in the information sheet. The information sheet requested that each respondent indicate an understanding of the information provided and indicated his or her agreement to participate in the study by accessing the linked questionnaire.

The questionnaire included clear and concise instructions. A confirmation that the respondent was responsible for faculty development for both academic and technical faculty, or academic faculty only, or for technical faculty only was included in the instructions. In the case where a college divided faculty development responsibilities, the instructions directed the respondent to answer the questions based on either academic or technical activities. Respondents were also instructed to answer the questions based on the college year of 2002-2003. Additionally, the instructions indicated that the

respondents should answer questions based on faculty development activities that impact multiple faculty and that were sponsored and funded entirely by the college.

The questionnaire asked relevant demographic information and characteristics of faculty development activities. Demographic information requested included the respondent's present position, years in present position, years assigned to faculty development responsibilities, and the number of students enrolled at the respondent's college in the fall of the academic year covered by the research. This section of the questionnaire also reconfirmed if the respondent was responsible for faculty development for academic faculty, technical faculty or for both academic and technical faculty.

A review of the literature was used to determine relevant questionnaire items. Questionnaire items were closed form, requiring specified responses and, open form, soliciting comments from respondents. The items on the questionnaire were designed to measure research objectives that correspond to research questions. After the initial demographic section entitled Background Information, the questionnaire was organized using the following headings:

1. Space
2. Staff
3. Funding
4. Needs Assessment
5. Content
6. Delivery
7. Evaluation

These questionnaire categories were based on previous areas of research. The area of staff was included in Centra (1976), Smith (1980), Richardson & Moore (1987), Hopple (1991), Murray (1995, 1998, 1999, 2000), and Grant (2000). Funding was included in Centra (1976), Smith (1980), Hopple (1991), and Grant (2000). Needs assessment was included in Grant (2000). Content and delivery were included in Lefler (1998). Evaluation was included in Centra (1976), Smith (1980), Richardson & Moore (1987), Hopple (1991), and Grant (2000). Space is included in the questionnaire as an indication of resource utilization and for its importance, as Harris (1989) emphasized, in logistics.

An open form comment area followed each section, allowing the respondent to make any response regarding each subject, thus allowing the researcher to receive data not included in prespecified questions.

Conditional page breaks were used to direct the respondent to or beyond a branch of related questions. For example, if a respondent did not use distance learning for delivery of faculty development activities, the respondent was moved electronically to another subject. However, if the respondent did use distance learning as a delivery mode, the respondent was taken automatically to questions regarding distance learning delivery.

Pilot Test

The electronic questionnaire and information sheet were independently reviewed and validated using a panel of experts in faculty development. The panel of experts

represented four Texas two-year public colleges and a representative from the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development. Each college representative was chosen by the two-year public college president as the person most responsible for faculty development at his or her college. The Consortium Director of the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development was chosen for his state leadership position and his expertise in faculty development as demonstrated through the person's direction of numerous professional development projects in two-year public colleges in Texas. Minor revisions to the questionnaire and the information sheet were made based on panel recommendations. The revised instrument with the information sheet was distributed to the population by electronic transmission.

Procedure

The president's office of each public two-year college in Texas was contacted by telephone prior to the electronic delivery of the questionnaires. As recommended by Gall, Gall & Borg (2003) in regards to precontacting, the researcher introduced herself, explained the study, and sought cooperation. Each president, or his or her representative, was asked to designate the staff or faculty member who was most responsible for faculty development at the college. The president, or his or her representative, was then asked if the designee was responsible for faculty development for both academic and technical faculty or if two respondents should be appointed. In the case when faculty development responsibility was divided by technical and academic faculty, both designees were sent questionnaires. Having each president identify the

appropriate college employee(s) ensured that the respondent had specific knowledge regarding faculty development on his or her campus.

As a result of the contact with each president's office, it was found that of the 78 colleges, 6 colleges, or 8 percent, divided faculty development responsibilities between two individuals at the college, one identified for the academic faculty and one for the technical faculty. Those six identified colleges were sent two questionnaires each for the two selected representatives. Of those 6 colleges, 4 responded or 67 per cent.

After the precontact with the president's office, the information sheet and questionnaire were e-mailed to the president's designated respondent(s). Respondents' email addresses were obtained from the president's office or through the college web site. The software program, WebSurveyor[®] (n.d.), supported a database of respondents' email addresses. Each email address was identified in the program with a unique identification for each respondent. The database served as a mailing list of the selected respondents and allowed for list management. The notifications module of WebSurveyor[®] (n.d.) sorted each unique identification by those that had been successfully transmitted, those that had been opened, and those that had been submitted. Three subsequent contacts were made by phone and/or email. By using the notification module of the software program, only nonrespondents were contacted. Of the 78 colleges sent electronic questionnaires, 57 responded yielding a 73 percent return.

Design and Statistics

The purpose of this study was to measure the current characteristics of faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data. In quantitative research, descriptive statistics are used to measure characteristics of a population on prespecified variables (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). The questionnaire was designed for ease of quantification. Open-ended questions and multiple selection items were analyzed based on content categories. The questionnaire asked for demographic data in order to characterize the population and respondents. The raw scores from completed and returned questionnaires were exported into Excel spreadsheets. Descriptive statistics, including percentage and frequency were used to analyze the data and answer each research question. Data were graphically arranged in tables suitable for reporting results.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to research current characteristics of faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas. To determine current characteristics, an electronic questionnaire was developed to investigate areas of space, staff, funding, needs assessment, content, delivery, and evaluation. The THECB database of 78 public lower division colleges and college administrators was used to identify each two-year public college and president in the state. Each president, or his or her representative, designated the staff or faculty member who was most responsible for faculty development at his or her public two-year college in the State of Texas. In cases where faculty development responsibility was divided by technical and academic faculty, two college designees were sent questionnaires.

Of the 78 colleges contacted, 6 colleges, or 8 percent, divided faculty development responsibilities between two individuals at the college; one identified for the academic faculty and one for the technical faculty. Those six identified colleges were sent two questionnaires each of the two selected representatives. Of those six colleges, four responded (67 per cent).

To clearly identify the responses from the colleges that use one person for faculty development and to differentiate each category of those responsible for technical or academic faculty, data presentation was arranged into four categories. The data was

classified by the term “combined,” where one person was responsible for all faculty, i.e., the combination of responsibility for both academic and technical faculty. The data were also reported by the categories of “academic” and “technical” when the responsibility was divided at the college into those two areas. The fourth category has been listed under the category of “total.” The total category data represents the answers of all respondents. While it is interesting to see the data of the academic and technical respondents in relation to the respondents in the combined category, the data must be viewed in the context of the very small population of those classifications.

Present Position Title Responsible for Faculty Development

Questionnaires were completed by the faculty or staff designated by the college president, or his or her representative, as the person most responsible for faculty development on his or her campus. Respondents selected his or her position from a list consisting of several categories of typical job positions at two-year public colleges in Texas. In descending authority, the positions for selection were President, Vice President, Academic Dean or Technical Dean, Associate Dean, and Director. As demonstrated in Table 1, at almost a third (32.7 percent) of the responding colleges, the Vice President was considered the person most responsible for faculty development for all faculty. The ranking for combined responsibility included the Director position with 10 colleges (20.4 percent), followed by 8 Academic Deans (16.3 percent) and 5 Associate Deans (10 percent). Only in the case of one college, did the president report that he or she was the most responsible for faculty development for all faculty. At one

college, a Technical Dean was designated as the person responsible for not only technical faculty development, but also for academic faculty development. Other responses that were not typically considered an on administrative level included three coordinators, one specialist, and one faculty assembly president. In the combined area, 44 or 91.7 percent of those responsible for faculty development were on the administrative level, at or above the level of Director.

Table 1 lists 3 of the 4 respondents for the position most responsible for faculty development for academic faculty as the Academic Dean with the third being Vice President. Table 1 also lists 3 of the 4 respondents for the position most responsible for faculty development for technical faculty as the Technical Academic Dean. The other position reported as responsible for faculty was Provost. In the area of both academic and technical, all of those responsible for faculty development were on the Dean level or above.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of Position Title of Respondents (n=57)

Present Position	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Vice-President	16	32.7	1	25.0	0	0.0	17	29.8
Director	10	20.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	17.5
Academic Dean	8	16.3	3	75.0	0	0.0	11	19.3
Associate Dean	5	10.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	8.8
Technical Dean	1	2.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	4	7.0
President	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.8
Other	8 ^a	16.3	0	0.0	1 ^b	25.0	9	15.8

^a 3 Coordinators, 1 Instructional Technology Specialist, 1 Faculty Assembly President, 2 Deans of areas not listed (Instruction and Educational Services), 1 Chief Academic Officer

^b Provost

Staff or Faculty Experience in Present Position

Of all categories responding, Table 2 shows that just under 50 percent of all respondents had only been in his or her position for 5 years or less. Slightly over 75 percent had been in his or her position for less than 10 years. In the combined category, just over 50 percent had been in his or her present position for 5 years or less. Of those responding that were responsible for academic faculty development only 66.6 were in his or her position less than 10 years. Of those responsible for technical only, all responses fell under the 10-year range.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Years in Present Position (n=66)

Years	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0 through 5	30	51.7	1	25.0	1	25.0	32	48.5
6 through 9	13	22.4	2	50.0	3	75.0	18	27.3
10 through 15	10	17.2	1	25.0	0	0.0	11	16.7
16 through 19	2	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.0
20 through 25	2	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.0
26 through 29	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
30 through 35	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5

Staff or Faculty Experience in Faculty Development

To determine faculty development experience, respondents were asked to list the number of years that they had been assigned faculty development responsibilities. As reported in Table 3, the combined, academic and total categories all list 50 percent or more having 5 or less years experience in faculty development. The technical area

respondents had between 6 and 15 years experience with 2 out of 3 having over 10 years experience.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Years with Faculty Development Responsibility (n=57)

Years	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0 through 5	28	56.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	30	52.6
6 through 9	8	16.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	9	15.8
10 through 15	9	18.0	1	25.0	2	66.7	12	21.1
16 through 19	2	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.5
20 through 25	3	6.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	4	7.0

Full-time Enrollment

Respondents were asked to estimate the number of full-time students enrolled at their college in the Fall of 2002; the first semester of the study's timeframe. Table 4 presents the enrollment figures as reported by the respondents. The largest percentage of respondents for the combined and the total categories fall in the 2,000 to 2,999 enrollee range with 10 (20 percent) and 11 (19.3 percent) respectively.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Fall 2002 Full-Time Enrollment (n=56)

Students	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0 through 999	3	6.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	4	7.0
1000 through 1999	5	10.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	6	10.5
2000 through 2999	10	20.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	11	19.3
3000 through 3999	4	8.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.0
4000 through 4999	3	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.3
5000 through 5999	3	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.3
7000 through 7999	2	4.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	3	5.3
8000 through 8999	5	10.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	6	10.5
9000 through 9999	2	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.5
10000 through 19999	5	10.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	6	10.5
20000 through 29,900	2	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.5

Note: One respondent listed enrollment erroneously as over 50,000. No individual two-year public college campus in Texas enrolls more than 50,000 full-time students.

College Space Used as a Faculty Development Area

Respondents were asked if there was a space in the college that was identified as a faculty development office or facility. In order to verify the space's actual use for faculty development activities, respondents were asked to report if the space was used 51 percent or more of the time for faculty development. A designated space that was used the majority of time for faculty development indicated a commitment to the activity by the college through the allocation of college resources. Table 5 shows that more than 50 percent of the colleges responding with one person responsible for all faculty development (combined category) did not have a space that was used 51 percent or more for faculty development. The academic category was split with half of the respondents reporting a 51 percent space utilization. The technical category had only one respondent with a space utilized more than 51 percent for faculty development.

Table 5. Frequency and Percentage of Faculty Development Area Used 51 Percent or More in Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n=61)

Responsibility Area	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	23	43.4	30	56.6
Academic	2	50.0	2	50.0
Technical	1	25.0	3	75.0
Total	26	42.6	35	57.4

Description of Space in Faculty Development

To ascertain the characteristics of the space utilized by Texas two-year public colleges, respondents were asked to select from a number of typical descriptions of college facilities. Only those who indicated that their college used a designated space more than 51 percent of the time for faculty development, were asked to describe the space utilized. The respondents selected from a list comprised of office(s), training classroom(s), curriculum development areas, and conference rooms. Table 6 reveals that overall and in the combined category, the training classroom appears to be the top selection. The office area is second.

Table 6. Frequency and Percentage of Descriptions of Faculty Development Facilities in Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n=61)

Facility	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Training Classroom(s)	20	35.7	1	20.0	1	50.0	22	34.9
Office(s)	17	30.4	1	20.0	0	0.0	18	28.6
Conference Rooms	10	17.9	1	20.0	0	0.0	11	17.5
Curric. Dev. Area	7	12.5	1	20.0	1	50.0	9	14.3
Other	2 ^a	3.6	1 ^b	20.0	0	0.0	3	4.8

Note: Multiple responses were given.

^a 1 library/reading room & 1 video conference area.

^b 1 computer training lab.

Identification of Faculty Development Space by Name

Respondents were asked if the area on campus that was used for faculty development more than 51 percent of the time was specified by name. A space that is identified by title is one that gives an impression of permanence and, perhaps, value. A named space is also more easily identified and communicated to the college population. As shown in Table 7, over 90 percent of those responding in the combined and total categories had a named space. The academic and technical categories showed 100 percent.

Table 7. Faculty Development Space Specified by Name (n=26)

Space Specified by Name	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	21	91.3	2	8.7
Academic	2	100.0	0	0.0
Technical	1	100.0	0	0.0
Total	24	92.3	2	7.7

When asked to list the name of the area used for faculty development for their college, respondents reported a variety of names. Only in one case did the name of the area not reflect, in some descriptive manner, the use of the room. In almost every case, the general area was designated a “Center;” however, one area was designated an “Institute.” In keeping with the learning movement in higher education (Barr & Tagg, 1995; O’Banion, 1997a, 2000), 7 of the colleges included the term “learning” in the name of the faculty development area. “Innovation” was also used in the title of the faculty development areas 7 times.

Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Space

Each respondent was given an opportunity to make any comment regarding college space utilized for faculty development. Of the 15 respondents who chose to make comments, 4 made comments that did not apply to space. One wished to share that professional development was required for performance review, one commented that new seminars were being planned for the following year, the third reported that no one office or program was responsible for faculty development, and the last noted that distance learning training was used. Of the remaining respondents, 6 used the opportunity to further describe the space and its use. Five shared a similar theme, indicating that college classrooms, labs, and library spaces were shared. Two comments indicated a lack of support in the area of assigned resource for faculty development. One respondent had expectations of a shelf and filing cabinet in the library the following year and the other confided that he or she was a tenured faculty member on re-assigned time working out of his or her faculty office.

College Division That Administers Faculty Development

The division of the college that has authority over the program, staff, and activities of faculty development may indicate whether the administering division has experience in faculty concerns. It also indicates whether faculty development maintains a certain degree of influence and authority by its placement in the college. As seen in all

categories of Table 8, the majority of colleges use the instructional division to administer or oversee faculty development, with a range of 76.5 percent to 100 percent.

Table 8. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Colleges Texas Public Two-Year Divisions Overseeing Faculty Development (n=59)

Division	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Instruction	39	76.5	4	100.0	3	75.0	46	78.0
Human Resources	3	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.1
President	3	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.1
Student Services	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7
Institutional Effect.	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7
Other	4 ^a	7.8	0	0.0	1 ^b	25.0	5	8.5

^a Includes 2 committees, 1 split of responsibility between Human Resources and Instruction, 1 Division of College Advancement

^b Multiple areas of responsibilities.

College Faculty Development Staff

As an indication of resource allocation and importance, the questionnaire asked how many employee positions were assigned to faculty development. The question included the restriction that the staff listed by the respondents must perform faculty development duties more than 51 percent of the time. One technical area respondent answered that he or she had 10 staff members meeting the criteria. Information regarding those 10 staff members contradicted the answer; hence the answer was eliminated from the analysis. Table 9 reveals that 46.2 percent of those responding in the combined category and 49.2 percent of the total respondents do not have a single staff member whose duties are more than 51 percent faculty development.

Table 9. Frequency and Percentage of Number of Positions Assigned to Faculty Development at Least 51% of Time by Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (59)

Positions	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	24	46.2	2	50.0	3	100.0	29	49.2
1	12	23.1	1	25.0	0	0.0	13	22.0
2	9	17.3	1	25.0	0	0.0	10	16.9
3	1	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7
4	2	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.4
5	3	5.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.1
7	1	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7

When asked to list the title of faculty development positions with faculty development duties of more than 51 percent, respondents listed director, coordinator, specialist officer, secretary administrative assistant, intern, fellow, and even designer. In only one case was the position level in the dean classification, Associate Dean of Organizational and Staff Development.

Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Staff

Comments regarding faculty development staffing were made by 18 respondents. Of those, over half of the comments discussed faculty development by use of committees, part-time staff, or staff with faculty development as an additional assigned duty. In at least two cases, the respondents wanted to share that staff was also used for staff development.

Faculty Development in College Budget

To determine if faculty development was considered important enough to the college to include in the college budget, respondents were asked if funding was specifically designated in the college budget for the academic year being studied. As illustrated in Table 10, in the combined category 90.4 percent of the respondent's colleges specifically included faculty development in the budget. The academic and technical categories showed 66.7 and 75 percent respectively for budget specificity. The total category listed 88.1 percent of all respondents as having faculty development specifically listed in the college budget.

Table 10. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Colleges Including Faculty Development in the Texas Public Two-Year College Budget (n=59)

Funded in College Budget	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	47	90.4	5	9.6
Academic	2	66.7	1	33.3
Technical	3	75.0	1	25.0
Total	52	88.1	7	11.9

Estimate of Dollar Amount Used for Faculty Development

Respondents were asked to estimate the total dollar amount used specifically for faculty development in the 2002-2003 academic year. The questionnaire directed the respondent to include all college sources, for example, grant, state or local funds. Respondents were also directed not to include funds for conference or travel/per diem. This last instruction was included to support the questionnaire request and study

limitation that confined answers and research to (1) faculty development activities that were available to all faculty in the academic and technical division (or all faculty in either division if the responsibilities were divided) and (2) activities that impact multiple faculty. Table 11 shows that 46 percent of all respondents have a faculty development budget at his or her college of \$20,000 or less. The number receiving \$30,000 or less equals 64 percent. Table 11 also shows that the academic and technical areas, with one exception, are under the \$5,000. The raw data used to populate Table 12 reveals that the lowest amount in the combined category was \$2,500. The lowest amount for the academic category was \$250. The lowest amount for the technical category was \$700 dollars.

Table 11. Frequency and Percentage of Estimate of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Faculty Development Funding Used for 2002-2003 Academic Year (n=50)

Total Dollar Amount	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0 to 5000	4	9.1	2	66.7	3	100.0	9	18.0
5001 to 10000	6	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	12.0
10001 to 20000	8	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	16.0
20001 to 30000	8	18.2	1	33.3	0	0.0	9	18.0
30001 to 40000	7	15.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	14.0
40001 to 70000	3	6.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.0
70001 to 100000	5	11.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.0
100001 to 300000	3	6.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.0

Table 12. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using Faculty Members in Planning Faculty Development (n=61)

Faculty Planning	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	51	96.2	2	3.8
Academic	4	100.0	0	0.0
Technical	3	75.0	1	25.0
Total	58	95.1	3	4.9

Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Funding

There were more comments regarding funding than any other section of the questionnaire that invited open comments. Two comments were regarding lack of information. Five wanted to emphasize that salary funds were not included in the estimate. The majority of the respondents wanted to discuss where monies originated or were allocated. Several mentioned that his or her college used grant funds.

Faculty Members Involvement in Faculty Development

When asked if faculty members were involved in faculty development planning, as shown in Table 12, a significant number of colleges responded in the affirmative. In only 3 cases did those responsible for faculty development in two-year public colleges in the State of Texas respond that faculty were not used in planning faculty development.

How Faculty Are Involved in Faculty Development

Those who declared that faculty was involved in faculty development planning were asked to select how faculty members were involved in planning. Respondents selected from a list that included a faculty development committee/task force, input through the appropriate department chair or dean, or if a designated college staff or faculty member planned faculty development activities. Respondents were also asked to specify other methods. Table 13, lists input through the dean or chair as the most often

selected method. In all categories, the second choice was committees, or other groups such as taskforces, faculty associations, or councils.

Table 13. Frequency and Percentage of How Faculty are Involved in Planning Faculty Development at Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n= 57)

Planning Involvement	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Input: Dept. Chair/Dean	38	41.3	4	80.0	2	66.7	44	44.00
Comit., Task Force, Assoc.	37	40.2	1	20.0	0	0.0	38	38.00
Faculty/Staff Member	14	15.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	14.00
Other	3 ^a	3.3	0	0.0	1 ^b	33.3	4	4.00

Note: Multiple responses were given.

^a 3 involvement by survey

^b Involvement by combination of all choices.

Needs Assessment for Faculty Development

Table 14 shows that 57.4 percent of the responding two-year public colleges in Texas report that they are performing needs assessment. Hence, faculty development needs assessment was not performed by 42.6 percent. In the colleges where responsibilities are divided by academic faculty and technical faculty, 75 percent of respondents in each category do not perform needs assessments to plan faculty development activities. The combined category listed 62 percent as performing needs assessments.

Table 14. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges That Perform Needs Assessment Before Planning Faculty Development (n=61)

Faculty Planning	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	33	62.3	20	37.7
Academic	1	25.0	3	75.0
Technical	1	25.0	3	75.0
Total	35	57.4	26	42.6

Needs Assessment Methods Used

Those respondents reporting that their college performed a needs assessment before planning faculty development were asked to select from a list of assessment methods that included Questionnaire(s), Observation, Faculty Evaluations, Review of Current Educational Trends, End of Course Surveys, and Statistical Reports of the College. Respondents could also choose “assessment data is not used in planning faculty development” as a selection. Three respondents made that choice even though all three had reported performing needs assessment. Table 15 lists the questionnaire as the most selected method in all three categories, combined, academic, and total. In the combined category, the area with the majority of colleges and respondents, observation is listed as the second choice. In the total category, faculty evaluation is second and observation is third.

Table 15. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Methods of Gathering Assessment Data Before Planning Faculty Development (n=35)

Data Gathering Methods	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Questionnaire(s)	29	23.0	1	50.0	1	25.0	31	23.5
Observation	25	19.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	25	18.9
Faculty Eval.	24	19.0	1	50.0	1	25.0	26	19.7
Current Ed. Trends	22	17.5	0	0.0	1	25.0	23	17.4
End/Course Survey	10	7.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	7.6
Statistical Reports	7	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.3
Data Not Used	2	1.6	0	0.0	1	25.0	3	2.3
Other	7 ^a	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.3

Note: Multiple responses were given.

^a 3 input or requests from the administration, 2 using feedback from in-service or faculty development activities, 1 information from faculty growth plans, 1 other data

Communication of Need for the Faculty Development Activity

To determine communication of need to faculty development activity participants, those responsible for faculty development were asked if the need for an activity was clearly defined during each faculty development class, workshop, seminar, presentation, or exercise. Respondents were asked to select strongly agree, agree, neutral, or strongly disagree. As shown in Table 16, the most chosen answer in the combined, academic, and total categories was “agree,” ranging from 45 to 50 percent, with strongly agree as second choice. No category reported the choice strongly disagree. However, the technical respondents reported 75 percent as neutral regarding communication of defined need, and the combined and total categories reported 17.3 percent and 20 percent, respectively. Of the 52 respondents that were responsible for

both the academic and technical faculty, 3 or 5.8 percent did not communicate a need for activities.

Table 16. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges That Clearly Defined Need for Faculty Development During Each Activity (n=60)

Respondents Opinion	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly Agree	15	28.8	2	50.0	1	25.0	18	30.0
Agree	25	48.1	2	50.0	0	0.0	27	45.0
Neutral	9	17.3	0	0.0	3	75.0	12	20.0
Disagree	3	5.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.0
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Needs Assessment

Respondents chose to make only 4 comments regarding faculty development needs assessment. One noted that topics were “self-selected” by faculty and added that there was no formal college-wide reason driving development selection. Another commented that next year he or she would incorporate needs assessment with the evaluation of all faculty development activities. One mentioned that in addition to surveys, some activities were based on the need to give faculty information from the administration. The last noted that his or her college’s SACS study had revealed needs.

Faculty Development Content

To discover the faculty development subjects covered by Texas two-year colleges content, respondents were asked to select all applicable topics. The topics list

included: academic subject(s) development, technical subject(s) development, new technologies applications, curricular applications, labor market and career information, integration of academic and technical curricula, use of effective teaching strategies, appreciation of diverse student backgrounds and needs, effective use of research in instruction, and use of technology/multimedia/telecommunication in instruction. The list offered respondents was from the Texas consolidated state plan serving as the state plan under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (1998). Table 17 lists use of technology/multimedia/telecommunication in instruction and new technologies applications as the top two choices, respectively, in all 3 categories. The third selection in all categories was use of effective teaching strategies with the technology category listing the second and third selection as a tie.

Table 17. Frequency and Percentage of Faculty Development Topics Offered in Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n=60)

Topics	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tech. in Instruction	48	15.2	3	25.0	4	22.2	55	15.9
New Technologies	46	14.6	3	25.0	3	16.7	52	15.0
Eff. Teaching Strat.	44	13.9	1	8.3	3	16.7	48	13.9
Academic Subj. Devel.	36	11.4	1	8.3	1	5.6	38	11.0
Curricular Applications	35	11.1	2	16.7	2	11.1	39	11.3
Technical Subj. Devel.	34	10.8	0	0.0	2	11.1	36	10.4
Diverse Students	33	10.4	2	16.7	0	0.0	35	10.1
Integration Acad/Tech.	21	6.6	0	0.0	1	5.6	22	6.4
Use of Research	10	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	2.9
Labor /Career Info.	9	2.8	0	0.0	2	11.1	11	3.2

Note: Multiple responses were given.

Other Subjects Areas Offered

Because of the potential number of topics that could be listed, the respondents were asked to list in a separate question any other subject areas that were offered during the 2002-2003 academic year. Of the 15 respondents listing topics, three commented that they did not know, could not remember, or did not offer training. One of those respondents was the only comment from academic category. The only respondent from the technical category listed work ethics as a subject. All other topics listed were from respondents who were responsible for faculty development for both academic and technical faculty. One of these college representatives responded with approximately 28 topics. Most responded with 1 to 3 topics. Topics tended to fall into three general areas, personal development and growth issues with emphasis on soft skills, technology issues, and teaching and college issues.

Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Topics

There were three comments regarding faculty development topics. One noted that they would offer more with a larger budget and staff. One told of a monthly discussion group on a variety of faculty chosen topics. One confirmed that faculty determined topics on the campus level and added faculty typically chose technology related topics. This comment mirrors the figures in Table 17.

Faculty Members as Presenters

Faculty participation in delivery of faculty development was measured by asking those most responsible for faculty development on each campus if faculty members were used in presenting faculty development activities. As listed in Table 18, only 3 respondents in all categories did not use faculty in presenting faculty development activities, two the combined category and one in the technical area.

Table 18. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using Faculty Members to Present Faculty Development Activities (n=61)

Faculty Presenting	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	51	96.2	2	3.8
Academic	4	100.0	0	0.0
Technical	3	75.0	1	25.0
Total	58	95.1	3	4.9

Faculty Development Activities from External Entities

Following the question regarding faculty presenters, responding colleges were asked if outside agencies, organizations, businesses, consortia, or associations were utilized for faculty development activities. In Table 19, the data show that most two-year public colleges in Texas use outside entities for faculty development, as well as faculty members. Only 7 respondents reported that they not use external entities.

Table 19. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using External Groups for Faculty Development (n=61)

External Groups	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	48	90.6	5	9.4
Academic	2	50.0	2	50.0
Technical	4	100.0	0	0.0
Total	54	88.5	7	11.5

External Entities Used for Faculty Development

Respondents who used external groups were asked to select from a list of entities used for professional development. Entities included STARLINK, a four year (or more) public or private college or university, North Texas Community College Consortium Leadership and Renewal Academy (CLARA), the Virtual College of Texas, the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development, other two-year public colleges, the Texas Collaborative for Teaching Excellence, Ed2Go, NetG, and ACT. Respondents were directed to select any entity that was used. As noted in Table 20, of the 152 selections, two noted that they did not use an outside entity. STARLINK or State of Texas Academic Resource Link, a satellite and Internet-based educational network and agency of the Texas Association of Community Colleges was selected 48 times (31.6 percent). STARLINK was the top choice in the combined, technical and total categories, with academic listed in a tie with the second choice. The second choice academic category tie and the second choice in all other categories was the use of a four year (or more) public or private college or university for faculty development. The North Texas Community College Consortium Leadership and Renewal Academy or

CLARA placed 3rd third in combined and subsequently, the total category. The fourth choice in the combined and total category was the Virtual College of Texas. The Virtual College of Texas is a service of the Texas Association of Community Colleges where colleges share distance learning courses. The academic category respondents only made 3 selections, STARLINK, a 4 year or more college or university, and the Virtual college of Texas. The technical category respondents made seven choices, but more than 50 percent of those choices were STARLINK. Only 10 respondents selected the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development, a statewide professional development system for community and technical college faculty funded by the THECB with Carl Perkins funds.

Distance Learning Use in Faculty Development

Distance Learning is used throughout higher education to deliver training. To determine if distance learning was used to deliver faculty development, respondents were asked to answer a yes or no question. Table 21 reveals that with the exception of the academic category, 75 percent or more in the responding categories used distance learning to deliver faculty development. The academic category is divided in its use of distance learning.

Table 20. Frequency and Percentage of External Groups Used by Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges for Faculty Development (n=54)

Outside Entities	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STARLINK ^a	43	30.9	1	33.3	4	40.0	48	31.6
4 Yr./More Coll./Univ.	18	12.9	1	33.3	0	0.0	19	12.5
CLARA ^b	17	12.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	11.2
Virtual Coll. of Texas ^c	11	7.9	1	33.3	1	10.0	13	8.6
Leadership Consortium ^d	10	7.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	6.6
Two-Year Publ. College	9	6.5	0	0.0	1	10.0	10	6.6
General Term for Ext. ^e	7	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	4.6
Tx. Collab. Tchng. Ex.. ^f	6	4.3	0	0.0	1	10.0	7	4.6
Ed2Go	5	3.6	0	0.0	1	10.0	6	3.9
NetG	4	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.6
No Outside Entity	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.3
ACT	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	10.0	2	1.3
Other	6 ^g	4.3	0	0.0	1 ^h	10.0	7	4.6

Note: Multiple responses were given.

^a State of Texas Academic Resource Link.

^b North Texas Community College Consortium Leadership and Renewal Academy.

^c Virtual College of Texas is a service of the Texas Association of Community Colleges.

^d Leadership Consortium for Professional Development.

^e Used general term for outside entity.

^f Texas Collaborative for Teaching Excellence.

^g SACS presenter, Johnson Cooperative, online company, conference, institutional effectiveness association.

^h Internal.

Table 21. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using Distance Learning for Delivery of Faculty Development (n=61)

Use of Distance Learning	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	41	77.4	12	22.6
Academic	2	50.0	2	50.0
Technical	3	75.0	1	25.0
Total	46	75.4	15	24.6

Methods of Distance Learning Delivery

Respondents using distance learning as a delivery method for faculty development activities were asked to select from a variety of distance learning delivery modes: Satellite Broadcast, Web-based Session(s), Video Conference, Video Tape, and CD ROM. Respondents could also select other. Of the 121 selections, 38 (31.4 percent) chose satellite broadcast. Web-based session(s) and video conferences were the second and third choice respectively. The combined area reflected the ranking of the total category. The academic and technical categories listed satellite broadcast and web-based sessions as the first and second selection (Table 22).

Table 22. Frequency and Percentage of Distance Learning Delivery Modes Used by Respondents (n=46)

Methods Used	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Satellite Broadcast	33	29.7	2	50.0	3	50.0	38	31.4
Web-based	30	27.0	1	25.0	1	16.7	32	26.4
Video Conference	23	20.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	19.0
Video Tape	17	15.3	1	25.0	1	16.7	19	15.7
CD ROM	7	6.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	8	6.00
Other	1 ^a	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8

Note: Multiple responses were given.

^a Interactive web conference

Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Delivery

There were 6 respondents that took the opportunity to make comments regarding faculty development delivery. Of those 6, 5 were comments about distance learning.

Three respondents noted that they did not use distance learning for faculty development,

did not use it during the designated study year, or did not typically use it. One planned to research the use of a regional distance learning consortium. The last comment regarding faculty development delivery through distance learning was to note that he or she had heard that video conferences were boring. One respondent made a comment not related to distance learning. The comment noted a lack of long-range plans and cohesive topic development for faculty development in the college he or she represented.

Evaluation of Faculty Development

Evaluation is needed to measure the success of any learning activity.

Respondents were asked if their college evaluated faculty development activities.

Table 23 lists the responses. Of the total respondents, 92.7 percent claimed to evaluate faculty development activities. Of the respondents reporting no evaluation of faculty development, 4 were in the combined category (7.7 percent) and 1 (1.9 percent) in the technical category. All those responsible for faculty development for academic faculty, reportedly evaluated development activities.

Table 23. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Who Evaluate Faculty Development Activities (n= 60)

Evaluation	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	48	92.3	4	7.7
Academic	4	100.0	0	0.0
Technical	3	75.0	1	25.0
Total	55	91.7	5	8.3

Use of an Evaluation Tool for Faculty Development

Respondents that reported evaluating faculty development were asked if their college used an evaluation instrument to measure faculty professional development activities. Table 24 reports the yes or no responses to the question. Of all respondents, 75.5 report using an evaluation instrument for faculty development. The combined category totaled 75 percent. Only one respondent in the technical category reported using an evaluation instrument. In the academic category, 3 out of the 4 respondents used an evaluation instrument. Overall, 13 of the respondents (24.5 percent) who reported evaluating faculty development activities did not use any instrument to perform evaluation.

Table 24. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using an Evaluation Instrument for Faculty Development (n=53).

Tool	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	36	75.0	12	25.0
Academic	3	75.0	1	25.0
Technical	1	100.0	00	00
Total	40	75.5	13	24.5

Evaluation of Areas Measured

Those respondents reporting the use of an evaluation instrument were asked to select the areas the evaluation instrument measured. Respondents selected from areas of content, participant satisfaction, adequate presentation, usefulness of information in the classroom, and performance outcomes. Table 25 lists the areas by percentage that were

most used by those responding. Participant satisfaction was measured most often in all categories with the exception of technical. The area of performance outcomes was the least used. The performance outcomes option was selected only 9 times out of 155 selections in this multiple selection question.

Table 25. Frequency and Percentage of Faculty Development Areas Measured by Evaluation Instrument at Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges (n=40)

Areas Measured	Combined		Academic		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Participant Satisfaction	37	26.1	3	27.3	0	0.0	40	25.8
Usefulness of Info. in Class	33	23.2	2	18.2	0	0.0	35	22.6
Adequate Presentation	33	23.2	2	18.2	0	0.0	35	22.6
Content	32	22.5	3	27.3	1	50.0	36	23.2
Performance Outcomes	7	4.9	1	9.1	1	50.0	9	5.8

Note: Multiple responses were given.

The respondents to this question were then asked if their college evaluation instrument measured areas other than those listed. Four respondents chose to answer. One noted that measurement depended on the department offering the activity. The other replies were not areas of measurement, but extras on his or her evaluation instrument that dealt with demographics or requests for suggestions of future activities.

Use of Evaluation Results to Determine Future Activities

To determine if colleges were making use of evaluation results, respondents were asked if evaluation results were used in determining future faculty professional development activities. Table 26 shows that only one respondent out of 41 in all categories did not use evaluation results to plan future faculty development.

Table 26. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Texas Public Two-Year Colleges Using Evaluation Results to Determine Future Faculty Development Activities (n=41)

Results Determine Future Development	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Combined	36	97.3	1	2.7
Academic	3	100.0	0	0.0
Technical	1	100.0	0	0.0
Total	40	97.6	1	2.4

Texas Two-Year College Comments Regarding Faculty Development Evaluation

Six respondents took the opportunity to make comments regarding faculty development evaluation. The one representative from the academic group whose college did not use an evaluation instrument, wanted to note that his or her college was in the process of developing an evaluation tool. The tool was undergoing its third revision. The rest of the comments were from the respondents who were responsible for both the academic and technical division's faculty development. Three respondents in this category had previously reported that their college did not evaluate faculty development or did not use an evaluation instrument. One explained that even though a formal system of evaluation was not used, the application of faculty development activities in the classroom and on campus was used as evidence of benefit at his or her college. The respondent did not explain how the application of the development activity was determined and measured. One noted a short instrument was used at the end of workshops and the last admitted that evaluation was difficult and noted that there was little follow-up. The other respondents shared the name of the instrument used or noted that campus evaluations were also used by the college district.

Summary of Results

A review of the literature was used to develop an electronic questionnaire designed to measure research objectives that correspond to research questions. The questionnaire was organized by demographics, space, staff, funding, needs assessment, content, delivery, and evaluation with a comment area following each section. The electronic questionnaire and accompanying information sheet were independently reviewed and validated by a panel of experts, including a representative from the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development and four Texas two-year public college representatives with faculty development responsibility. The President of each two-year public college in the State of Texas (or his or her representative) designated the staff or faculty member who was most responsible for faculty development at the college. When faculty development responsibility was divided by technical and academic faculty, the two designees were sent questionnaires. Of the 78 colleges, 6 colleges, or 8 percent, divided faculty development responsibilities between two individuals at the college. Of those six colleges, four responded. Of the 78 colleges sent electronic questionnaires, 57 responded, yielding a 73 percent return.

Descriptive statistics of including percentage and frequency were used to analyze the data. Data were graphically arranged in tables and described in this chapter to report results.

The following summarizes the results:

1. In almost a third (32.7 percent) of the responding colleges, the Vice President was considered the person most responsible for faculty development for all faculty (combined category). The total respondents using the Vice President as responsible were 29.8 percent.
2. Almost half, 48.5 percent, of all respondents had only been in his or her present position for 5 years or less.
3. Of all respondents, 52.6 percent have 5 years or less experience in faculty development.
4. The largest percentage of those responding work in two-year public colleges with an enrollment of between 2,000 and 2900 students in fall of 2002.
5. Of all respondents, 57.4 percent do not have a designated space used more than 51 percent for faculty development.
6. The colleges that had a faculty development space meeting the 51 percent criteria tended to have training rooms.
7. Those with a designated faculty development space tended to name the area. The term 'center' was typically used to identify the space.
8. The majority of colleges use the instructional division to administer or oversee faculty development.
9. Of the total respondents, 49.2 percent do not have a single staff member whose duties are more than 51 percent faculty development.

10. Of those listing a faculty development position, only one listed was on the dean level.
11. According to all respondents, faculty development was listed in the majority of two-year college budgets (88.1 percent).
12. Faculty development funding for more 46 percent of all respondents is \$20,000 or less.
13. Of all respondents, 95.1 of faculty were involved in planning faculty development.
14. According to all respondents, input through the appropriate chair or dean is the most used method of faculty involved in planning faculty development.
15. Faculty development assessment is not performed by 42.6 percent of all respondents.
16. Of those respondents performing assessment, the questionnaire is the most used method.
17. According to more than 75 percent of the respondents, the need for the faculty development activity is clearly defined.
18. The top three topics offered are use of technology, multimedia, and/or telecommunication in instruction, new technologies applications, and effective teaching strategies.
19. Most colleges use faculty and outside entities for faculty development delivery.

20. STARLINK (State of Texas Academic Resource Link) is the most used external group used in faculty development.
21. Of all respondents, 75.4 percent use distance learning for faculty development.
22. Satellite broadcast, web-based session(s), and video conferences were the top three distance learning delivery modes used for faculty development.
23. Of the total respondents, 91.7 percent reported that his or her college evaluated faculty development activities.
24. Of the respondents who reported evaluating faculty development activities, 24.5 percent did not use any instrument to perform evaluation.
25. Of all respondents, 75.5 percent report using an evaluation instrument for faculty development evaluation.
26. Of those responding colleges using an evaluation instrument, participant satisfaction was measured most often.
27. Only one out of all respondents did not use evaluation to plan future activities.

The summary and conclusions regarding the study research questions will be fully discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was conducted to research faculty development in two-year public Texas colleges. Data was collected to answer the following research questions:

1. How do public two-year colleges in Texas approach faculty development in regards to issues of:
 - a. Space
 - b. Staffing
 - c. Funding
2. How are faculty development needs assessed for public two-year colleges in Texas?
3. What content is offered in faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas?
4. How is faculty development delivered in public two-year colleges in Texas?
5. How is faculty development evaluated in public two-year colleges in Texas?

The following is a summary of the results of the research:

In researching the approach to faculty development in Texas two-year public college in regard to space, the results revealed that at least 57.4 percent of all respondents do not have a space in the college that is used for faculty development 51

percent or more. The academic category is divided in terms of space use with half of the respondents meeting the 51% criteria. In the technical category, only one of the four respondents had a space used 51 percent or more for faculty development. The training classroom was the most typically used space. The office was the second most selected area, at selection rate of only 28.6 percent.

The results regarding staff experience revealed that 48.5 percent of all respondents had been in their present position for 5 years or less. Further, 50 percent or more of those responsible for faculty development, with the exception of the technical category, had 5 or less years experience in faculty development duties. Typically, administration of faculty development was directed through the instructional division. Of all responding colleges, 91.7 percent of those responsible for faculty development were on the administrative level, at or above the level of Director. Through examination of the title of respondents, it appears that most of these 91.7 percent have other duties to perform at his or her college.

The number of staff performing faculty development duties was determined by first setting a criterion. Respondents were asked to count positions at their college who spent 51 percent or more of time performing faculty development duties. Using the 51 percent measure, 49.2 percent of the total respondents had no faculty development staff member at their college.

Over 88 percent of respondents in the study, report that his or her college designates faculty development in the college budget. Of those respondents with designated faculty development budgets, 46 percent are under \$20,000, with 64 percent

under \$30,000. The respondents were asked to include local or grant funds in the total and several commented they did use grant funds.

Over 95 percent of the total respondents report that faculty are in some way involved in faculty development planning, typically through input to a dean or chair, or through a committee or group. However, all respondents report that only 57.4 percent perform a needs assessment. Further, of those total respondents performing a needs assessment, observation is selected in the combined area as the second most used method as assessment. Of all respondents, 75 percent report that the need for the faculty development activity is defined during the activity. However, 20 percent of the respondents were neutral when asked if the need for the faculty development activity was communicated and 5 percent disagreed that need had been communicated.

In determining the content of faculty development activities in Texas two-year public colleges, the respondents were offered a list of subjects taken from the Texas Consolidated State Plan, serving as the state plan under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998. The subjects selected most often by respondents were, in order of selection: technology, multimedia, and telecommunications in instruction; new technologies applications; and the use of effective teaching strategies. Other selections, in descending order of choice, were: development of curricular applications, academic subject(s) development, technical subject(s), development, appreciation of diverse student backgrounds and needs, integration of academic and technical curricula, labor market and career information, and effective use of research in

instruction. Labor market and career information was selected 3.2 percent and use of research in instruction was selected 2.9 percent.

According to the majority of respondents, faculty development programs in two-year colleges in Texas, use college faculty (95 percent) and outside groups (88 percent) to deliver development activities. Of the outside entities, STARLINK or the State of Texas Academic Resource Link, a satellite and Internet-based educational network and agency of the Texas Association of Community Colleges, was the most used in the state for two-year public college faculty development. The second most used entity for faculty development was four year (or more) public or private colleges or universities. The third choice was the North Texas Community College Consortium Leadership and Renewal Academy.

In keeping with the general growth of distance learning in education, distance learning was selected as used to delivery faculty development by 46 respondents (75.4 percent). Satellite broadcast was the most selected distance learning delivery method for faculty development for all respondents.

Of the total respondents, 92.7 percent claimed to evaluate faculty development activities, but almost 25 percent of the respondents who reported performing faculty program evaluations did not use an evaluation instrument. When asked to select areas measured by the instrument, the most selected area was participant satisfaction. Only 9 respondents claimed to have an instrument that had an area measuring performance outcomes.

Conclusions

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked, “How do public two-year colleges in Texas approach faculty development in regards to issues of: Space, Staffing, and Funding?” In researching space, a standard was set to determine if a space was designated and allocated in the colleges for faculty development the majority of time. A 51 percent or more use criterion was established. This criterion was used to indicate a certain commitment, if not permanence. Additionally, having a space available for faculty development eases logistical issues. In looking at the allocation of space for faculty development, it appears that the majority of colleges studied do not designate a faculty development space and, of those that do, the majority do not always allocate an office. The lack of a designated office for a staff person to oversee faculty development supports the conclusion (see below) that the person responsible for faculty development has multiple duties, and has an office that cannot be claimed under the 51 percent standard. Given the results of these findings, it is evident that the majority Texas two-year public colleges lack a commitment to the allocation of space for faculty development.

The employee designated by each president as the person most responsible for faculty development was an administrator, often a vice president, with many duties. It is positive that the majority of colleges use the instructional division to administer or oversee faculty development. This gives those with the closest relation, understanding,

and authority with the faculty the responsibility for faculty development. However, a large percentage of two-year public colleges in Texas, 49.2 percent of the total respondents, had no staff member responsible for faculty development who spent more than 51 percent of the time on faculty development duties. Also, of those with faculty development duties over 51 percent, only one was listed in on the dean level and, in that case, it was an associate dean.

In looking at the results of the data concerning faculty development staff, it appears that Texas two-year colleges do not place a high level of emphasis on faculty development. The administrator who is accountable to the president has many duties and little experience. Almost one half of the respondents do not have a full-time position devoted to faculty development. Of those who are predominantly, and directly, responsible for faculty development (those who have faculty development duties assigned more than 51% of the time) do not have a high level of authority at their college.

A large number of colleges studied include faculty development in the college budget. A designated monetary recognition lends importance to faculty development. However, even though faculty development has a place in the budget, as confirmed by 88.1 percent of all respondents, the amount set aside is meager when compared to two-year public college total budgets. According to the THECB (2004), the total education and general fund expenditures for the fiscal year ending 2002 for Texas two-year public colleges was \$2,890,148,766 with a median amount of \$26,107,713 (2004). The THECB (2004) lists the smallest two-year public college budget as \$5,128,800. If a

college designates \$30,000 for faculty development, the highest budget amount reported by 64 percent of respondents, the faculty development budget would be only .005 percent of even the smallest college budget and .001 percent of the median budget. This leads to the conclusion that Texas two-year public colleges spend relatively very little on faculty development. It is further supported by the comments included by some respondents who noted that the total budget listed included grant funds, as requested by the directions in the questionnaire. If grants funds are included in some faculty development budgets listed, the disparity between the amount budgeted for faculty development and the total educational and general fund of Texas two-year colleges (which do not include grant funds, becomes even greater.

These results of this research question, indicates a lack of resource allocation and commitment to faculty development in a significant percent of public two-year colleges in Texas.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked, “How are faculty development needs assessed for public two-year colleges in Texas?” Needs assessment should be used to accurately plan activities that meet faculty, and college, needs, desires, or requirements. Centra (1976) strongly suggested that faculty needs and attitudes be assessed for the selection of faculty development activities. It is positive that most respondents report that faculty members are involved in planning faculty development; but involvement was mainly through input to a dean or chair. This very informal planning option was selected more

by respondents than the choice of using faculty development committees or task forces. Unfortunately, 42.6 percent of all respondents report that they do not perform a needs assessment. Without a needs assessment, it can be concluded that faculty development in a significant percent of Texas two-year colleges is guess work. The respondent who noted that his or her college had no long range plans or cohesive topic development may speak for many two-year public colleges in Texas. Of the colleges that reported performing needs assessment, the second most selected method of assessment was observation. Observation, outside of clinical settings, is usually not practiced as an in-depth method of assessment. .

Communication of the assessed need during the activity confirms to the participants that the need for the activity has been acknowledged and that an attempt has been made to meet that need. A fourth of all respondents were either neutral or did not communicate the need for faculty development.

Planning faculty development activities without assessing needs indicates that a large number of two-year public colleges in Texas are still providing what Richardson and Moore (1987) termed “hit-or-miss” activities. Those who report that they assess faculty development needs are not necessarily performing in-depth assessments.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 asked, “What content is offered in faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas?” Both Caffey in 1979 and McQueen in 1980 ranked teaching skills as the most needed goal or emphasis for faculty development.

Respondents confirmed that teaching skills are still considered important by its ranking as a selection topic. The ensuing years of changing technology more than likely, have contributed to a greater need for technology training as reflected in content topics offered in faculty development programs. However, some of the least selected topics had potential to improve the classroom. Curricula applications and subject development for academic or technical areas did not make the top of the list. Labor market and career information was selected 9th in a field of 10, even though, information regarding the job market is often important to the two-year public college student. According to Phillippe and Patton (2000), many of these students are 25 years of age or older and are working full or part-time (80 percent). This population tends to be more serious about their reason for attending college and more in need of information regarding their career path. The item least selected as a content topic was the effective use of research in instruction. This is unfortunate in that programs regarding research provide faculty members with the tools to discover important information in their field, share information with their students, and include research activities in classroom activities.

In 1975, Bergquist & Phillips recommended a comprehensive faculty development program model that included areas of instructional development, organizational development, and personal development. Respondents adding additional content areas listed personal growth issues with emphasis on soft skills, technology issues, and teaching and college issues, all falling within Bergquist and Phillips original recommendations for content.

Research Question 4

Research Question 4, asked, “How is faculty development delivered in public two-year colleges in Texas?” Both faculty and external entities are used for faculty development. This study finds that the Texas Association of Community Colleges is achieving success in its effort to support professional development in two-year public colleges in Texas. Its network, STARLINK, or the State of Texas Academic Resource Link, was selected as most used external source for two-year public college faculty development. This result leads directly to the next finding. A large number (46 or 75.4 percent) of Texas two-year public colleges use distance learning for faculty development with the most selected mode of delivery being satellite broadcast. This could be attributed to the success of STARLINK, a satellite and Internet-based educational distance learning network.

It is interesting to note that the entity authorized and funded to coordinate professional development activities for two-year public colleges in Texas, the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development (Texas Education Agency, 2003), was in a tie for fifth place. Only 10 respondents in the state selected the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development as a provider of faculty development. This leads to the conclusion that the funds supporting this entity could either be put to better use, or the consortium should be evaluated and improved. At the very least, improvements should be made in its outreach to stakeholders.

Research Question 5

Research Question 5 asked, “How is faculty development evaluated in public two-year colleges in Texas?” Faculty development evaluation is a persistent concern in faculty development literature. In 1975, Gaff reported that there was little evidence of effectiveness of the faculty development programs. In 1976, Centra reported that the majority of programs he studied had not been evaluated. In 1980, Smith noted in his study that only 25 percent of the development programs in two-year colleges performed program evaluations. Both Centra (1976) and Smith (1980) found that 42 percent of the responding colleges conducted no evaluation. In Hopple’s (1991) study, only 24 percent of respondents reported performing faculty development program evaluation only 5 percent more than in the 1976 Centra study and 1 percent less than the 1979 Smith study. However, in 1983, Bauske’s national study of public community colleges, two-thirds of the faculty development programs studied had an evaluation component. In 2000, Grant noted that 50 percent of faculty development programs did not perform formal evaluations.

Numbers are growing in the use of faculty development evaluation. In this study, 92.7 percent of respondents claimed that their colleges evaluated faculty development activities. However, almost 25 percent of those respondents did not use an evaluation instrument. Of those respondents using an instrument, the most selected area of measurement was participant satisfaction. Performance outcomes measure was the least selected category at 5.8 percent. In Kirkpatrick’s (1994) four-level model of evaluation,

participant satisfaction, falls into the lowest level in the model, reaction. The reaction level, which deals with how participants feel, is the least meaningful or important level.

While more colleges claim to be evaluating faculty development in this study, this study's findings indicate a lack of formal in-depth evaluation procedure. The results of this study call into question the depth of evaluation of faculty development in Texas two-year public colleges. Participant satisfaction, the most selected method of measurement, will not reveal faculty development as related to teaching effectiveness. This is consistent with Rubino's (1994) national study of faculty developers in higher education, which reported that faculty development evaluation was predominantly satisfaction based. Rubino (1994) concluded that most evaluations performed lacked rigor. Richardson & Moore (1987) in their study of Texas public community colleges noted that faculty development was evaluated, more often than not, on the basis of audience reaction. Several years later, this still appears to be the case in Texas.

Recommendations

Recommendations Based on the Study

This study provides a description of faculty development in Texas public two-year colleges. The results of the study provide a baseline of information for further research. The research also provides a resource for two-year college professional developers and administrators in the development and/or revision of faculty development programs in Texas by providing information for comparison. College administration and faculty developers should review this research to increase awareness

and understanding of the current approach to faculty development in Texas two-year public colleges in order to make data-driven decisions.

The THECB community and technical college division should examine the results of this study to understand current practices in faculty development in the colleges it leads. Faculty development is encouraged, but limited allocation of resources and a scarcity of in-depth evaluation of programs indicate a lack of college commitment. Agency policy makers and legislators should be aware of this problem. More specifically, the THECB should examine the reason the Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development (Texas Education Agency, 2003), authorized by State Plan to coordinate professional development activities for Texas Community and Technical colleges, is used by so few colleges in the state.

Recommendations for Future Study

The focus of this study was to investigate current characteristics of faculty development in two-year public colleges in Texas. This was accomplished by conducting research in the areas of space, staff, funding, needs assessment, content, delivery, and evaluation. Each of these areas is worthy of an in-depth investigation regarding its use and/or effect in professional development for faculty, or for other populations. Evaluation is a particularly important area to investigate. Evaluation is generally considered important in measuring the success or failure of educational and training programs. Measurement of performance after training can identify if learning

has occurred, if learning has been applied, and if improvements have been made as a result of the learning. Improvement in student learning is the ultimate measure.

Further research should be conducted to compare trends in the data over time. It would be interesting to see if those responsible for faculty development will grow in experience, if more resources will be allocated in terms of space, staff, and funding, or if needs assessments, and evaluations will become progressively more important. The instrument could be used in other states to examine faculty development characteristics in a similar manner. The instrument in this study could also be adapted for use in researching professional development for specific sectors within the public two-year college. For example, faculty could be divided by types and or departments and compared. With reconfiguration, the instrument could be used in investigating staff professional development. Reconfigured, the instrument could be used on the four-year college or the university level. The instrument could also be adapted and used to examine business and industry training programs. In most cases, revision of the instrument could be accomplished by substituting selection lists with content more suitable to the specific population to be studied.

Other factors should also be explored as having bearing faculty development. Incentives have sometimes been used in relation to participation. Faculty retention should be studied to determine the relationship, if any, between faculty development and faculty turnover. A researcher could ask if faculty development improves faculty retention rates.

Additionally, it is recommended that an in depth study be conducted using a smaller population. The study could be confined to 6 colleges of three different sizes based on student population. Sizes should be selected by defining a specific population range in the categories of small, medium and large colleges. This will allow the researcher to contrast and compare data based on college size. Data could then be retrieved at each location, first at the summary level, and then, extracted and expanded to a more detailed and specific statistical analysis. On-site interviews and follow-up site visits could be added to the methodology. This will enable the researcher to more easily identify patterns leading to the discovery of more specific relationships and conclusions.

REFERENCES

- Age Discrimination Act of 1975, 42 U.S.C. § 6101 et seq.
- Alabama Department of Archives & History. (n.d.). *Statement and Proclamation of Governor George C. Wallace, University of Alabama, June 11, 1963*. [On-line]. Available: http://www.archives.state.al.us/govs_list/schooldoor.html.
- Al-Bataineh, A., & Brooks, L. (2003). Challenges, advantages, and disadvantages of instructional technology in the community college classroom. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 473-484.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2003). *Resolution on the Brown v. Board of Education's 50th Anniversary*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Template.cfm?Section=Inclusiveness&template=/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=11550&InterestCategoryID=196&Name=Inclusiveness&ComingFrom=InterestDisplay>.
- Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101-12189.
- Barr, R., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning – A new paradigm for undergraduate teaching. *Change*, 27 (6), 12-26.
- Bauske, D. (1983). A critical analysis and evaluation of faculty development programs outcomes in community colleges in the United States. (Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, IA). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 27 (01), 19.

- Bennett, M. (1996). *When dreams come true: The G.I. Bill and the making of modern America*. Washington, DC: Brassey's.
- Bergquist, W., & Phillips, S. (1975). *A handbook for faculty development*. Washington, DC: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.
- Berry, L., Hammons, J., & Denny, G. (2001). Faculty retirement turnover in community colleges: A real or imagined problem? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 123-135.
- Boggs, G., & Carter, J. (1994). The historical development of academic programs in America. In G. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on community college in America: Its history, mission, and management* (pp.218-226). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Boulard, G. (2003). Diverse city. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 20 (16), 28-33.
- Brass, R. (1984). Editor's notes. In R. Brass (Ed.), *Community colleges, the future, and SPOD* (pp. 1-4). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press, Inc.
- Brick, M. (1994). From forum and focus for the junior college movement. In B. Townsend (Series Ed.) & J. Ratcliff (Vol. Ed.), *Community colleges* (2nd ed., pp. 43-66). Needham Heights, MA: ASHE Reader Series, Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.
- Brown, B.J. (2003). A study of the nature of faculty professional development in community college learning communities. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64 (05), 1506A.

- Burnstad, H. (1994). Management of human resources in the community college. In G. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on community college in America: Its history, mission, and management* (pp. 386-395). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Caffey, D.L. (1979). Full-time faculty on faculty development: Their perceptions of what is and what should be. *Community/Junior College Research Quarterly*, 3 (4), 311-323.
- Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, 20 U.S.C. §2301 et seq.
- Centra, J.A. (1976). *Faculty development practices in U.S. colleges and universities*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d et seq.
- Clayborne, C., & Shepard, K. (Eds.). (2001). *A call to conscience: The landmark speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: IPM/Warner Books.
- Clowse, B. (1981). *Brainpower for the cold war: The Sputnik crisis and the National Defense Education Act of 1958*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Cohen, A. (2001). Government policies affecting community colleges: A historical perspective. In B. Townsend & S. Twombly (Eds.), *Community colleges: Policy in the future context* (pp. 3-22). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F.B. (1977). *The two-year instructor today*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F.B. (2003). *The American community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2003).

Core requirements. [On-line]. Available:

<http://www.sacscoc.org/commpub.asp>.

Cooley, N., & Johnson, M. (2001). Professional development: The single most important IT challenge in the United States. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 8 (1), 35-47.

Diener, T. (1994). Growth of an American invention: From junior to community college. In J. Ratcliff (Ed.), *Community colleges* (pp. 3-11). Needham Heights, MA: ASHE Reader Series, Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

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

Erickson, G.R. (1986). A survey of faculty development practices. *To Improve the Academy*, 5, 182-196.

Evelyn, J. (2001, June 15). The hiring boom at 2-year colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A8-A9.

Floyd, D. (2003). Distance learning in community colleges: Leadership challenges for change and development. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 337-347.

Fugate, A., & Amey, M. (2000). Career stages of community college faculty: A qualitative analysis of their career paths, roles, and development. *Community College Review*, 28 (1), 1-22.

- Gaff, J. (1975). *Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty, instructional, and organizational development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gall, M., Gall, J., & Borg, W. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gleazer, E., Jr. (1994). Beyond the open door, the open college. In B. Townsend (Series Ed.) & J. Ratcliff (Vol. Ed.), *Community colleges* (2nd ed., pp. 33-42). Needham Heights, MA: ASHE Reader Series, Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.
- Grant, M. (2000). Faculty development programs in publicly supported two-year colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61 (08), 3008.
- Grubb, W. (1999). *Honored, but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York: Routledge.
- Harris, B. (1989). *In-service education for staff development*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Harris, Z., Rouseff-Baker, F., & Treat, T. (2002). Faculty learners create a learning college. *Community College Journal*, 72 (5), 29-31.
- Higher Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. § 1051.
- Hopple, T. (1991). Professional faculty development practices used in two-year postsecondary educational institutions. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, Athens, OH). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52 (03), 759.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990, 20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.

- Kerr, C. (1994). Expanding access and changing missions: The federal role in U.S. higher education. *Educational Record* 75, 27-31.
- King, K., & Lawler, P. (2003). Best practices in faculty development in North American higher education: Distinctions and dilemmas. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 19 (1), 29-36.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1994). Evaluating training programs: The four levels. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Lawrenz, F., Keiser, N., & Lavoie, B. (2003). Sustaining innovation in technological education. *Community College Review*, 30 (4), 47-63.
- Lefler, J. (1998). A study of faculty development at fourteen community colleges in the Tennessee board of regents systems. (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (01), 53.
- Lovell, C. (2001). Federal policies and community colleges: A mix of federal and local influences. In B. Townsend & S. Twombly (Eds.), *Community colleges: Policy in the future context* (pp. 23-38). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Lunde, J., & Healy, M. (1991). *Doing faculty development by committee*. Stillwater, OK: Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education /New Forum Press, Inc.
- Magner, D. (2000, March 17). The imminent surge in retirements. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A18-A20.
- Manzo, K. (1996, August 26). Faculty development moving in the right direction. *Community College Week*, 10, 10-12.

- McClenney, K. (2004). *Keeping America's promise: Challenges for community colleges*. [On-line]. Available:
<http://www.league.org/league/projects/promise/download.html>.
- McQueen, R.M. (1980). The impact of staff development programs on public community college teachers in Texas. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton, TX). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47 (07), 2903.
- Mellander, G. A., & Mellander, N. (1999). Critical Issues—and therefore opportunities—for community colleges. Presentation to Congress, Major R. Owens, Congresswoman Carrie P. Meek, and to the Congressional Progressive Caucus and the Progressive Challenge. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University/National Center for Community College Education.
- Meredith, J. (1966). *Three years in Mississippi*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Moore, G. (1965). *Cramming more components onto integrated circuits*. [On-line]. Available: <ftp://download.intel.com/research/silicon/moorespaper.pdf>.
- Murray, J. (1995). Faculty (mis)development in Ohio two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 19, 549-593.
- Murray, J. (1998). Faculty development in New York two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22, 53-66.
- Murray, J. (1999). Faculty development in a national sample of community colleges. *Community College Review*, 27 (3), 47-64.

- Murray, J. (2000). Faculty development in Texas two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24, 251-267.
- Murray, J. (2002). The current state of faculty development in two-year colleges. In A. Cohen (Series Ed.) & C. Outcalt (Vol. Ed.), *New directions in community colleges: Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges*, Vol. 118 (pp. 89-97). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- National Defense Education Act of 1958, 17 U.S.C. § 401.
- Nelson, W., & Seigel, M. (1980). *Effective approaches to faculty development*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED184439).
- O'Banion, T. (1972). *Teachers for tomorrow: Staff development in the community-junior college*. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.
- O'Banion, T. (1989). The renaissance of innovation. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), *Innovation in the community college* (pp. 1-22). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- O'Banion, T. (1997a) Back to the future. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), *A learning college for the 21st century* (pp. 41-62). Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.
- O'Banion, T. (1997b). How firm a foundation: The promise of technology. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), *A learning college for the 21st century* (pp. 63-80). Washington, DC: American Council on Education/American Association of Community Colleges.

- O'Banion, T. (2000). An inventory for learning-centered colleges. *Community College Journal*, 71 (1), 14-23.
- O'Banion, T. (2003, April/May). The learning centered institution: Ideas and observations. *Community College Journal*, 13-15.
- Oromaner, M. (1997, February 13). Staff development and organizational change. Hudson County Community College: Office of Planning and Institutional Research. (Report 97.03-SR). Paper presented at a meeting of the Rotary Club of Jersey City, NJ.
- Outcalt, C.L. (2002). A profile of the community college professoriate, 1975-2000. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, CA). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63 (01), 63.
- Parsons, M. (1992). Quo vadis: Staffing the people's college 2000. In A. Cohen (Series Ed.) & K. Kroll (Vol. Ed.), *New directions in community colleges: Maintaining faculty excellence*, Vol. 79 (pp. 3-100). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Paterno, D.L. (1994). Elements of faculty development programs and their evaluations at Texas community colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55 (05), 1202.
- Peterson, C.J. (2003) Is the thrill gone: An investigation of faculty vitality within the context of the community college. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64 (09), 3219.

- Phillippe, K., & Patton, M. (2000). *National profile of community colleges: Trends and statistics* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Community College Press/American Association of Community Colleges.
- President's Commission on Higher Education. (1947). *Higher education for American Democracy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Quick, D., & Davies, T. (1999). Community college faculty development: Bringing technology into instruction. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 23 (7), 641-653.
- Quigley, M., & Bailey, T. (2003). *Community college movement in perspective*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Ratliff, J. (1994). Seven streams in the historical development of the community college. In G. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on community college in America: Its history, mission, and management* (pp. 3-16). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Rendon, L., & Mathews, T. (1994). Success of community college students: Current issues. In J. Ratcliff (Ed.), *Community colleges* (pp. 343-353). Needham Heights, MA: ASHE Reader Series, Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.
- Rendon, L., & Valadez, J. (1994). New wave students and the community college. In G. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on community college in America: Its history, mission, and management* (pp. 565-579). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Richardson, R. (1994). Responding to student diversity: A community college perspective. In J. Ratcliff (Ed.), *Community colleges* (pp. 295-308). Needham Heights, MA: ASHE Reader Series, Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.

- Richardson, R., & Moore, W. (1987). Faculty development and evaluation in Texas community colleges. *Community/Junior College Quarterly Research and Practice, 11* (1), 19-32
- Rouseff-Baker, F. (2002). Leading change through faculty development. In G. Watts (Ed.), *New directions for community colleges: Enhancing community colleges through faculty development*, Vol. 120 (pp. 35-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rubino, A.N. (1994). Faculty development programs and evaluations in American colleges and universities. (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55* (07), 1846A.
- Sanchez, I. (2000). Motivating and maximizing learning in minority classrooms. In A. Cohen (Series Ed.) & S.R. Aragon (Vol. Ed.), *New directions for community colleges. Beyond access: Methods and models of increasing retention and learning among minority students*, Vol. 112 (pp. 35-4). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schuster, J., Wheeler, D., & Associates. (1990). *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Simmons, H. (1994). Diversity among community college student populations. In G. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on community college in America: Its history, mission, and management* (pp. 454-461). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Simpson, J., & Weiner, E. (Eds.). (1989). *The Oxford English dictionary* (2nd ed., Vol. 3). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Smith, A. (1980). *Staff development practices in U. S. community colleges*.
Nelsonville, OH: AACJC/ National Council for Staff, Program and
Organizational Development
- Smith, A. (1989). Innovations in staff development. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), *Innovation
in the community college* (pp.177-199). New York: Macmillan Publishing
Company.
- Spann, M., & McCrimmon, S. (1994). Remedial/developmental education: Past,
present and future. In G. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on community college in
America: Its history, mission, and management* (pp.161-175). Westport, CT:
Greenwood Press.
- Taylor, P.W. (2004, October). *Digital community colleges and the coming of the
"Millenials" report of the major findings from the Center for Digital
Education's 2004 digital community college survey 2004*. [On-line]. Available:
<http://thejournal.com/magazine/vault/articalprintversion.cfm?aid=5072>.
- Texas Administrative Code (2003). *Chapter 4. Rules applying to all public institutions
of higher education in Texas. Subchapter B. Transfer of Credit, Core
Curriculum and Field of Study Curricula. § 4.2.3*. [On-line]. Available:
[http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=1&ch=4&rl=23](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=1&ch=4&rl=23).
- Texas Association of Community Colleges. (2004). *Legislative priorities 2005*. [On-
line]. Available: http://www.tacc.org/pdf/lpd05_final.pdf.

- Texas Education Agency. (2003). *Carl Perkins updates to Texas consolidated state plan serving as the state plan under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998*. [On-line]. Available:
<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/Cate/conplan.pdf>.
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (n.d.). *Community and technical colleges institutional effectiveness peer review guidelines for college site coordinators*. [On-line]. Available:
<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/ctc/ie/ctciems/SiteVisitCoordinatorsHandbook.pdf>.
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2003a). *Guidelines for instructional programs in workforce education 2003, part one*. [On-line]. Available:
<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/ctc/ip/GIPWE2003/default.htm>.
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2003b). *Texas higher education facts – 2003*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/reports/pdf/0445.pdf>.
- Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2004). *2003 college profiles*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/reports/pdf/0706.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2003a) *Distance education at degree granting postsecondary institutions: 2000-2001*, (NCES # 2003-017). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2003b). *Remedial education at degree-granting postsecondary institutions in Fall 2000*, (NCES 2004-010). Washington, DC: Author.

- Vaughan, G. (2000). *The community college story*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Watts, G. & Hammons, J. (2002). Professional development: Setting the context. In A. Cohen (Series Ed.) & G. Watts (Vol. Ed.), *New directions in community colleges: Enhancing community colleges through professional development*, Vol. 120 (pp. 5-10). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- WebSurveyor[®]. (n.d.). *WebSurveyor[®] homepage* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.websurveyor.com>.
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (2003). *Knocking at the college door: Projections of high school graduates by state income, and race/ethnicity*. Boulder, CO: Author.
- Zahorski, K.J. (2002). Nurturing scholarship through holistic faculty development: A synergistic approach. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 90, 29-38.

APPENDIX A

TEXAS TWO-YEAR PUBLIC COLLEGES

TEXAS TWO-YEAR PUBLIC COLLEGES

Alamo Community College District
 Northwest Vista College
 Palo Alto College
 San Antonio College
 St. Philip's College
Alvin Community College
Amarillo College
Angelina College
Austin Community College
Blinn College
Brazosport College
Central Texas College
Cisco Junior College
Clarendon College
Coastal Bend College
College of the Mainland
Collin County Community College District
Dallas County Community College District
 Brookhaven College
 Cedar Valley College
 Eastfield College
 El Centro College
 Mountain View College
 North Lake College
 Richland College
Del Mar College
El Paso County Community College District
Frank Phillips College
Galveston College
Grayson County College
Hill College
Houston Community College System
Central College
 Northeast College
 Northwest College
 Southeast College
 Southwest College
Howard County Junior College District
Howard College
Kilgore College
Lamar University - Institute of Technology

Lamar State College - Orange
Lamar State College - Port Arthur
Laredo Community College
Lee College
McLennan Community College
Midland College
Navarro College
North Central Texas College
North Harris Montgomery Community College District
 Kingwood College
 Montgomery College
 North Harris College
 Tomball College
Northeast Texas Community College
Odessa College
Panola College
Paris Junior College
Ranger College
San Jacinto College District
 Central Campus
 North Campus
 South Campus
South Plains College
South Texas Community College
Southwest Texas Junior College
Tarrant County College District
 Northeast Campus
 Northwest Campus
 South Campus
 Southeast Campus
Temple College
Texarkana College
Texas Southmost College
Texas State Technical College System
Texas State Technical College Marshall
Texas State Technical College Harlingen
Texas State Technical College West Texas
Texas State Technical College Waco
Trinity Valley Community College
Tyler Junior College
Vernon College
Victoria College, The
Weatherford College
Western Texas College
Wharton County Junior College

APPENDIX B

AREAS OF RESEARCH COMPARABLE TO CURRENT STUDY

Researcher/s	Areas of Research					
				Funds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Organization/ Person responsible: Staff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Evaluation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Centra 1976				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Smith 1980				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Richardson & Moore 1987					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hopple 1991				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Murray 1995 1998 1999 2000					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Lefler 1998		Topics or Content <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Instruction methods: includes DL delivery <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Grant 2000	Needs assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Practices: includes Delivery <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

= Area of research same as current study

= Area of research not similar

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION SHEET

From: "Jeanne Wesley" <jeanne.wesley@marshall.tstc.edu>

Subject: Faculty Development

To: "wesante@sbcglobal.net" <wesante@sbcglobal.net>

INFORMATION SHEET

A Study of Current Characteristics of Faculty Development in Public Two-Year Colleges in Texas

Your President has named you as the staff or faculty member who is most responsible at your college for faculty development activities for academic faculty, technical faculty or for both or technical and academic faculty. I would like to ask your assistance in researching faculty development in public two-year colleges in Texas by completing a simple electronic questionnaire. The questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please note:

- Electronic questionnaires will be sent to all 77 public two-year colleges in Texas.
- Participation is voluntary and you may refuse to answer any or all questions without consequences.
- Your response will remain confidential and stored in a secure server.
- Your individual responses will be available only to the principal investigator and graduate committee members.
- Only aggregate data will be reported, without the individual respondent's identifying information.
- You may contact the principal investigator Ms. Jeanne Wesley at 1-903-923-3250, by fax at 1-903-935-9554, or by email at wesante@sbcglobal.net. You may contact the dissertation committee chair, Dr. Walter Stenning at 1-979-845-8380, by fax at 979-862-4347, or by email at w-stenning@tamu.edu.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review

APPENDIX D

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Thank you for your assistance. Please answer these few background questions before answering this short questionnaire regarding faculty development. The questionnaire is pertaining to the 2002-2003 academic year.

Background Information

What is your present position?

- President
- Vice-President
- Academic Dean
- Technical Dean
- Associate Dean
- Director
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other please specify:

How many years have you been in your present position?

How many years have you been assigned to faculty development responsibilities?

If you have received this questionnaire you have been selected by your college President as the person responsible for faculty development activities for both the academic and technical faculty. Please confirm by checking the statement that most applies:

- I am responsible for faculty development activities for the academic faculty.
- I am responsible for faculty development activities for the technical faculty.
- I am responsible for faculty development activities for both the academic and technical faculty.

Number of full-time students in enrolled in your college Fall 2002 - the Fall semester of this study (not 2003):

Next Page

Faculty Development Questionnaire

If you are the person responsible for faculty development activities for **both academic and technical faculty**, please answer the following questionnaire on the **2002-2003 academic year** regarding faculty development activities that are

- 1) available to **all** faculty in both the academic and technical division
 - 2) impact **multiple** faculty
 - 3) are sponsored and funded **entirely** by the college budget - including state and federal monies that flow through to the college in grants and local funds.
-
-
-

Space

Is there a space in the college identified as a faculty professional development office or facility that is used 51% of time or more for faculty professional development?

Yes No

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Please check the areas below included in the space, identified as a faculty development facility and used 51% of time or more for faculty professional development.

- There is not a faculty development space meeting the 51% criteria.
- office/s
- training classrooms/s
- Specified curriculum development area
- conference room/s
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other please specify:

Is the faculty development space specified by a name?

- Yes
 - No
-

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Please list the title(s)/name(s) of the space identified as the designated area/s for faculty development. Please note if they are for academic only, technical only or for both academic and technical:

Other comments regarding Faculty Development assigned space:

[Previous Page](#)[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Staff

Please select the area or division of the college that administers/oversees faculty development?

- President
- Instruction
- Human Resources
- Institutional Effectiveness
- Student Services
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other please specify:

How many employee positions are assigned to faculty development where it is understood that more than 51% of assigned duties are faculty development? Please type the numeric value for zero ("0") if no employees are 51% or more faculty development. Please use numeric values: 0,1, 2, 3, etc.

Number:

Using the 51% criteria, please list the Position title/s for the number of faculty development employees listed above (if no positions meet the criteria, type none):

Other comments regarding Faculty Development staffing:

Previous Page

Next Page

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Funding

Was funding specifically designated in the college budget for faculty development in the 2002-2003 academic year?

Yes No

Please estimate the total dollar amount from all college sources (grant, state, local funds, etc., that originate or flow through the college) that were used specifically for faculty development activities during the 2002-2003 academic year. Do not include conferences or travel/per diem for conferences. Do not use \$ signs or commas.

Other comments regarding faculty development funding:

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Needs Assessment

Are faculty members involved in planning faculty development activities?

Yes

No

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

How are faculty members involved in planning faculty development activities? Please check all that apply.

- A designated faculty development committee or task force participation
- Input through the appropriate Department Chair or Dean
- A designated college staff or faculty member plans faculty development activities
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other please specify:

Is a needs assessment performed before planning faculty development activities?

- Yes No

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Which of the following ways do you gather assessment data to plan faculty development activities? Please check all that apply.

- Assessment data is not used in planning faculty development
- Diagnostic test(s)
- Questionnaire(s)
- Statistical reports of the college
- Observation
- Faculty evaluations
- Student end-of-course surveys/questionnaires
- Review of current educational trends
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other please specify:

The need for the activity is clearly defined during each faculty development class, workshop, seminar, presentation, or exercise.

- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

Other comments regarding faculty development needs assessment:

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Content

Please check the following topics that were offered during the 2002-2003 academic year. Please check all that apply.

- Academic subject(s) development
- Technical subject(s) development
- New technologies applications
- Curricular applications
- Labor market and career information
- Integration of academic and technical curricula
- Use of effective teaching strategies
- Appreciation of diverse student backgrounds and needs
- Effective use of research in instruction
- Use of technology/multimedia/telecommunications in instruction

Please list any other subject areas that were offered during the 2002-2003 academic year that were not listed above:

Other comments regarding faculty development content:

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Delivery

Are faculty members used in presenting faculty development activities

- Yes
 No

Are outside agencies, organizations, businesses, consortia, or associations utilized for faculty development activities?

- Yes
 No
-

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Please check any entity below that was used for faculty development in the 2002-2003 academic year:

- No outside entity was used for faculty development in the 2002-2003 year
- STARLINK
- Texas State Leadership Consortium for Professional Development
- Ed2Go
- ACT
- North Texas Community College Consortium Leadership and Renewal Academy
- NetG
- Another two-year public college
- A four year (or more) public or private college or university
- Virtual College of Texas
- Texas Collaborative for Teaching Excellence
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other please specify:

Previous Page

Next Page

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Is distance learning utilized in delivering faculty development activities?

Yes No

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Please select each distance learning delivery method that was used to deliver faculty development activities during the 2002-2003 academic year. Please check all that apply.

- Distance Learning was not used for faculty development
- Satellite broadcast
- Video tape
- Interactive video conference
- Web-based session(s)
- CD Rom
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other please specify:

Other comments regarding faculty development delivery:

Previous Page

Next Page

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Evaluation

Does the college evaluate faculty development activities?

Yes No

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Does the college use an evaluation instrument to measure faculty professional development activities?

Yes No

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Faculty Development Questionnaire

Which of the following areas does the evaluation instrument measure:

- Content
- Participant satisfaction
- Adequate presentation
- Usefulness of information in the classroom
- Performance outcomes
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other please specify:

Does the evaluation instrument measure other areas?

If so please list.

Are evaluation results used in determination of future faculty professional development activities?

Yes No

Other comments regarding faculty development evaluation:

Thank you for participating. Please feel free to contact me regarding this questionnaire. Jeanne Wesley 903-923-3250

[Previous Page](#)

[Submit Survey](#)

