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CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY/RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education published their report "A Nation at Risk" which precipitated a national re-evaluation of American education with a call to reform the system. Inadequate teaching was at the root of the problems in education at the elementary and secondary levels.

In 1984, the Study Group on the Conditions on Excellence in American Higher Education published their report, "Involvement in Learning." The report states that the system of higher education in the United States is "by far the largest, most complex, and most advanced in the world." However, it currently is "under-educating" Americans in relation to their true potential. The report contains a series of recommendations addressed to college administrators and faculty members calling for an improvement in college teaching. Among these recommendations is one which challenges deans, department chairs, academic vice-presidents... "to institutionalize an incentive system for quality teaching and

---

academic involvement with undergraduates."² The report suggests that college administrators "employ a multidimensional approach that can be used for faculty evaluation and feedback to help faculty improve teaching"...such as "syllabus and examination analysis, peer review by colleagues who are knowledgeable about good teaching, videotaped classes, external consultants and improved student evaluations of teaching."³ "Involvement in Learning" has been followed up by other reform reports and documents⁴ each in solid agreement that education in our colleges and universities is lacking and that central to the problem and to the solution is the teaching of college professors.

The purpose of this dissertation was to study the educational leadership activities of college deans and department head in their role of working with the faculty to improve and/or renew their teaching. Have the recommendations of the 1984 reform documents to increase the value given to teaching in the colleges been implemented in the past five

² Ibid., 46.
³ Ibid., 46.
years? The reform documents specify particular ways in which the development of the faculty can be fostered. Have these faculty development ideas been implemented? Has faculty development been the role of the college dean, the department chair or of the faculty themselves? How are faculty encouraged to participate in these developmental activities?

Is there any difference in the faculty development activities found in two year and four year colleges? The four year liberal arts college prides itself on excellence in teaching; the two year college emphasizes excellence in teaching in order to reach out to the diverse group of students who attend the college, and usually have difficulty in learning. However, is one of these colleges more committed to excellence in teaching, as measured by the kind of faculty development activities sponsored? Does the size and type of the college make a difference as to the role specifications of the dean and department chairperson in improving teaching activities?

This research provides a significant contribution to the field of educational administration as there is very little literature on the leadership role of the college dean and/or department head in improving teaching in the colleges. Most of the literature on faculty development was written in the 70's, but it does not clearly delineate the specific role the dean plays in faculty development. This dissertation is valuable as it assesses the state of faculty development as
we enter the 90's, following the reform reports written in the 80's calling for the improvement of college teaching.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Higher education administration does not yet have many theoretical models or paradigms to guide its development as a profession. It is categorized as an 'emerging field' still in need of defining its own paradigms. 5 According to Kuhn in The Structure of Scientific Revolution, once scientific communities have reached a certain level of maturity, they begin to operate on the basis of "some implicit body of intertwined theoretical and methodological belief" which he calls a paradigm.

The success of a paradigm...is at the start largely a promise of success discoverable in selected and still incomplete examples. Normal science consists in the actualization of that promise, an actualization achieved by extending the knowledge of those facts that the paradigm displays as particularly revealing, by increasing the extent of the match between those facts and the paradigm's predictions and by further articulation of the paradigm itself." 6


Jack Culbertson states that the indicators of a paradigm for the field of higher education would include a group of practitioners in the field working with a disciplinary matrix which guides inquiry into the field with disciplinary based concepts, theories and models which guide research and contribute to formulating a body of literature. Those who state that higher education must be a distinct field of study due to the difference in organization and mission of the higher education setting versus the K-12 setting will find that there is not much theoretical research to date.

The paucity of research in higher education literature on colleges as compared with elementary and secondary education has now stood the test of a few years time. The reason why there is so little present interest in this writing is its lack of any theoretical base, almost none of it was tied to theories of teaching and learning, of faculty and student development or of the workings of educational institutions. Instead, it was topical, transitory and ephemeral. Basic aspects of teaching in higher education – lecturing, leading discussions and advising students, for example, has rarely been touched by systematic inquiry.

---


The Getzels-Guba model of the dimensions of social behavior has often been applied to studies of K-12 administrative processes but has not been used in many cases as a model for higher education administration. It could provide one paradigm which would help establish the field of higher educational administration with the other administrative fields. The Getzels-Guba model will be used to provide a conceptual framework in this study to explain the role of the college dean in the implementation of the institutional mandate to improve teaching in the college. The model has been successfully used in many studies regarding educational, industrial and military roles. The Getzels-Guba model has been used to study role expectations of departmental chairpersons \(^{10}\) and to study the role of the dean in promoting faculty development. \(^{11}\) This model has not been used, however, in research based on a comparison of the role of the dean in different types of institutions, as was done in this dissertation.


The Getzels-Guba model, shown in Figure 1, conceives administration as functioning within a social system framework. "A social system involves two classes of phenomena that are at once conceptually independent and phenomenally interactive. One class constitutes the normative (or nomothetic) dimension of behavior, the other the personal (or idiographic) dimension of behavior."\(^{12}\)

\[\text{Figure 1 - The Getzels-Guba Model}\]

According to Getzels, in order to understand the performance and relations of specific role incumbents in a specific social system, one must take into account both the role expectations and the need-dispositons of the individual.\(^{13}\)

From Figure 1, it can be seen that the Nomothetic or normative dimension consists of the institution with its roles and role expectations that are expressed in behavior which fulfills the goals of the system. In this research, "Institution" will refer to the two year or four year college.

---


\(^{13}\) Ibid., 79.
'Role' will refer to dean or department chairperson, 'Role Expectations' will refer to improving the teaching of the faculty. The Idiographic or personal dimension can be seen to refer to the individual with his/her personality and need-dispositions which are expressed in his/her observed behavior. The 'Individual' in this case will be the person in the role with a PhD or advanced degree in a subject matter or perhaps in educational administration. 'Personality' will refer to the leadership or individualism of the role incumbent and 'Need dispositions' will refer to his/her needs as a member of this collegium of professionals.

A given act is conceived as deriving simultaneously from the normative and the personal dimensions, and performance in a social system as a function of the interaction between role and personality. That is to say, a social act may be understood as resulting from the individual's attempts to cope with an environment composed of patterns of expectations for his behavior in ways consistent with his own pattern of needs and dispositions.\(^{14}\)

Role conflict occurs when the role expected of the incumbent conflicts with his/her individual style and or capabilities. Most deans and department chairs have been recruited from the professorate. They are not trained administrators. Do they experience role conflict in their new responsibility? How do they work with the faculty, who were their colleagues, to help them improve their teaching, if neither the dean nor the professor have been trained in

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 80.
teaching methods? The Getzels-Guba Model will help to understand this complex social interaction.

William Bergquist and Steven Phillips have provided a conceptual paradigm of faculty development which corresponds well with the Getzels-Guba Model for Social Behavior. This model conceives successful faculty development as aimed at three components: instructional, personal and organizational development.¹⁵ (See Figure 2.)

The Bergquist model is based on the assumption that all three levels must be considered in the effort to improve the teaching of a professor. 'Instructional' aims at the process of teaching and corresponds to Getzels 'Role' and 'Role Expectations' dimensions. 'Personal' refers to the attitudes of the person and corresponds to Getzels 'Idiographic' dimension. 'Organizational' refers to the structure of the organization. This refers to Getzels 'Institutional' aspect of the nomothetic dimension. The Bergquist model was validated through this dissertation research and provided a paradigm that helped to explain the different kinds of faculty development found in the various types of institutions. It also helped to characterize the deans' conceptions of the role of faculty development in helping improve teaching in the colleges.
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RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study is descriptive and correlational research which uses a triangulation design employing both quantitative and qualitative methods. It is important to use different data collection techniques and research strategies to study the same problem in order to place more weight in the validity of the findings.

Triangulation is a process by which the evaluator can guard against the accusation that a study's findings are simply an artifact of a single method, a single data source or a single investigator's bias.¹⁶

Triangulation of methods usually involves comparing data collected through some kind of qualitative methods with data collected through some kind of quantitative methods. In this study, the triangulation involved data generated from an extensive review of the literature, compared with quantitative data generated from a mailed questionnaire to college deans and qualitative data generated from in-depth interviews with a representative sample of those deans who returned a completed questionnaire. The findings generated by different methods do not necessarily and automatically come together to produce a nicely integrated whole. It is the role of the researcher to find patterns, linkages and explanations that

emerge from the analysis of the data and use them to answer the research questions and to indicate rival, competing or unexpected relations that can lead to further research on the subject.

For this dissertation, an extensive review of the literature was conducted first. Over one hundred books, journal articles and dissertations were reviewed on the college dean, the department chair, improving teaching in the colleges, the uniqueness of two year colleges and faculty development. The prevailing paradigms and models in these areas were identified. The review revealed that less research has been done on the role of the college dean and the department chairperson than on any other college administrator. The role of the dean in improving teaching in the colleges is always mentioned, however few specifics are given. Faculty development began in the 1970's, however it declined during the 1980's. The dean is important to the success of faculty development according to the literature, however once again few specifics are mentioned. The review of the literature generated data devoid of specifics on the dean's role in improving teaching in the colleges and encouraged the relevance of the proposed research.

Quantitative data were generated through survey research. "Quantitative methods have long been the dominant model for the study of organizations - including institutions of higher
education."\textsuperscript{17} The descriptive survey method was used in order to generate data to describe the currently existing situation regarding the role of the dean in improving teaching and in faculty development. John Best maintains that descriptive research describes "what is."

It involves the description, recording, analysis and interpretation of conditions that exist. It involves some type of comparison to contrast and attempts to discover relationships between existing non-manipulated studies.\textsuperscript{18}

This descriptive survey method used a mailed questionnaire with a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. It was sent to college deans in all two and four year accredited colleges in the State of Illinois. The sample was an area sample. An area sample is "one in which the ultimate sampling units are land areas and the reporting units...can only be identified by geographic rules associating them with land areas in the sample."\textsuperscript{19} All of the colleges in the state of Illinois are an appropriate area sample of the universe as Illinois is one of the larger states with a high number of colleges; urban and rural, large and small, public and


private. Although it will bear the unique characteristics of accredited colleges in the midwestern United States, data generated from this sample can accurately predict the characteristics of deans and their role in faculty development as would be found in most colleges in the United States.

The list of colleges was compiled from the NCA Quarterly listing all accredited institutions of higher education. A cover letter, questionnaire and self-addressed, stamped envelope for return of the questionnaire were sent to all two and four year colleges which offered undergraduate education. Institutions which only offered graduate education were excluded from the sample, as the focus of the research was the improvement of undergraduate teaching. A total of 124 questionnaires were mailed. The sample consisted of 45 two year public colleges, 10 two year private colleges, 43 four year private colleges, 13 private universities and 13 public universities. Private universities were categorized as those which use the title of university in their name and grant advanced degrees. Some of the four year private colleges also grant advanced degrees, but for the purposes of this study were included in the four year private sample. It is interesting to note that there are no public colleges, only public universities. The envelope was directed to the

---

academic dean in the two and four year colleges, it was directed to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and sciences in the universities in the sample.

In order to ensure a higher rate of return, research findings regarding survey research were employed: first class mail was used, a self-addressed envelope stamped with a brightly colored stamp was enclosed and the cover letter identified the academic title of the researcher and was personally signed for each.\textsuperscript{21} The respondent was not asked to identify himself in order to ensure a higher participation rate; however each questionnaire was coded as suggested by Dillman\textsuperscript{22}, in order for the researcher to know who had responded and to be able to randomly select and contact respondents for follow-up interviews.

The questionnaire was designed by the researcher but it was a reproduction of parts of John Gould's questionnaire to deans found in \textit{The Academic Deanship}\textsuperscript{23} and William Bergquist's "Faculty Development Practices" questionnaire found in

\begin{quote}

\textsuperscript{22} Donald Dillman, \textit{Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method} (New York: John Wiley Co., 1985)

\end{quote}
Handbook of Faculty Development, Vol. 1. A pilot study was made by administering the questionnaire at the spring convention of the American Association of Higher Education. The results of the pilot study indicated that the hypotheses under study were important and valid and that the questionnaire would obtain the necessary data for the study. Modifications were made to the questionnaire based on the pilot study findings. The instrument was then field tested with a panel consisting of two professors of higher education, the three committee members and two deans not involved in the study in order to determine concerns regarding internal consistency of items, content validity and potential problems of administration. Changes and revisions were made based on the panel's recommendations.

Since the questionnaire was patterned after two other questionnaires already used in research, the instrument had a higher validity and reliability than other researcher constructed instruments. Validity indicates "the degree to which the test is capable of achieving certain aims," i.e. the ability to measure what we think we are measuring.


content validity "is demonstrated by showing how well the contents of the test sample the subject matter about which the conclusions are to be drawn."\textsuperscript{26} The content of the questionnaire from Gould's study measures, as he did, the role of the college dean in duties regarding working with the faculty in comparison to the department chairperson's duties. It also includes items regarding the dean's professional preparation for this position. The references to supervisory activities which the dean could employ in improving teaching are found in the reform reports and in the literature on supervision. The section of the questionnaire on faculty development is from Bergquist's questionnaire and is also found in the literature on faculty development. Thus the questionnaire does validly measure the role of the dean in faculty development activities, as it proposes to measure. Reliability "means the consistency between measurements in a series".\textsuperscript{27} It refers to the accuracy of the measuring instrument to consistently yield a dependable and stable result each time it is administered. Parts of this questionnaire have been administered before and have yielded dependable results. Therefore, this instrument has reliability.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 121.

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 123.
The results of the questionnaires were analyzed using the descriptive statistics of frequency, mean, and range in order to answer the research questions: Who has primary responsibility for working with college faculty to improve teaching: the dean or the department chair? What are the instructional leadership activities engaged in by deans and department heads to improve the teaching ability of college faculty? What kinds of faculty development activities are sponsored by two year and four year colleges?

The Chi square statistic was calculated for all variables to see if there was a relationship between the variable and the type or size of the college. The non-parametric correlational statistic, the Contingency Coefficient, was then calculated to see if there was any correlation between the kind of college and the role of the dean or department head. This provided data to test the significance of the third hypothesis as to whether there is a difference between the supervisory activities of college deans/department heads in two versus four year colleges.

In order to validate the results found quantitatively and in order to probe deeper into the interesting areas found by evaluating the questionnaire results, qualitative research methods were employed. Qualitative methods allow the evaluator to study selected issues in depth and detail. The quantitative method described 'what' is happening with breadth in colleges today regarding the improvement of teaching. The
qualitative method allowed the researcher to probe into the 'why' of what was happening.

Thomas Greenfield in a searching critique of inquiry in educational administration concluded that investigators using quantitatively oriented science to study educational organizations where traveling on a dead-end highway. He argued that educational organizations...are mental constructs that reflect the perceptions and interpretations of their members. Students of organizations should ...adopt interpretive modes of inquiry. 28

In depth personal interviews were the means of collecting qualitative data. A questionnaire can be considered a self-administered interview. 29 However an in-person interview allows for communication and interaction which is impossible through a questionnaire. "For it is only when the researcher and the respondent have the possibility of communicating directly with each other that the subtleties of the mutual understanding between the two parties can be harnessed. 30 Intensive interviewing is a discovery technique. "Its object is to find out what kinds of things are happening rather than to determine the frequency of predetermined kinds

---


of things which the researcher already believes can happen."\(^{31}\) The purpose of the qualitative interview in this research was to converse with the college dean in order to see how he/she viewed their role of working with the faculty to improve their teaching and to probe and assess whether they experienced any role conflicts. The dean was given the opportunity to speak freely on how he/she works with the faculty. The researcher listened for different methods, perhaps not listed in the questionnaire. Finally, the dean was asked to indicate the one improvement that he/she really thought would help the institution.

The interviews were conducted with a systematic sample of the questionnaire respondents. "Purposeful sampling is used as a strategy when one wants to learn something about certain select cases without needing to generalize to all such cases."\(^{32}\) Questionnaires were selected from each of the different constituencies (2 year private, 2 year public, 4 year private, liberal arts; 4 year private university and 4 year public university) and these deans were interviewed and taped. The deans were selected in order to represent a cross section sample and in order to represent critical cases, that is cases which where dramatically different from the general group. The researcher selected two colleges from each

\(^{31}\) Ibid., 151.

\(^{32}\) Patton (1980) op cit., 100.
constituency: one respondent had indicated on the questionnaire that the institution had a formalized faculty development program in place, the other had indicated that there was no formalized faculty development program.

An open ended list of ten questions was prepared by the researcher based on the results of the questionnaire. The questions were studied by the same panel that studied the questionnaire questions and modifications to the questions were made as indicated by the panel. In depth interviews were be conducted. The interviews lasted approximately one hour. The primary data of in-depth, open-ended interviews are quotations of what people say, what they thing, how they feel, what they have done and what they know. The answers to these questions were analyzed by identifying common typologies and then calculating frequencies for these typologies. The goal of the researcher using qualitative methods is to strive to understand phenomena and situations as a whole. "This holistic approach assumes that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts; it also assumes that a description and understanding of a program's context is essential for understanding the program."33

The findings of the interviews were then compared to the data found through analysis of the questionnaire results and

33 Patton, 268.
through the review of the literature, in order to verify and validate the results of this research study.

There are three major research questions to be investigated. Each major research question also has minor questions to also be answered. These questions are the following:

1. Who at the college level has the primary responsibility for instructional leadership activities, i.e. working with the faculty to help them to enhance and/or improve their teaching; is it the college dean or the department chairperson? Does the type, size or kind of college make a difference to this role delineation?
   a. How does the dean or department chair prepare themselves for this instructional leadership position? Do they experience role conflict?
   b. Have the higher education reform documents asking for the improvement of college teaching been implemented in any way in the past five years by college deans or department chairs?
   c. Is the movement to improve teaching more evident in the two year or four year colleges?

2. What, if any, instructional leadership activities are engaged in by college deans and/or department chairs in order to improve the teaching ability of their faculty?
a. What is the most commonly used and most effective supervisory techniques at the higher education level? Are they similar to any K-12 supervisory techniques?

b. Is there a difference in supervisory techniques in different types and sizes of institutions?

c. What can/does a college dean do if he has a tenured faculty member who is teaching poorly?

3. Is there any difference between the kinds of faculty development sponsored by an institution and the type and size of the institution?

a. Is the Bergquist model of faculty development the accepted paradigm?

b. Who is responsible for faculty development: the dean, the faculty or the institution?

c. Do faculty participate in faculty development activities? How are they encouraged to do so?
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A thorough review of the literature was conducted. Over one hundred books, journal articles and dissertations were examined. A substantial amount of pertinent data was provided. In order to organize this data, the review of the literature is divided into four components: the administration of higher education as a field of study, the role of the dean and of the department chairperson in improving teaching in the colleges, the uniqueness of two year colleges and the history and development of faculty development with particular note of the role of the administrator in the success of these programs.

The data generated from the review of the literature are one component of the triangulation of data that will be used to answer the research questions.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS FIELD OF STUDY

Educational administration began as a career field in 1875, when William Harold Payne, Superintendent of Schools in Adrian, Michigan wrote the first book on educational
administration.¹ In 1905, Teachers College of Columbia University awarded the first eight doctorates in educational administration.² It was a defined field of study with its own literature and research by 1947. That year the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) was founded; as was the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) which began at five universities. Educational administration usually refers to the administration and supervision of elementary and high schools. Higher education administration became an organizational reality with the founding of Harvard University in 1636 and the appointment of its first president. However there is a mixed support in the literature for the inclusion of higher education administration with K-12 administration. Daniel Griffiths wonders if the word administration should even be applied to colleges and universities.

There is a serious questions as to whether the term "management" or even "administration" should be used when discussing the academic aspects of universities...In most universities virtually all the vital processes are under faculty control: the curriculum, faculty selection, promotion, appointments to tenure...³

² Ibid., 8.
J. Victor Baldridge states that colleges and universities are like other organizations in that they have goals, hierarchical systems and structures, and officials who carry out specified duties. However, goal ambiguity, complicated client services, problematic technology and professionalism are some of the characteristics that distinguish higher education academic organizations from other organizations. Nevertheless, Baldridge does find that the traditional models of governance found in the literature can be used to describe different colleges' modes of organization and decision making. These three models are Max Weber's bureaucracy, John Millett's collegium or community of scholars and Victor Baldridge's political system. Perhaps the fact that there are three models of governance for higher education helps to explain the uniqueness of college administration. Each college is different and no one model adequately explains the varying types of organization found on different types and sizes of college campuses.

Allan Tucker and Robert Bryan also state that university administration is unique in their recent book *The Academic Dean*, the latest work on the dean.

Colleges and universities are very unlike standard corporations or businesses and we believe that principles of management cannot be applied to

---

They agree that is a need to help the Academic dean be a better administrator, however they find that it is an elusive task. "We hold that a dean is a leader and a manager who uses science in the performance of an art, an art that finally defies precise analysis." 6

The opposite view is expressed by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). They have broadened their mission statement to encompass higher education as well as K-12 systems. 7 Although some question whether higher education administration shares enough characteristics with K-12 schools to be included by the UCEA, others say that administration, whether of a large corporations, hospitals or universities is the same. William Dill studied 425 publications about administrative behavior in higher education and concluded that the use of time, types of skills and networks of people with which the higher education


6 Ibid., 3.

administrator works are similar to those found for public school administrators and business managers.  

This understanding of administration is supported by other recent research studies. "Contemporary researchers have found that the administrators of effective schools and successful companies perform certain common functions." The purpose of this study by Catherine Morsink was to determine which functions higher education administrators have in common with educational administrators in school districts and managers of excellent companies. She then sought to identify those conceptual variables from which differences in the critical functions of higher education administrators (deans and department chairpersons) might be inferred. Table 1 summarizes her findings regarding the critical functions of administrators which can be inferred from the research on excellent companies, effective schools, successful school/college/department of education deans and from the research on higher education department chairpersons. It can be seen from this table that the common functions of

a) communicating goals/missions

b) involving people on a "team"

---


c) supporting staff efforts and
d) encouraging innovations
were common across the across excellent companies, public
school administration and successful dean studies. If one
equates 'Encourage professional development' found in
successful department chairpersons with 'Encourage
innovation,' these four functions are common to all
administrative settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Critical Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Companies</td>
<td>Peters &amp; Waterman, 1982</td>
<td>Communicate goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peters &amp; Austin, 1985</td>
<td>Encourages innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involve people on team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reward high performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listen to &quot;clients&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Schools</td>
<td>DeBeVoise, 1984</td>
<td>Communicate goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rutherford, 1985</td>
<td>Encourage achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson &amp; Snyder, 1985</td>
<td>Support staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purkey &amp; Smith, 1982</td>
<td>Encourage innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norton; 1978, 1980</td>
<td>Involve people on team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respond to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>Tucker, 1984</td>
<td>Develop goals/policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foster good teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit/select staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage prof.dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Deans</td>
<td>Grosnick &amp; Reynolds, 1978</td>
<td>Communicate goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivage, Bryson &amp; Okun, 1982</td>
<td>Support staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involve people on team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate findings to profession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These four functions are of particular interest to this study in answering the research question: What are college deans doing to encourage and foster good teaching in colleges? If the view that there is similarity between higher educational administration and K-12 administration is supported, the role of the college dean can be compared with the supervisory role of the school principal and also that of the industry training director to see if a common model emerges that can be used to improve teaching at all sites.

Thirty seven college presidents meeting in Spring Hill in Fall, 1987, to plan how they were going to work together to reform education agreed that the problems of elementary and higher education were deeply intertwined. They called for a partnership between elementary school, high school and higher education. On what did they think this partnership should be based?

The deepest most enduring ones (partnerships) will be those that recognize that we are all engaged in a common profession - the profession of teaching. Teaching is the first business of our universities, just as it is the first business of the primary and secondary schools across the countries. Recognition of that deep community of profession should therefore underlie all our efforts.\(^\text{10}\)

THE ROLE OF THE COLLEGE DEAN

A study of the origin of the word "dean" gives further support for the theory stated in Chapter I that there is more similarity between the administration of institutions than there are differences related to their being different types of institutions i.e. companies, colleges, schools. David E. Ugwu explains the derivation and history of the development of the word.

"The word "dean" has its roots in the Latin "decannus" which means ten. About 386 AD it was used by the Romans to denote a military grade in the army having to do with the number ten. Presumably, this military dean had command over ten men, ten officers, ten companies, etc. The term "dean" is used by the Visigoths and Lombards, the title was applied ...to a subordinate judge who had jurisdiction over a district called "decania" or a deanery... In the medieval times, a "decanus" was appointed over ten monks in the monasteries....The title of dean was used at various times in the administration of the medieval universities created in the eleventh century. Each faculty was headed by a dean...The title of dean appeared in early modern universities in Europe...The title dean is also used to designate the oldest member by virtue of service in a group of equal rank."\(^{11}\)

The term "dean" thus means one in a supervisory function. It is commonly used today to designate one in a supervisory function within a college or university. John Wesley Gould

tells us that the first college dean was appointed in the United States in 1870 at Harvard as an assistant to the president.  

William Dill in "The Deanship: An Unstable Craft" states that Harvard's then President Charles Elliott detailed the functions of the dean.

(\textit{the dean is}) an extension of the president, to preside at faculty meetings in his absence, to administer discipline to the College, to handle all petitions from undergraduates to the faculty...In later statements, Elliott put more stress on academic leadership than on student counseling or record keeping.  

"The need of such an officer bore fruit, first at Amherst in 1880; at Yale in 1884...; at the University of Chicago in 1892...; and at Columbia College in 1896..."  

In 1890, the deanship at Harvard "was divided into two offices...this involved essentially a division of labor between the academic dean and a dean of student affairs. Everywhere two types of deans made their appearance..."


"By 1913, the office was already quite universal."\(^{16}\)

In different colleges, depending on the size, structure and control, the office has different names. As used in this dissertation, the term dean is used to designate the chief academic officer. Titles that would be the same office include academic dean, dean of the faculty, vice-president for academic affairs \(^{17}\), dean of instruction or Provost. \(^{18}\) In two year colleges, this person is usually called the academic dean. In technical colleges, this office is fulfilled by the director.

It is important to note that larger colleges have an organizational structure with different levels and types of deanships. It will be important to this dissertation research, as it was for Tucker and Bryan, to get to the first level, the dean directly involved with the faculty.

Not all deans in colleges or universities have the same types of responsibilities. Some have institution wide functions such as the coordination of faculty affairs, student affairs, graduate studies, undergraduate studies, ... These individuals are usually considered part of the institution's central administration. Deans of this type generally have no jurisdiction over faculty members. This study is concerned with deans who have jurisdiction over academic departments and


\(^{17}\) Gould, 8.

programs. That includes faculty members, budgets and curriculum.  

A. J. Dibden in *The Academic Deanship in American Colleges & Universities* states that the earliest serious attempts to determine the functions of the dean was done by Reeves & Russell in 1929 & 1932. Their first study surveyed 16 colleges and the second study included 35 colleges. From these studies a list of 13 functions performed by the dean was compiled. During the time period of their studies, these functions included academic affairs and student affairs. Of particular interest to this study are the following functions:

- to direct the educational activities of the college
- to direct the attention of the faculty to changing educational thought and practice.
- to supervise curriculums, courses and methods of instruction  

John Gould in *The Academic Deanship* cites other early research on the role of the dean which includes Clyde Milner's 1936 study of 100 small colleges with annual enrollments of between 200 and 600 students. Out of a total of sixty functions listed, thirteen were marked as their chief responsibilities. The findings include:

- to supervise the college curriculum
- to help estimate the teaching ability of faculty members
- to improve instruction

Ruth Higgins' 1946 study as well as Earl McGrath's 1947 study

---

19 Tucker and Bryan, preface, page x.

20 Dibden, 10.
are cited. John Corson's 1960 study is then cited. In this study of ten colleges and universities, Corson calls attention to the organizational characteristics which results in the dean functioning as a mediator between administration and faculty. Corson asks a question which is key to this doctoral research: How does the dean influence educational programming and faculty development? 

John Gould's book The Academic Deanship is the result of his own research study. It is today considered to be the classic descriptive research study of the deanship. Gould's sample included correspondence with 100 college deans which yielded a list of 163 deans. The 12 most frequently named academic deans were interviewed and then a questionnaire was prepared from the interview information. The questionnaire was mailed to systematic sample of 268 academic deans in all 50 states. One hundred sixty six or two thirds responded. The research questions Gould sought to answer included the following:

What is the leadership function of the academic dean?  
How does the dean describe his leadership function?  
What helps and what hinders a dean in the exercise of leadership?  
What as a matter of fact are some of the characteristics of an effective dean? 

22 Ibid., 15.  
23 Ibid., 18-19.  
24 Ibid., 15.
John Gould states that the importance of his study of the academic dean's leadership functions lies in that fact that there was to date very little research available on the role of the dean. The challenge of this research lies in that no two deanships were alike in all respects.

Multivarious, it resists description, an this is one reason why - a fair number of books, dissertations and articles by and about the academic dean notwithstanding - there is little systematic knowledge of what an academic dean can do, does, or is expected to do by way of leadership.25

Daniel Griffiths and Donald McCarty state that "there is so little, theoretical, conceptual or research literature published on the deanship as to constitute an embarrassment to both the practitioners and scholars of higher education."26 Most of the 'research' on the deanship has been primarily descriptive.27 The problem is a "scarcity of conceptual analysis on leadership in higher education. There is a great deal written, but mostly anecdotal, not analytical."28 Some even criticize the research design of Gould's work. They say that Gould's data has "emerged from causal reflections by

25 Ibid., 41.
26 Griffins and McCarty, preface.
those practitioners perceived as successful...not based on empirical research but on individual judgments supported by the personal experiences and the ideological beliefs of the author." 29

In 1967, J.M. Bevan reviewed the literature on the deanship and found that "a review of the literature since 1925 dealing with the functions and responsibilities of the academic dean reveals little change in the definition over the years." 30 The real questions according to Bevan are "How does the dean combat the contemporary problems in higher education with imagination and vision?" and "What leadership techniques does he use to go about implementing his strategy?"

One of the first conceptual works of the educational leadership role of the dean was the study by Victor Hanzeli. Through a review of the work of Gould, Dodds and Kerr, Hanzeli presents the concept of a "triadic model of academic leadership: president, dean and chairman." 31 The president, as the head of the university must be the representative to the outside world. The chairman is the personification of the


faculty. The dean constitutes the middle position.

The dean is perhaps the only academic administrator left whose constituency is almost entirely within the institution. He is committed solely to the governance of an academic program. His "market" consists of the faculty quo teachers and his students quo learners."32

Another important conceptual work on the deanship was prepared by Frederick Cyphert and Nancy Lusk Zimpher in their 1976 study "The Education Deanship: Who is the Dean?" They comment in this article about the state of research on the dean.

"Both the university presidency and the university professoriate have been the object of numerous studies. However, university "middle management", the deanship, represents a void in our data base, even though its importance is increasingly recognized."33

In their research study, Cyphert and Zimpher found that the major functions and responsibilities of the deanship included:

- Organizing responsibilities - 17%
- Staff development - 16%
- Public Relations - 14%
- Program development - 13%
- Budget related activities - 9%

When asked what was the most successful and the least successful activities of the past year, 14% of the deans said it was success in staff development, but 25% stated that their least successful activities were staff development. The deans

32 Ibid., 424.

33 Frederick Cyphert and Nancy Lusk Zimpher, "The Education Deanship: Who is the Dean?", The Dilemma of the Deanship, op cit., 108.
expressed a clear desire for further training, however the training they desire does not seem to be available. According to Cyphert and Zimpher, "any training program for education deans must be based on a body of knowledge about the role responsibilities of deans as well as an understanding of the persons who execute these role responsibilities." 34 To date, this body of systematic and conceptual knowledge has not been compiled. Perhaps the body of knowledge about the role of the school principal could help construct a model of the dean's administrative and supervisory roles. The recent book The Academic Dean 35 can be considered an important beginning in this area. The book is based on the combined sixty years of experience in academic administration of the two authors of the book, Allan Tucker and Robert A. Bryan. It is written as the first textbook on the role of the academic dean. It could be used in a professional in-service for new deans or as textbook in a class on higher education administration.

E. L. Dejnoska in 1978, "studied the role norms of a variety of higher education groups ...he investigated more specifically the intra- and inter-group role norm expectancies for the deanship."36 Dejnoska discovered that "faculty and departmental chairpersons view the dean as primarily an

34 Ibid., 92.
35 Op cit. footnote #9
36 Lasley and Haberman, 13.
advocate or cheerleader for his or her college rather than as a bureaucratic supervisor."  

William Dill's 1980 study focused on the implicit conflicts of the deans' role as middle manager who had to resolve inherently complex problems of higher educational administration. Dill concludes that the dean's role has moved from an extension of the presidency to a "precarious middle management position." "The deanship then, is a leadership role with much heavier political and social than hierarchial and technical overtones."  

According to David Kapel and Edward Dejnozka there is a renewed interest today in researching the role of the dean. The deanship in higher education, as a subject, has experienced heightened interest among students of educational administration. Such factors as financial exigency, declining enrollments... and quest for improved academic quality have generated increased curiosity about this leadership position. Adding to this interest is the realization that the deanship is operationally unique in at least two respects: first, those appointed to this position have rarely been trained for it and second, the collegial (consensus) model prevailing in most institutions of higher education frequently precludes the exercise of middle management administration along traditional superior-subordinate lines."  

37 McCarty and Reyes, 2.  
39 Ibid., 267.  
The review of the literature available to date on the role of the dean highlights the importance of this dissertation research. This study can be seen as contributing to the conceptual knowledge of the dean in the role as educational leader who seeks to improve teaching instruction through faculty development.

THE ROLE OF THE DEAN IN IMPROVING TEACHING IN THE COLLEGES

A review of the literature in this area reveals conflicting views on the dean's role, real or ideal, in the improvement of the teaching of the faculty. According to Hanzelli, the dean is the ideal person to assume educational leadership in the college.

His office is situated in the heart of the academic microcosm. If his role is properly understood by all, including himself, he is in a better position than anyone else to assume its vitality. Moreover, his actual or potential contributions to the life of his college or university are such that they directly concern the major problems confronting American higher education today. 41

Some of these conflicting views regarding the role of the dean in the development of the faculty, result from the fact that, as stated before, the dean's role is different in different size institutions. John Gould stated that

The difference between a dean's responsibilities in one institution and those of a dean in another is

41 Hanzelli, 421.
related more directly to institutional size than to type of control or to the fact that the college is or is not university related...It does appear to make a difference whether the institution is small or large, endowed or state.\textsuperscript{42}

In the words of one of the deans Gould interviewed, "Being dean in a small college is not at all like being dean in a university and not very much like being dean of another small college." \textsuperscript{43}

John Corson stated that "The influence and status of the dean tends to grow as the institution grows larger."\textsuperscript{44} Kenneth Eble found the opposite to be true in his report on the Project to Improve College Teaching sponsored from 1969-71 by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. As the institute grew larger, more and more administrative layers were established.

My observation of individual colleges and universities lead me to conclude that the academic vice-president in a larger institution, or the dean of a college in smaller ones, is most likely to lead in establishing campus wide faculty development programs.\textsuperscript{45}

The differing views on what the dean can and should do to improve instruction also relate to the dean's unique

\textsuperscript{42} Gould, 24.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 51.


\textsuperscript{45} Kenneth Eble, \textit{Professors as Teacher} (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972), 123.
position on the organizational chart. As the history of the office of the dean revealed, the dean was originally the chief assistant to the president. As Lewis B. Mayhew explains:

The dean has come to occupy both a line and staff relationship, as advisor to the president on academic matters and on faculty matters he is a staff officer...However since presidents are absent a great deal...The dean has been granted some line authority.He stands between the presidents and the heads of departments or divisions. 46

"The dean has a formal role in the administrative structure and another role (often advisory) in the academic organization." 47 "The chief academic officer is expected to be the principle educational leader on the campus and the head of the faculty." 48 In many schools, the dean "is a tenured faculty member appointed through a faculty controlled search and screen process. The governing factor is that the dean should be in and of the faculty, not above or beyond it." 49

Van Cleve Morris found that the dean's level in the organization chart provides a unique vantage point from which to view the entire organization.

It (the dean's position) is the only line position that enjoys routine contact with the full spectrum of organizational elements - students, faculty, department heads, fellow deans, vice-presidents and

46 Lewis B. Mayhew, "Shared Responsibilities of the President and the Dean," in The Academic Deanship in America, op cit., 95.

47 Doris Ryan, "Deans as Individuals in Organizations," in The Dilemma of the Deanship, 141.

48 Louise Allen, 9.

49 McCarty and Reyes, 4.
presidents, not to mention staff persons at all levels. A line dean still holds a faculty position whereas administrators at higher levels make a final commitment to career administration.... Finally, the deanship is the seat of personnel administration, the heart of any organization. More than any other office, lower or higher, the dean is the person responsible for the calibre of the academic employees. Moreover, in daily work, a dean deals primarily with people, not with paper. He or she is the highest officer in the hierarchy expected to have regular operational contact with the faculty, the deliverer of the university's service.... at the center of the university's raison d'etre i.e. teaching and research. No higher officer enjoys this close proximity to the primary action of an academic institution.

As advisor to the president and to the faculty, the deanship is a staff office: however, in the absence of the president, he represents the president to the heads of department and divisions in a line relations. This dual relationship helps to clarify the main role conflict which the dean experiences. "If he provides leadership, he is going to get resistance; if he doesn't provide leadership, then people will wish he did." 

Harold Enarson's chapter "The Academic Vice-President or Dean," in The Academic Deanship in American Colleges and Universities states that "the dean is more than an administrator. He provides leadership, leadership among

51 Lewis Mayhew "Shared Responsibilities of the President and the Dean" in The Academic Deanship in American Colleges and Universities, 95.
52 McCarty and Reyes, 5.
equals to the faculty." 53 Those who have researched the leadership style of the dean have found that deans engage mostly in a collegial style of leadership. 54 Collegiate or shared leadership follows from the idea of the university as a community of scholars, a collegium. Enarson says that "if the dean would lead, he must persuade" for "a dean works with and through others." 55

Jerry Gaff did not agree that this conceptualization of the dean's role was true in the 70's.

Whereas at one time the dean was regarded as intellectual and educational leader of the faculty, the first among equals, the dean's role has too often become bureaucratized, routinized and trivialized in so far as meaningful work with the faculty is concerned. 56

However, Tucker and Bryan still see work with the faculty as an important aspect of their job in the 80's. They ask how and in what way the dean works with the faculty. Formally, much of the work occurs through committee work. Informally, the dean can establish direct contact with faculty members by

53 Harold Enarson, "The Academic Vice-President or Dean," in The Academic Deanship in American Colleges and Universities, 65.

54 Mayhews, 95 and McCarty and Reyes, 7.

55 Enarson, 66 & 68.

hosting informal luncheons, by occasionally visiting the faculty member's office, and by walking the corridors holding brief informal chats with faculty members.  

Mary Sherman in her doctoral dissertation explains what it means to say that the dean's role is instructional leadership.

This means leading the faculty toward what Arthur Cohen calls professionalism: a recognition that there is a discipline of instruction and a specialized body of knowledge that characterizes a profession: helping faculty to know that our job is to effect predictable learning, working with faculty to communicate precise objectives, to select procedures and methods which assist the learner and to assess the predicted consequences of learning activities.

Some question how the dean can be an instructional leader if he is not trained for the job of the dean. In fact, the dean has probably come from a position as a professor. It is as enigma of higher education that professors are not trained in instructional techniques. This lack of professional preparation and/or competence can be a source of role conflict between the institutional demands for the position and the personal abilities of the incumbent.

The Getzels-Guba model provides a framework for understanding the role conflict which many deans experience. In the words of Enarson, "the academic dean is not trained n

57 Tucker, 82.

58 Mary Sherman. "The Role of the Academic Dean in the City Colleges of Chicago: A Comparative Study" Ph.D. diss., Loyola University, 1984, 42.
any sense for the job... We can be sure of one thing: the gap between what he has done and what he is now expected to do is a big one." The institutional expectations for the role of dean are set, yet the person of the dean usually brings an academic background to the administrative position.

Facilitating quality teaching is one of the most important functions of university administration... (Yet) most senior administrators are not trained in disciplines that provide them with conceptual tools for analyzing organizations and how people—including themselves— are affected by them. They therefore base their actions on personal experience and instinct. In the past, this was enough, or so it seemed... Universities are undergoing major changes now in the 80's as in the 60's and successful past experiences are not the best indicators of future success as decisions must be made that are different from the past.

Mary Sherman also notes this same idea: the dean is expected to fulfill the role of educational leadership and yet with no specialized training. Most deans were once faculty members. Most college faculty have no formal training in teaching. Therefore, the dean is asked to help others to be better teachers even though he himself has no formal training as a teacher, nor as a dean.

These accounts of the deanship give some insights into the reasons that deans are widely regarded as amateurs in educational circles. In this case amateur means lacking in specialized training. Most deans have not received specialized training to prepare them to be an educational executive.

59 Enarson, 69.
60 Alan Guskin, 89.
61 Sherman, 19.
In Gould's classic text, he mentions the then new and controversial idea that individuals could be deliberately prepared for administration at the college level. However, most of the deans Gould surveyed found the idea an anathema, because they believed that the dean should come from the teaching ranks with first hand experience. When the deans were asked what they think of the importance of certain experiences as preparation for the academic deanship, 57% found formal training in administration (courses) unnecessary, 36% found it desirable, only 4% found it essential. However 40% found individual reading of the literature on college and university administration essential and 50% found it desirable...unfortunately, they did not know how little literature was available at this time.\textsuperscript{62} In this dissertation research, the same question will be asked of the deans sampled to see if this idea has gained acceptance in the past 30 years.

The ACE Fellows Program is one way in which deans and other college administrators can prepare themselves professionally for the demands of their new position. The ACE Fellows Program was begun in 1965 to identify and prepare leaders for colleges and universities in a time of great

\textsuperscript{62} Gould, 85.
expansion of higher education. In the twenty years of the program, a total of 747 fellows have participated in the program. Twenty six percent of these fellows are currently in positions as deans or assistant deans. This program is one way in which a person can be helped to meet the challenges of as an instructional leader of the college.

What specifically does the dean do in his role as instructional leader? How does the dean help improve the teaching ability of the college faculty?

Tucker and Byran think that no matter how large and diverse a college is, the dean should be personally involved in the recruitment of each new faculty member. They state that perhaps this is the most important single aspect of the deans's job, recruiting the best faculty the college's resources will allow.

Thomas Lasely and Haberman Martin found that "Deans appear first of all to be evaluated on their ability to attract, keep and reward high quality faculty." An emphasis on the importance of good teaching is found in their research. Their questionnaire item to university administrators "The dean makes excellence in teaching a priority," received a

---


64 Tucker and Bryan, 83.

65 Lasley and Martin, 15.
mean ranking of 4.29 with a median of 4.39 where 5.0 represented the highest ranking.

Lorman Ratner also found that the maintenance of "quality teaching and the commitment to quality in all aspects of university life" was the most important and difficult challenge in the role of the academic dean. The faculty expect the dean to be an educator according to Louis Joughin. The personal aspects he is expected to have are summarized as "Intellectual, academic and personal integrity...the hallmark of a great dean."  

Another viewpoint is presented by Louise Allen. She found that the role the Dean plays in improving teaching on campus has changed from the emphasis on hiring new and better teaching personnel to keeping current faculty alive. In this role demand, once again the dean comes up against possible role conflict. "Although this can be creative and rewarding work, it requires venturing into largely uncharted territory."  

Gerald DuPont in "The Dean and His Office" finds that the dean needs to be freed of the many time-consuming tasks. 

---


68 Louise Allen, 9.
administrative details which also contribute to role conflict. In this way he will be able "to build up the faculty, encourage the teachers, procure time and opportunities for them to develop professionally" and to do many other things, "all within the proper sphere of the dean's activities which will have rich educational consequences." 69

Mary Sherman also found time and task conflicts in her doctoral dissertation research. The Academic Dean is expected to be actively involved in the search and recommendation of new faculty, administering new teacher orientation programs as well as evaluating the performance of the faculty. In addition, the dean is also "expected to develop and nurture the professional growth of the faculty." 70

Faculty development is the term which refers to this "nurturing the professional growth of the faculty." A review of the literature regarding faculty development will be found in the last section of this chapter. At this point, the review will be limited to an examination the role of the dean in faculty development.

According to Tucker and Bryan, faculty development in most small colleges has been the responsibility of the academic dean and the president. "In many colleges, it has


70 Sherman, 16.
been the dean's office to which the faculty member applied for travel money, leave or other support."\(^{71}\)

It is the goal of the academic administrators to create an organizational environment within which faculty members can be creative teachers. In many institutions, faculty development is largely faculty run. However, the presence of the academic dean on these faculty-run faculty development committees is crucial. According to Jerry Gaff in *Institutional Renewal through the Improvement of Teaching*, the dean "provides the link between the committee and the individual and between the committee and the administration. He can judge the feasibility of providing such aids as release time and clerical assistants...less time on committees, advising, etc..."\(^{72}\)

Kenneth Eble and Wilbert McKeachie also found that the dean's leadership was important to the success of the faculty development program.

Where there is little leadership, the programs faltered. Where there was impositions of authority...programs had difficulty getting off the ground.\(^{73}\)

---

\(^{71}\) Tucker and Bryan, 4.


\(^{73}\) Kenneth Eble and Wilbert McKeachie. *Improving Undergraduate Education through Faculty Development*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1985), 211.
In *Towards Faculty Renewal*, a book written in 1975, Jerry Gaff states that although deans are in key positions to facilitate the development of the faculty members in their units, the actual role of the dean in faculty development has been reduced.

The role of the dean has been reduced from the one chiefly in charge of the faculty development program to the one who administratively supports and encourages such programs. In many institutions, the instructional improvement staff must take over the various functions concerning the promotion of effective teaching and learning.\(^74\)

Kenneth Eble agrees with Gaff that although it may be theoretically possible for the deans' office to administer the faculty development program, it was not commonly done in the programs he reviewed. He also found there were things that were more effective if done by the dean's office.

All deans' offices could probably do more for faculty development than they are currently doing. Within an institutional faculty development program, the deans' office could be responsible for shaping and staffing the development program for beginning faculty members in the college..for gathering and disseminating information about teaching,.and for setting up a review and reward system for departments based on the department effectiveness in developing and maintaining teaching excellence.\(^75\)

One of the goals of this doctoral research was to find out how involved deans are today in faculty development, five years after Eble's research in view of the reform documents

\(^74\) Gaff, 157.

\(^75\) Eble, 123.
that have come out during this time. Do deans support faculty
development as a way of helping improve the teaching in their
college?

THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRPERSON

The role of the department chairperson in his effort to
improve teaching in the colleges must also be examined. There
are three possibilities which emerge from a review of the
literature: 1.) faculty development is primarily the dean's
responsibility. 2.) faculty development is primarily the
department chairperson's responsibility. 3.) faculty
development is a joint responsibility of the dean and
chairperson working together. One of the goals of this
dissertation research was to answer this question: Is faculty
development today primarily a responsibility of the dean or
of the department chairperson? Does the size/type of the
college make a difference as to who holds the primary
responsibility?

In Gould's classic work on *The Academic Deanship*, he
describes the historical growth of the department chairperson.
Once a college grew to the size that there were several
sections of one course being taught, it was necessary to
appoint a "course supervisor" or "coordinator." The course
supervisor visited all of the sections, rated the teaching and
coordinated the instruction. The visit was not for
evaluation, but for the improvement of teaching. The "course supervisor" soon grew into the "department chairperson." Soon, it was the department chairperson, because he was so close to the faculty, that was really influencing the educational life of the institution. Gould quotes one dean who says that, "Chairmen are really the most important administrators...From one point of view, I am simply the middle man between the chairmen of departments and the chancellor of the university." Gould cites the research of Caplow and McGee in their study of the relationship of the dean to the department chairperson. This study is of interest because it used the same research design as this dissertation: questionnaire followed up with personal interviews. Caplow and McGee make an important distinction between the dean's power over individuals and his power over departments. They found that the dean has power over individuals via the budget; however his organizational power over departments and their policies is often limited and ambiguous. Part of this is because the dean has delegated some of his power to the department chairperson. His control over departments comes to depend on his personal power over the chairperson. Power struggles

76 Gould, 71.

77 Ibid., 62.
between deans and departments seem to occur at times in all universities.\textsuperscript{78}

One can conclude therefore, that the dean who wants to improve teaching in the colleges can encourage departments to consider, not necessarily adopt, new teaching techniques or procedures. Gould suggests that the dean get to know his department chairperson well, for it will be an important determiner of the academic dean's leadership opportunities.\textsuperscript{79}

Of interest to this study is Gould's finding of the different relationship of dean to department chairperson in larger or smaller colleges.

Academic deans of small colleges considered their relationships with all three (president, department chairmen and informal faculty leaders) to be just about equally important. Academic deans of large colleges regard their relationships with department chairmen to be about twice as important as their relations with each of the other two choices.\textsuperscript{80}

Kenneth Eble, in his visits to over 30 different college campuses in 1970, found that major responsibility for assisting the beginning college teacher, lie with the department or division chairmen. The excellence of the chairmen was in large part their ability to work with the faculty. The chairperson could influence the development of


\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., 67.

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., 67-69.
the teaching ability of the new faculty by encouraging them to take pride in their teaching and to work at developing their skills.  

Eble agrees that both deans and chairs are charged with the responsibility for seeing that teaching is well done. However, he found that "the department is the most efficient unit for influencing teaching practices...Department chairmen are in a position to work directly and effectively with the faculty."  

Allan Tucker's book Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership Among Peers is a more recent study of the department chairperson's responsibilities. Tucker suggests the relationship between dean and department chair can best be understood through a delineation of power and authority. According to Tucker, "Authority may be defined as the power granted officially from a higher level to command resources or to enforce policies and regulations." The board delegates authority and responsibility to the president, the president to the vice-presidents and deans, and the dean to the chairpersons. Therefore, whatever official authority the

---

81 Eble, Professors as Teachers (1972), 115.
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chairpersons have been delegated to them by their deans. Nevertheless, the dean can delegate no more authority than he or she has been delegated. "Persons in authority generally have power, which can be defined as the ability to change or influence behavior. Power is acquired by having access to or actually possessing certain resources that others desire." The department chairperson has what is called power of position, but a successful chairperson also needs to have personal power. Personal power derives from the peers' respect for the abilities of the chair as a professional and an individual. Since the chairperson is closer to the faculty, often times he possesses more personal power than the dean, and can actually influence the faculty toward teaching improvement efforts more than the dean can.

Tucker found that in a survey asking both two and four year college chairs to rank their most important responsibilities, 50% of the 10 most important responsibilities had to do with improving teaching and faculty development. "The case can be made that the department chairperson's most important function is to foster the growth and development of faculty and staff members within the department." This finding has been corroborated in other studies on the role of the department chairperson. "Promoting

---
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good teaching, stimulating faculty research productivity and recruiting promising faculty" were considered to be the most important.\(^8^6\) However, the average chairperson devotes only 7% of his time to faculty development, although he wants to spend much more time on it.

A study of the role of the department chairperson reveals that the ultimate responsibility for faculty development cannot realistically lie with the chair. Department chairpersons are drawn from the faculty ranks. Tucker reports on a 1977 survey he conducted with 400 department chairperson in the State University System of Florida. In some colleges (15%), the department chair position is a duty which is rotated every three years among the faculty. In others (41%), the chairperson is elected by their colleagues, usually for a term of six years. In other colleges (44%), the chair is appointed by the dean with faculty consultation. The turnover rate is 15-20% per year.\(^8^7\) The department chairperson faces an astonishing variety of tasks and duties, which he fulfills for his term. In addition, he is usually a teaching administrator. Most chairs gladly return at the end of their term to their former teaching and research duties.


\(^8^7\) Tucker, 1.
Department chairperson thus have had, at best, very little administrative experience. In Tucker's survey mentioned above, he found that 86% of these department chairs had no prior administrative experience. It seems that college administrators are no more prepared to lead and manage, than professors are to teach. "It stands to reason that if college administrators are to become as knowledgeable and skillful as they need to be to improve teaching and learning, in-service development is necessary. Yet there are few such programs around."

In their book on the academic dean, Allan Tucker and Robert Bryan compare and contrast the role of the dean and the role of the department chairperson, explaining how they interrelate. "Although the dean is the chief spokesperson for the college, the department chair is the main link for his or her department and is the main link of communication between the faculty and the dean."

The department chairperson is responsible to the dean for the quality of teaching in his/her department and with the help of the dean, must promote good teaching, through various incentives. Chairpersons are at least initially involved in the recruitment of new faculty members. Although the dean has the final approval of all new faculty, the chairperson's recommendation is almost always

88 Tucker, 16.

89 Tucker and Bryan, 28.
the deciding factor. The chairperson has to foster the development of each faculty member's special talents and interests, and can do this when the dean approves the necessary individual budgetary requests for conferences, sabbatical, etc. The dean and the department chairperson need to work together.

Donald McCarty and Pedro Reyes corroborate this finding in their recent research of deans of schools of education. They agree that the chairperson holds the classic "person-in-the-middle role." "Their academic future is tied firmly to the department, but their ability to represent the department effectively in budgetary and personnel matters is directly related to the quality of their working relationship with the dean."\(^{90}\)

In a very large measure, department chairpersons are critical to the success or failure of the dean's mission, a mission we take to be the constant improvement of the teaching, research and service activities of the college. It is not possible for deans alone to establish program priorities, implement them, upgrade the faculty, strengthen the curriculum and increase and improve scholarly activity. They need the willing support of the college department chairpersons.\(^{91}\)

The role of the dean in faculty development is examined in a later section of this chapter. Faculty development is one more area in which the dean and the department chairperson

---
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must work together. Faculty development may arise from the dean's office or from the faculty themselves. However, if it arises from the dean's office, it will only succeed with faculty support; and if it arises from faculty initiatives, it will only find permanence with the dean's budgetary support. It is the role of the department chairperson, "the man in the middle", to see that this connection is made. Furthermore, faculty development will only work if faculty participate. Once again, it is the department chairperson that is close enough to the faculty to encourage and promote this participation.

TEACHING IN THE TWO YEAR COLLEGES

Public junior colleges first appeared in the early 1900's and grew slowly until the 1920's when they experienced a period of rapid growth. Their rate of growth accelerated again during the period following World War II and once again in the 1960's. Today there are over 1200 community, junior and technical colleges in the Unites States.\(^2\) One out of

\(^2\) Tucker, 29.
every three undergraduate students in this country is enrolled in a community college.  

The community college is primarily a teaching institution, as opposed to research. Therefore the quality of its programs depends solely on its staff. Because of this emphasis on teaching, community college instructors spend one and a half to two times as many hours in the classroom as their contemporaries in four year institutions. In a recent survey of 5000 faculty members around the country by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, they found that four-year college faculty allocate a majority of their time (58%) to course preparations, instruction and research. However, faculty employed at two year colleges, devote 90% of their time to activities that directly serve the student, i.e. office hours, academic advising, course preparation and instruction.

---
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In a recent survey of 2,433 department chairpersons, conducted by the U.S. Education Department, it was found that three fourths of academic department heads consider teaching quality a key factor when hiring new faculty. When controlling by type of college, however, they found that only forty five percent of the university department chairs found teaching "very important" in the hiring decision. Universities consider "a candidate's highest degree level, the quality of his or her research and the program needs of the institution" in that order, in the hiring decision. Two year colleges consider teaching quality a key factor in 99% of the reporting schools.

The same survey revealed that currently there are 825,000 college faculty members, 60% are employed full-time and 40% are employed part-time or as temporary faculty. At two year public colleges, part-time faculty make up a majority of the faculty, 59%.

Unlike 4 year colleges and universities which reward scholarly research, two year colleges generally expect their staffs to devote themselves to the singular task of teaching. One of the biggest difference between community based
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colleges and other higher education institutions is the role of the faculty.\(^{98}\)

Thus community/junior colleges seek not communities of scholars, but rather communities of learners. Approximately two thirds of community/junior college faculty members hold master's degrees and approximately ten percent hold doctoral degrees.\(^{99}\)

In order to be employed at a two year college, an instructor must have 6 years of higher education or 6 years of equivalent vocational experience.\(^{100}\)

There are certain aspects of the community college operation which virtually mandate faculty development. For example, the employment of technical specialists from commerce, industry and the professions for the vocational programs forces the issue of "training the trainer." Although these technical specialists are really no different from their four year college Ph.D. counterpart i.e. both are subject specialists, not teaching specialists; the two year college more openly acknowledges their responsibility to provide faculty development for their instructors.

---


In addition, faculty in community colleges face students who, on the whole, are less well-prepared than students in other segments of higher education. Teaching a student who has suffered previous educational and social deprivation, "demands teaching skill of a high order."\(^{101}\) These skill involve knowing how to teach students for whom middle class standard English may not be the primary oral language, who are uncomfortable with written language and who are perceived as lacking basic skills in reading and writing.\(^{102}\) The community college is nevertheless the avenue through which these students can better themselves. Many of them are first generation college students, perhaps with parents who never even finished high school. "According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, community colleges enroll 43 percent of all black undergraduates, 55 percent of all Hispanics, and 57 percent of all American Indians."\(^{103}\) These students make up about 30\% of the total community college enrollment.

According to John Centra, two year colleges emphasize the staff development concept more than faculty development. The


\(^{102}\) Seidman, 66.

"Staff development concept assumes that administrators and other staff members - not only teachers - can improve their professional or personal functioning. Development activities are therefore encouraged for the entire staff of the college."

However, according to Chester Case, the staff development in most colleges is not necessarily a formalized program. It is an aggregation of activities, such as the fall orientation session and the venerable sabbatical leave as well as the guest speakers, workshops, seminars and incentive grants. He found that some colleges have a person or committee that does staff development work, but not within the framework of a program. If staff development is to be effective then someone must assume major responsibility for coordinating the program.

Since many two year colleges began in the public school system, they often have a history of stronger administrative control than do the four-year colleges. Terry O'Banion states that the dean and the division chairman in the

---


community college should assume the major responsibility for staff development. However, their lack of training and their devotion to other duties keep them from doing so except in the most potent of community/junior colleges. As the need for staff development has become more and more recognized as a central concern of the institution, many two year colleges have appointed a staff development officer to coordinate this in-service education of staff and faculty. 107 Charles Novak and Barbara Barnes, in a 1974 study of faculty development in Illinois and Florida, found that division chairperson or program coordinators had the primary responsibility for staff development, not an administrator. 108 David Egbo Ugwu found in his doctoral research that the academic deans in technical institutions, on the average, personally performed faculty development related functions. However, the academic dean in community colleges perceived these to be the responsibility of someone outside of academic affairs. 109 According to Burton Clark, what is most important is that someone is visibly responsible for faculty development.

The excitement today is on campuses where there are good deans who really care about faculty and see

107 O'Banion, 94.
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themselves as enablers. Those who have power are the ones who delight in giving it away, who have learned the power of empowering others. It is not the kind of institution, size of the school nor the location. It is the leadership. There are a number of institutions where creative presidents and deans, working with department chairpersons are literally revitalizing their campuses. They have reached levels of commitment from their faculty no one would have anticipated.\textsuperscript{110}

An American Association of Junior Colleges Survey revealed the opinions of 288 community college senior administrators about the needs for faculty in-service education and thus the weaknesses in faculty pre-service graduate preparation.

The faculty's greatest general need was for more preparation in 'educational curriculum and learning' including programmed instruction, testing and measurements and learning theory... Ninety five percent of the respondents declared that the in-service training which their people needed was not adequately available within their regions at least at the present time. The AAJC concluded that a serious national 'training gap' existed in the preparations and in-service development of the two year college faculty.\textsuperscript{111}

Frank Adams suggests that business and industry can present the community/junior college with a training model. Business and industry place a high priority on staff development and evaluation, spending hundreds of millions of dollars on it each year. The underlying philosophy of corporate training is the belief that no person is completely


\textsuperscript{111} O'Banion, \textit{Developing Staff Potential}, 58.
trained or educated when they are hired and that training helps a person reach their true potential. Adams has found that seeking advice from industry for curriculum development and special instructional methods has proved beneficial and appropriate for community colleges. "To draw upon business and industrial models for evaluation and development of personnel might be the most important consideration community colleges could give to cooperation between business and community college in this decade."\textsuperscript{112}

Although community college administrators see the gap between what they are doing and what needs to be done, they may nevertheless be doing much more than other institutions according to John Centra's research.

Instructional assistance practices (specialists to assist individual faculty in instructional development or in improving teaching skills or strategies and applications in instructional technology to teaching...) were found in many two year colleges, some universities, few four year colleges.\textsuperscript{113}

Cashin also found that when comparing two year to four year institutions, two year college teachers receive higher course ratings from students than four year college teachers. When comparing four year institutions, baccalaureate level

\textsuperscript{112} Frank Adams, "Evaluating, Developing and Promoting Community College Staff", in \textit{Evaluating Faculty and Staff}, 97.

\textsuperscript{113} Centra, 146.
institutions receive higher course ratings than universities or graduate level institutions.\textsuperscript{114}

One of the goals of this doctoral research was to correlate the kind of institution with the kinds of faculty development sponsored by the institution to see if the type of college is a significant variable in the faculty development paradigm and the improvement of teaching in the colleges model.

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

One of the earliest research studies on faculty development is William Frederick Kelley's 1950 review of twenty studies from 1927-1950 regarding the in-service education of college faculty. In this "meta-analysis", Kelley found that providing time for research and sabbaticals, making use of outside consultants, planning for cooperative faculty groups and using students' evaluations of instruction were the dominant forms found in 70\% or more of the studies.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{114} Cashin in *Evaluating Faculty and Staff*, 63.

\textsuperscript{115} William Frederick Kelley, "Twenty Studies of In-Service Education of College Faculty and the Procedures Most Recommended," *Educational Administration & Supervision*, 36 (1950), 351-358.
According to Robert Blackburn, contemporary faculty development had its immediate antecedents in the 1950's with sabbatical leave programs, travel money for attendance at conferences, release time, and faculty retreats.\textsuperscript{116}

John Centra reports that a 1960 survey of 214 southern colleges by Miller and Wilson found only a few one-shot faculty development programs designed to orient new faculty.\textsuperscript{117} A national survey conducted by Many, Ellis and Abrams in 1969 found that although "503 of the approximately 1000 schools in the sample reported the existence of formal in-service programs for faculty, the majority of these programs were relatively unstructured, causally implemented, rarely the responsibility of one designated person and even less frequently supported by an item in the instructional budget of the institution."\textsuperscript{118}

Prior to the 1970's, the term "faculty development was virtually unheard of. According to William Bergquist
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...up until the mid 1960's, the educational community shared a common, discipline centered paradigm of the teaching learning enterprise. Primary emphasis was placed on expertise within the discipline. Then a significant anomaly was discovered, or at least acknowledged: college and university teaching was frequently ineffective, at times incompetent.119

For some, this realization came from student unrest, for others it came through research evidence on the impact of college on students, for others this came from the realization that higher educational research was serving the interests of the military, not of the students.

Once the anomaly came to light, it precipitated the period of crisis and confusion Kuhn finds characteristic of the failure of a once firmly established paradigm. Out of this crisis has come faculty development, a potential candidate for a new paradigm.120

Then in 1974, two significant events led to the sweeping establishment of faculty development throughout the nation. Change Magazine published a position paper entitled "Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment" by the Group for Human Development in Higher Education. It was well received because many thought that it would be the answer to the unique problems of the 70's: declining enrollments, the greying of the faculty and fiscal exigency. Also in 1974, the Council


120 Bergquist, 4.
for the Advancement of Small Colleges launched a program to provide facilitators to assist more than 40 institutions in developing faculty development programs.  

Jerry Gaff defines faculty development as "enhancing the talents, expanding the interests, improving the competence and otherwise facilitating the professional and personal growth of faculty members, particularly in their roles as instructors." Allan Tucker defines faculty development as "establishing activities and procedures that assist faculty members in acquiring knowledge, skills and attitudes that enable them to become more effective in performing all functions related to professional academic life." William Bergquist combines both of these definitions in his definition of faculty development which is now considered the paradigm for understanding the total. "Essentially, it (faculty development) is primarily an attempt to improve the quality of teaching taking place in individual classrooms by focusing on the individual faculty member and the issues that confront him as a teacher, a person and a member of an organization."
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In 1976, John Centra did a national survey in order to find out what colleges were then doing in faculty development. The study also investigated the perceived effectiveness of individual practices and how development programs were funded and organized. Centra sent out a questionnaire to 2,600 accredited degree-granting institutions in the country and received responses from 1,800. About 60% (1,044) said that they had a program set up. Of the twelve institution-wide development practices, travel funds, periodic review of faculty, newsletters, and sabbatical leaves were the predominant forms found at over 67% of the institutions. This doctoral research will replicate this study in Illinois, to see which are the predominant form of faculty development currently in use.\textsuperscript{125}

The research work of William Bergquist and Steven Phillips provided the much needed conceptual paradigm of faculty development as aimed at instructional, personal and organizational development.\textsuperscript{126} The Bergquist model is based on the assumption that change must take place at three levels: a) attitude (person) b) process (teaching) and c) structure (organization). Before the Bergquist model, faculty

\textsuperscript{125} Centra, "Faculty Development in Higher Education", op cit., 190.

development primarily gave attention to the process of instruction and improving the teaching skills of the faculty member. Bergquist agrees that the primary emphasis of faculty development should be instructional development, however instructional development will not be successful unless it takes into consideration the personal needs of the faculty member and the organizational environment in which he works.\footnote{Ibid., 182.}

In order for a faculty member to participate in an instructional development program, he must personally feel a need for such participation. In addition, once he has learned new ideas and methods, he must receive support from the organization if the proposed changes are to be sustained. One of the goals of this doctoral research was to validate the Bergquist model of faculty development by measuring college deans' perceptions of the goals of faculty development.

From being unheard of before 1970, the idea of faculty development for the sake of better teaching and learning became a social force in higher education that in many ways had a life of its own.\footnote{Gaff, 175.}

"The ultimate goal of faculty development is to make the profession of college teaching more successful and more
satisfying."^{129} By definition, a faculty development program can only succeed if it obtains the support and participation of the faculty. This is the challenge, it stems from its goal of trying to improve teaching. Teaching in colleges as a field of study, or a pedagogy of higher education is a very new notion.

As stated before in the section on the role of the dean in improving teaching, most faculty have received little if any formal training as teachers. They view themselves as members of a particular discipline rather than as members of the teaching profession or of the educational community. The college teachers' teaching experience, if any, is usually acquired through being a teaching assistant while attending graduate school.^{130} An often stated criticism of college professors is that although they may be well versed in the theories and techniques of their field, they are least prepared for the specific profession they have chosen - teaching.^{131} Teaching, unlike research and publishing,
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remains very much a private professional art, rarely open to collegial scrutiny according to Joseph Katz.

The art of teaching is very different from the arts of research and the design of good lectures. Teaching encourages breadth and trying to see both how the various strands of knowledge fit together and what knowledge among all that exists is most worthy of passing on to students. Research and scholarship emphasize depth in one area of knowledge.132

In general, there is a widespread academic reluctance to regard teaching in the same way as the professions regards almost every other set of skills— as something that can be taught. "Many professors may describe teaching as so straightforward that it requires no special training and yet so complex and idiosyncratic that mere training could never meet its extraordinary demands."133

One of the goals of faculty development is this professionalization of teaching. According to Arthur Cohen, "the most profound changes to overtake the American university in the twentieth century have resulted from the professionalization of the faculty."134 This professionalization has led the faculty to specialize within their disciplines. The professionalization of teaching would bring the characteristics of a profession to college teaching: it would be considered as a body of specialized knowledge not

132 Katz and Henry, 161.
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easily available to the laymen a long period of training would be required and entry would be controlled by its ranks. Nevertheless, some still hold the opinion that anyone can teach, just because the practice of showing someone how to do something is so common. However, as J.M. Bevan states, "it is not only what is taught, but how it is taught" which is essential to student learning. Lee Shulman advocates the need to document case studies of people learning to teach. This would contribute to a now almost totally missing research literature on learning how to teach. Higher education is just beginning to admit that it is much more difficult to teach somebody something than merely to know that something.

One of the reasons learning to teach is so difficult is because, unlike the other professions where you use the disciplines as a basis for your practice, in teaching the disciplines play a dual role...All our research on learning to teach really revolves around the notion that teaching...is the central focus of everything we do in universities and colleges and it ought to be the primary concern for all of us.

The professionalization of teaching recognizes instruction as an organized discipline of knowledge, with its own theories, vocabulary, test procedures and operating methodology. The professional instructor knows that his job is to effect predictable, demonstrable learning. He knows the

135 Bevan, 348.

results he is trying to achieve, the methods he will use to achieve them and how to measure his success in achieving them. Faculty development is based on the premiss that teaching is a science that can be taught as well as an art that can be further enhanced by inter-change with fellow artists.

The organizational development aspect of Bergquist's model of faculty development is also vital if teaching is to be improved on campuses. The organization must support and reward good teaching. According to Alan Guskin, "quality teaching is directly and indirectly affected by the nature of the organizational environment in which faculty members work, that is by the quality of their professional life." The dean who rewards a new course developed or employment of innovative teaching techniques in large freshman core courses as equivalent to publishing a research article in a journal will do much to relieve the strain and stress experienced by faculty caught in balancing the dual roles of teaching and research. This may do more to encourage good teaching than anything done in a formal faculty development program. Merit pay increases are one way in which institutions can reward and encourage good teaching.
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The growth of faculty development in the past twenty years has largely been supported by funding from external sources, i.e. private foundations such as the Danforth, the Lilly, the W.K.Kellogg, the Andrew W. Mellon, the Carnegie and the Ford Foundations. The Federal government has also financed programs through the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE). These funds have been used by individual colleges to develop faculty development programs and have been used to set up instructional development centers, either institutional or regional. Some of the Centers for Research and Learning first set up at a university, have now become regional in their service. One of these centers is here in Illinois at Northwestern University. Other such centers include the Michigan State Educational Development Program, the Kansas State University Office of Educational Research and the Syracuse University Center for Instructional Development. They offer programs both for administrators and faculty members who want to gain expertise in teaching other teachers how to improve their instruction; and for faculty members to attend instructional improvement workshops at these centers.

One of the first books on Faculty Development is Kenneth Eble's *Professors as Teachers*. This book is a report of the Project to Improve College Teaching sponsored from 1969-1971

139 Eble and McKeachie, 21.
by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. It was funded by the Carnegie Corporation. Kenneth Eble visited over 30 colleges, visiting classes and speaking with professors. He found that despite innovative practices on almost every campus, the dominant mode of instruction remained the lecture or the lecture-discussion. Even the architecture of the classrooms supported this mode. Eble found that if college teaching was to be improved, faculty and administrative attitudes and institutional practices would have to change to be supportive of teaching.

Many faculty members seem to feel that teaching is not valued as it should be, either in the abstract or in the specific workings of the reward system. Within the great majority of institutions...there are conflicts...between teaching and research...which underlie the general complaint that the reward system is hostile to teaching. 140

Eble found that, in fact, 60% of the institutions supported research, but only 10% supported teaching in their reward system.

The purpose of Jerry Gaff's book Toward Faculty Renewal was to provide a comprehensive analysis of the various efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning currently on campuses in 1975. Gaff sought to describe the organization, politics, financing, staffing and impact of these programs and thus develop a model for higher educational research on

140 Eble (1972), 127.
teaching, learning and faculty development. His model identifies three types of faculty development: faculty, instructional and organizational and is very similar to the Bergquist model. Gaff suggests that instructional development centers are the most effective organizational structure. His book concludes with a listing of 200 centers for instructional development established to date.  

In 1978, Jerry Gaff summarized the effectiveness of the Project for Institutional Renewal through the Improvement of Teaching (PIRIT). Most of the institutional programs for faculty development set up through participation in this project were involved in improving teaching. The projects were for the most part run by faculty members, i.e. a faculty member relieved of some teaching duties to serve as the center administrator for 2-3 years. However each project also had administrative support. Many times it was at the administrators initiative that the institution joined PIRIT. The main challenge was to overcome the basic "assumption that knowledge of the subject is the basic ingredient in effective teaching and that it is more important than the teacher, the

\[\text{Gaff (1975), 210-225.}\]
student, the instructional procedures used and the college environment".\textsuperscript{142}

Paul Lacey reports on four years of participation in the Lilly Endowment post-doctoral teaching fellows program from 1979-1983, in the book Revitalizing Teaching through Faculty Development. The Lilly post-doctoral teaching fellows program was then 10 years old. It was seen as filling an important need, as most of the faculty teaching in colleges and universities had never been prepared for classroom instruction beyond a primitive level. He found, as did Eble, that a supportive departmental context was necessary which had several visible coherent policies on teaching. Resources should be allocated to support teaching, systematic efforts should be made to appraise the quality of teaching and there should be opportunities for frequent collegial dialogue concerning teaching.\textsuperscript{143}

In 1985, Kenneth Eble and Wilbert McKeachie reported on the 26 institutions which participated in the Bush Foundation's Faculty Development Program in 1980. They found that faculty development had substantial impact in 15 institutions and some impact in 8 others. Thirteen of the


\textsuperscript{143} Lacey, 84.
institutions (half) had faculty development programs related to improving teaching. Eble & McKeachie found that basic to the success of any faculty development program was that it was more effective if the faculty felt that the program was theirs rather than imposed on them by the administration or an outside agency; yet an effective program also required strong support from the college or university administration. What kind of support is necessary from the administration is not clear in this report. The dean is mentioned once, the president and the vice president for academic affairs are mentioned a few times. One of the goals of this doctoral research was to find out what kind of support deans can and do give to faculty development.

Eble and McKeachie also found that faculty development had to be responsive to the organizational culture of the institution, different types of institutions needed different types of faculty development. Large public universities are oriented toward specialized research, so faculty development programs which emphasize teaching as well as assisting faculty in carrying out their scholarly responsibilities will be more successful. In addition, most large universities across the country have established centers for faculty development. The majority of liberal arts colleges were found to be already

144 Kenneth Eble and Wilbert McKeachie. Improving Undergraduate Education through Faculty Development. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1985), 36.
teaching at a high quality, but they had little time to pursue scholarly work. In these cases the foundation money was used to finish scholarly work. Finally, faculty development also has to be sensitive to the career stage needs of participants. Beginning teachers have different needs from seasoned teachers, faculty development should offer something for each. This doctoral research also sought to find any other additional distinctions between the types of institution and the type of faculty development they sponsor.

Recently, Joseph Katz and Mildred Henry have proposed a new approach to faculty development in their book *Turning Professors into Teachers* (1988). Their model has faculty helping other faculty to improve their teaching through the use of colleague visitation of the classroom, interviewing of students and the administration of the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI). Mentor faculty help other instructors improve their teaching by discovering what works well with different learning styles. The authors propose that there is a need for a pedagogy for higher education. They state that "the essence of good teaching is the greatest possible individualization of the teacher's response to students." In the authors opinion, because there is an attitude among most college faculty that learning to teach takes relatively little time, faculty development programs have produced few

145 Katz and Henry, 4.
profound modifications of teaching and learning styles to date. The faculty development model proposed by the authors will only work with joint administrative (dean) and faculty support.

The faculty development movement which began in the early 1970's has not had the transforming influence upon teaching and learning that many had expected. Many thought that the problem lay in the fact that on many institutions faculty development was short term and episodic.\textsuperscript{146}

Two research projects completed in 1980 found that faculty still rated leaves and sabbaticals as most effective and judged instructional development projects as least effective. A nationwide assessment of faculty development was conducted by Robert Blackburn and associates through the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan with a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. The project developed assessment instruments for judging the success of faculty development programs and provided formative and summative evaluation for the 24 participating institutions. The authors suggest a possible explanation to their finding on the ineffectiveness of instructional improvement programs: perhaps the fault lie

\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., x.
with the nature and focus of the programs themselves and their lack of congruence with faculty needs.\textsuperscript{147}

In research completed in 1983, Gustafson and Bratton found that many instructional development units had disappeared. "In a sample of seventy two centers, twenty (28\%) had closed and more than half the remainder reported budget cuts."\textsuperscript{148}

Carole Bland and Constance C. Schmitz present another interpretation of the situation from their 1988 research in which they reviewed 288 articles on faculty development programs of the past twenty years. They found that twenty five percent of the literature was on programs implemented between 1983 and 1985. They state that "Faculty vitality (or institutional renewal) has replaced faculty development as the new "buzz word"."\textsuperscript{149} Although ninety three percent of the literature they reviewed was written in the past decade, all but four articles repeat concepts found in the literature of 1975. There is a need for new ideas if institutions are to revitalize tenured in faculty and departments in order to keep


\textsuperscript{148} Blackburn et al., 357.

because it helped them renew their enthusiasm, improve their attitudes and in general help their scholarly zeal.

The broader approach includes relationships between what instructors teach, what they think about what they teach, what they think about themselves personally and professionally, what they think about their institution, and finally, how all this relates to classroom practice.\textsuperscript{151}

As stated in the introduction, in 1983, the report \textit{A Nation at Risk} once again focused public and federal attention on the state of education in the nation. This was followed in 1984 and 1985 by three reports focusing on the quality of higher education. This doctoral research tried to find out how these reports have impacted on the faculty development movement, and what changes have been made in the past five years.

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid., 292.
CHAPTER III
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

General Review of Methodology

As was pointed out in the first chapter, the general method or research approach of this study was a triangulation of quantitative and qualitative methods. The review of the research found in Chapter II formulates the first data source. The mailed questionnaire, which provided the quantitative data source, was patterned after two questionnaires found in the literature on the deanship and on faculty development. A total of 124 questionnaires were mailed to all of the accredited two and four year colleges in the State of Illinois. Responses were received from 81 colleges. Follow up letters generated responses from an additional 7 colleges.

Only one questionnaire was unusable, as it was returned not filled out. This questionnaire was returned with a note from the assistant to the dean of this large, private, research university. It stated that "the dean was unable to complete this questionnaire because the questions bear no resemblance to the work he does as Dean."

The return of 87 usable questionnaires represents a 70.2% return rate. According to Kerlinger, this is better than the
average return rate. Most important to valid assumptions to the population, is to understand the characteristics of those who did not return the questionnaire, in order to see if any pattern on "non-respondents" emerges. The return rates are found in Table II and show that five types of colleges have a very similar return rate. The best return rate was the two year private colleges, and the lowest return rate was from the four year liberal arts colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF COLLEGE</th>
<th>N MAILED</th>
<th>N RETURNED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two year private</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two year public</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Liberal Arts</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire contained a total of 76 variables. A full screen edit screen (FS Edit screen) was constructed using the statistical analysis system (SAS) computer program. In this way the responses to the questionnaire could be accurately recorded on the computer. These data were then

analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science, version X (SPSSX) computer program.

Frequencies for all responses were generated. Responses were coded in order to represent the types of colleges. Crossbreaks were made of the responses by type of college and by size of college.

A crossbreak is a numerical tabular presentation of data usually in frequency or percentage form, in which variables are cross-partitioned in order to study the relations between them. This form of analysis can be used with any kind of data, but its principle use is with categorical or nominal data. Crossbreaks enable the researcher to determine the nature of the relations between variables. The data is organized in a convenient way to test statistically.²

The crossbreaks were then analyzed by using the Chi Square statistic. As most of the variables in this study are nominal and not continuous or ordinal, non-parametric statistics such as the Chi Square and the Contingency Coefficient are the most proper to use. The Chi-square test of independence is the statistical procedure to use to determine whether two nominal (or higher level) measures are related. Chi square seeks to measure whether "the frequencies observed in our sample deviate significantly from some theoretical or expected population frequencies"³ which would

² Ibid., 149-150.

be expected if the variables were independent of one another and the frequencies were left to chance. In order to have cells with expected frequencies of five or more, the colleges were compressed into three categories: two year, liberal arts or university. The original questionnaire had allowed for more fine distinctions i.e. public or private, two year, four year, liberal arts or university but this crossbreak left too high of a percentage of the cells with frequencies less than five, with is one of the requirements for the valid use of the Chi Square statistic. An interesting finding was that some private and public universities characterized their institution as a liberal arts college instead of a research or regional university. These institutions were those included under liberal arts colleges. Although the total number of universities to respond was 19, only 12 were included in the crossbreak as universities because the others were included under liberal arts colleges. A crossbreak was made based only on number of years of the college, (which would have included these institutions as universities), for comparison. These values were not, on the average, as significant as the values found when controlling for type of college as well as for years. It was more relevant to this study to control by both type of college and years of college in order to test the stated hypotheses.

As it was one of the variables specified in the research questions, it was important to test whether the factor of size
of institution had more influence on the values than the type of the institution. Therefore, the variables were also tested with a crossbreak based on the size of the institution. Whenever this was significant, it is noted in the corresponding section.

When Chi square indicates a dependant relationship between two variables, it does not tell the strength or type of association between the variables. The Coefficient of contingency is a measure of association which can be used to quantify the strength and nature of the relationship between two variables in a cross-tabulation when the data considered is nominal data and in a table larger than a 2 x 2. For a three by three table the maximum value of the contingency coefficient is .816. Therefore a Contingency Coefficient "C" of .28 would be considered moderate, and a C. of .58 would be considered substantial.4

"Two variables are related if knowing the value of one variable tells us something about the other variable."5 When two variables are so related we say that the two sets of measurements are correlated. However, if two variables are correlated, this does not mean that one of them causes the other.6 The sign of the coefficient merely indicates the

4 Kerlinger, 158.
6 Ibid. 317.
direction of the correlation: a positive sign indicates that as one variable increases the other variable increases, a negative sign indicates that as one variable increases, the other variable decreases in size.

Finally, responses were recoded in order to construct a total number of responses in the areas of deans preparation, supervisory activities and faculty development activities. These responses were analyzed by type and size of college using factorial analysis of variance.

Factorial analysis of variance is the statistical method that analyzes the independent and interactive effects of two or more independent variables on a dependent variable.\(^7\)

Analysis of variance will be used to test the null hypothesis that the populations means are equal. It will test the variability in the samples and based on the variability, it determines whether there is reason to believe the populations means are not equal.\(^8\) Is there any difference in the group means based on their values for type of college, size of institution and the main variables of study: the deans' preparation, the supervisory activities of the dean and the faculty development sponsored by the institution? Analysis of variance also allows one to see if there is any interaction between the variables. "Interaction is the working

\(^7\) Kerlinger, 228.

\(^8\) Norusis, 257.
together of two or more independent variables in their influence on a dependent variable.\textsuperscript{9}

In analysis of variance, the F ratio is the statistic which tests whether the groups have the same mean as would be expected in a normal population. It is computed by dividing the between groups mean square by the within groups mean square. The significance level tells whether we can reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the observed means and the expected normal means.

The .05 level of significance means that the obtained result that is significant at the .05 level could occur by chance only 5 times in 100 trials. A level of significance is, to some extent, chosen arbitrarily. However, most investigators say that the results are not significant if they do not make the .05 or .01 level.\textsuperscript{10}

Finally, personal interviews were conducted with a systematic sample of the questionnaire respondents. The questionnaires were divided by type of college and whether or not the institution had a formalized faculty development program. Two respondents were selected from each type of college (2 year private, 2 year public, 4 year liberal arts, 4 year private university and 4 year public university); one respondent had indicated a formalized faculty development program was in place, the other did not have a formalized faculty development program in place. The respondents were

\textsuperscript{9} Kerlinger, 229.

\textsuperscript{10} Kerliner, 156-57.
contacted by phone and an appointment was made for an interview. Only one dean contacted (from a public university) would not grant an interview. Each time he was contacted he said he was too busy, call back in a week or two. Call backs to this dean received the same reply. The interviews lasted an average of one hour. They were taped and transcribed. The transcription resulted in a total of 65 pages of conversation. This provided the qualitative data source.

In order to organize the presentation of the data, this chapter is divided into three sections, each corresponding to one of the three main hypotheses of this study. The first section is on the leadership activities of the dean and department head. This section provides data on the preparation of the dean, the supervisory responsibilities of the dean and the delineation of duties between the dean and department chairperson relating to the supervision of the faculty. The first section presents data to answer the first research question: What, if any, instructional leadership activities do college deans and department heads engage in to improve the teaching ability of their college faculty? Is working with the faculty to improve their teaching the role of the dean or the department chair? The qualitative interviewing also provided data for this section regarding possible role conflicts. These findings are presented according to the conceptualization of the Getzels-Guba Model of Social Behavior.
The second section focuses on the supervisory activities of the dean. It provides further data to answer the first research question. In addition, cross tabulations were made on this data dividing by type of college dean, i.e., dean of a community college or dean of a four year college or university. This provided data to answer the second research question: Is there any difference between the supervisory activities of college deans in two year college versus those in four year college?

The third section focuses on the faculty development sponsored by the colleges. It seeks to test the Bergquist Faculty development paradigm and to delineate the relationship of the dean's office to faculty development in the institution. This information is also divided by type of college. These data answer the third research question, is there any difference between the kinds of faculty development sponsored by a college and the type of college.

In each section the quantitative questionnaire results are presented first. These findings are followed by data generated from the interviews and direct quotes from the interviewees. These qualitative data corroborate the quantitative data while presenting an in depth analysis of the situation. Each section concludes with an analysis of the data showing how the findings support or refute the research question under study.
The Leadership Activities of the Dean and Department Chair

Table III shows the titles and highest degree earned and field of study of the respondents to the questionnaire and also includes information on the characteristics of the colleges which they represent.

From this table it can be seen that the questionnaire did reach the intended audience. Sixty four percent of the respondents were deans; either the dean of the college, of a college of the university or dean of instruction. Fourteen percent of the respondents were the vice president for academic affairs.

A surprising finding was the number of dual title respondents. Eleven percent of the respondents were the dean and the chief executive officer or dean and academic officer or some combination. The other titles were usually director. This individual could be the dean of a technical school.
**TABLE III**
RESPONDENTS CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Liberal Arts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Instruction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Pres.Ac.Aff.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Title</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or M.S.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Missing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 2-year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privat University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two year</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-500 FTE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1000 FTE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-2000 FTE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-5000 FTE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-10000 FTE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000+FTE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A crosstabulation was made of these variables by type of school and is shown in Table IV. The crosstabulation revealed that the dean of instruction was responding most often from the community colleges (72%), the vice president for academic affairs was found equally as often in both community and liberal arts colleges, director was most often (75%) found in the community colleges and the dual title individual was responding almost exclusively (90%) from private institution which perhaps due to lack of funds must ask one individual to assume two roles. The Chi Square was not significant therefore one would have to assume that the variable of title is independent and not dependent on the type of college.

From the interviews, it was found that the usual organization chart in a small college is dean -- department chairs + faculty; in a medium sized college it is president - dean - department chair - faculty and in a large college it is president -vice-president for academic affairs - dean - department chairs - faculty. However, it should be noted that each college is unique, with its own particular organization.

Seventy five percent of the respondents had a doctoral degree, 54% were Ph.D.'s and 18% were Ed.D. Masters degree deans were found almost exclusively in the two year colleges; however, it should be noted that more than half of the two year college deans had doctorates.
## TABLE IV
CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE OF COLLEGE BY TITLE, DEGREE AND FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dean/I.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VP.A.A.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY COLLEGE</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>引:2-YEAR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY COLLEGE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE 2-YEAR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Ed.Admin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Higher Ed.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY COLLEGE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE 2-YEAR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V shows the crosstabulation of degree and field by type of college with type of college recoded to compress values in order to have enough frequencies in each cell for a valid Chi Square test. The Chi square of type of college by degree is 25.427, significant at the .001 level. Therefore one can conclude that there is a relationship between the degree the dean has and the type of college at which he/she works. The Contingency Coefficient of .4755 shows a moderately strong relationship. These statistics show that as the academic level of the college increases, the terminal degree level of the dean also increases. In other words, there are more doctorally prepared deans at universities than at two year colleges. This finding concurs with the literature findings.

Forty one percent of the deans had their degree in an academic subject area, twenty six percent had their degree in education, and twenty three percent of the deans did not fill in the area of their degree. In retrospect, the researcher thinks that the field was omitted because the question was worded in such a way that it asked for two responses, degree and field. According to approved questionnaire techniques, each question should ask for only one response.
### TABLE V
CHI SQUARE FOR TYPE OF COLLEGE BY DEGREE AND FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Year</td>
<td>22 55</td>
<td>15 38</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>32 91</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>8 67</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 25.427 df 4, p = .0001
Contingency Coefficient .4755

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Other/Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Year</td>
<td>8 20</td>
<td>18 45</td>
<td>14 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>21 60</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>10 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>6 50</td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td>5 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square 17.95 df 4, p = .0013
Contingency Coefficient .4136

That twenty six percent of the deans had a degree in education is a significant difference from what is found in the literature; thirty years ago, Gould found the idea that deans be prepared for administration at the college level anathema among the deans he surveyed (see page 48 above). In 1981, Tucker and Bryan still found the dean and/or department chair unprepared professionally for their role (see pages 60-61 above). Of those who had their degree in Education, forty eight percent had it in educational administration, nineteen percent had it in higher education and the remaining thirty three percent had it in educational studies. It is
interesting to note the predominance of administration degrees over higher education degrees even though the higher education degree would be what one might expect would be the proper credential for the position. The Chi Square for type of college by degree field was 17.95, significant at the .01 level. This finding allows one to reject the null hypothesis of independence of the variables and to conclude that the variables are related is some way. The Contingency Coefficient of .4136 shows that there is a moderately strong relationship. One can conclude from these statistics that as the size of the college increases the tendency to have the higher coded field decreases. (The higher coded field is education, because of the way the variables were arbitrarily set up.) This is seen by the fact that forty five percent of the two year college deans had their degree in education, whereas only eight percent of the university deans had it in education. Sixty percent of the liberal arts deans had their degree in an academic field.

Relating these findings to the Getzel's-Guba Model of Social Behavior, one could conclude that the two year college dean has prepared him/herself for working in an educational institution by majoring in education. This individual should experience the least amount of role conflict.

The liberal arts and university deans have prepared themselves academically for teaching a particular subject at the higher education level. They do not have the professional
background in education, and may therefore experience more role conflict in the position as dean. With this quantitative finding in mind, the research probed during the interviews for expressions of role conflict.

The crosstabulation of the variables of degree and field by size of college did not reveal any significant Chi Squares; therefore one would have to conclude that these relationships discovered are a factor of the type of college, not the size of the college in which the dean works.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Another College in Univ.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Pres. Academic Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Came to Institution as Dean               | 6   | 60  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Dean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years at Institution</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| K-12 Teaching Experience                 | 6   | 6   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>52.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV shows the characteristics of the deans that were systematically chosen to be interviewed. The titles of the
deans represented on the average, similar percentages as those found in the questionnaire sample. If one were to combine the titles of Dean, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Dean of Another College together, the interviewed sample had 30% more of these individuals than in the questionnaire sample. The dean was the targeted individual of the dissertation, purposefully chosen to be interviewed, whenever possible, given the other factors to also be considered when systematically selecting questionnaire respondents to be interviewed.

The number of Ph.D. and M.Ed. holders of those interviewed, was similar to the number found in the questionnaire sample. The number of Ed.D. bearers was eighteen percent larger, and the number holding degrees in education was also higher than those in the questionnaire sample. These two findings correlate because an Ed.D. degree is always in an education related field.

Education was the field of the degree held by the interviewed deans twenty two percent more often than in the questionnaire sample; educational administration was the field of the degree twenty seven percent more than in the questionnaire sample. This was a surprising finding for the researcher. Forty percent of the interviewed deans had not indicated their field of degree on the questionnaire; the field was noted during the personal interview with the dean. The higher percentage prepared in education is an interesting
finding as was the fact that fifty percent of the deans interviewed were Loyola graduates. As all of the deans interviewed were from Northern Illinois, one could conclude that more of the deans in the urban colleges are preparing themselves for the challenges of this position by obtaining degrees in education.

One could also suggest that affinity of university and similarity of field preparation, contributed to their agreeing to fill out the questionnaire in the first place, and to granting an interview to the researcher. A final note on degree preparation was the surprising number of deans who had majored in biology. Thirty percent had been biology majors. Further study would need to be made to see if there is any kind of correlation here.

Sixty percent of the deans interviewed came to the institution as dean. The researcher found less role conflict expressed in the interviews than she had anticipated would be the case. One could conclude from this finding that perhaps there is less role conflict when one comes into a new institution as dean to fill an open position, than when one is promoted from within the faculty ranks to assume new administrative responsibilities.

The average number of years as dean corresponds to what is found in the literature; there is a high turnover of those in the dean's position. Those who make it stay, but a
significant number fail to meet the challenge and their term is usually limited to three to four years.

The average age of the dean corresponds to that found in the literature. A significantly different finding was the number of women deans interviewed. Some deans were able to be contacted by name, as they had indicated their name at the end of the questionnaire, requesting a copy of the results of the study. The other questionnaires necessitated a call to the secretary of the dean, in order to determine the name to be contacted for an interview. There was no influence therefore regarding their sex; however eighty percent of the deans interviewed were women, much higher than the 13.1% cited in the literature. This finding led to a manual tabulation of the sex, if able to be determined from the name of the responding dean, from all of the returned questionnaires. It was found that twenty six percent of the respondents were women, thirty seven percent were men and thirty percent did not indicate a name, so no sex could be determined. This finding suggests a significant change in the number of women represented in this administrative position in 1990 than found five years ago.


12 Ibid.
Question three of the questionnaire asked the respondent whether they still taught, and if they did, how many classes did they teach. The answers to this question are found in Table VII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>DOES THE DEAN TEACH?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square 15.78, df 4, p = .0033
Contingency Coefficient .3938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If so, how many courses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 per year</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 per year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10 per yr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table VII it can be seen that more than half of the deans also teach. The Chi Square of 15.78 is significant at the .01 level which means that the null hypothesis of independence can be rejected. There is a relationship between the kind of college and whether or not the dean teaches. The Contingency Coefficient of .3938 shows a moderately strong positive relationship. These statistics can be interpreted that as the type of the college increases, the tendency to
teach also increases. It is seen in Table V that seventy percent of the deans in two year colleges do not teach, while seventy two percent of the deans in liberal arts colleges do teach and sixty four percent of the deans in universities also do teach. The vast majority of those who do teach, teach one or two courses per year.

From this finding, one could conclude that the deans in the liberal arts and universities still consider themselves as faculty, albeit leaders of the faculty, and continue in a small way fulfilling the role expectation that faculty teach. The deans in the two year college considers themselves as administrators, and as such, do not teach. This finding also correlates with the difference found in the degree and field of two year and four year deans.

The crosstabulation by size of institute did not reveal significant Chi Squares; therefore one can conclude that whether the dean teaches or not depends more on the type of college from which he comes than on the size of the institute.

From the interviews, it was found that forty percent of these deans teach because they want to keep in touch with the students and/or be able to understand the challenges their faculty face. Half of the teaching deans indicated that they now only team teach or cannot teach every semester due to the time restraints of their position as dean.

Table VIII summarizes some of the job responsibilities of the dean. The table shows that the dean can have anywhere
from zero to thirty department chairs that report to him and the dean can represent anywhere from zero to six hundred faculty members. A surprising finding is the number of part-time to full-time faculty currently on campuses. Forty four percent of the colleges have fifty percent or more of their faculty as part-time faculty.

TABLE VIII
JOB RESPONSIBILITIES OF DEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many department chairs report to you?</td>
<td>Minimum 0 - 14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 30 - 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many faculty report to you?</td>
<td>Minimum 0 - 9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 600 - 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 116, Median 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many are full-time?</td>
<td>Minimum 0 - 9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 420 - 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 62.4 Median 43.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many are part-time?</td>
<td>Minimum 0 - 15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 372 - 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 55 Median 25.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range   N  %
< 25%     23  34
26-50%    18  24
51-75%    21  28
> 76%      10  14

The crosstabulation of these responsibilities by type of college is found in Table IX and reveals that there is a significant difference in the deans responsibilities in the
different types of colleges. The crosstabulation by size of college is found in Table X, and also reveals significant differences in the number of full-time and part-time faculty that report to the dean, however the total number of faculty reporting is not significantly different. These findings agree with John Gould's findings that the role of a dean varies as the size and type of the college varies. These findings are also important to this study for the help to answer the research question: "Does the type, size or kind of college make a difference to the role delineation of the dean?"

From Table IX it can be seen that fifty nine percent of the deans in the liberal arts colleges have less than 75 faculty reporting to them, while over eight three percent of the deans in the universities have over 75 faculty reporting to them. The organization of the college regarding the dean's span of supervision has a Chi Square of 19.50, df 8, p = .0124 which shows that there is a relationship between these variables, they are not independent of one another. The Contingency C. of .4405 shows a moderately strong relationship. The number of full-time faculty and the number of part-time faculty also show significant Chi Squares, but the tables are not reproduced here, because they are the same relationship as that found with the total faculty. From these findings one can conclude that the deans in the university have a significantly larger number of faculty reporting to
them than the deans in the two or four year colleges. The role of the dean in the university, must therefore, be unique from the role of the other deans. Due to the large number of faculty for which he/she is responsible, these deans will be limited as to how closely they can work with each individual faculty member.

The number of full-time faculty was divided by the number of part-time faculty to yield a new variable, "Percent part-time". This crosstabulation is also significant with a Chi Square of 29.73, df 8, p = .0002. It shows that sixty nine percent of the two year colleges are hiring over half of their faculty as part-time. Liberal arts college, have the lowest percent of part-time faculty. Universities have twenty five percent of their campuses with over seventy five percent part-time faculty.

One could conclude from these facts that the dean in a liberal arts college will be able to work more closely with his/her faculty to help them improve their teaching because they will be full-time faculty members committed to teaching and committed to the institution. In the two year and universities with such a large percentage of part-time faculty, one could question whether the dean even gets to know the faculty, as part-time faculty are usually only on campus the hours their class meets. From the interviews with the deans of the two year colleges, it was found out that the
### TABLE IX

**THE DEAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES BY TYPE OF COLLEGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>&quot;Number of faculty that report to you&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;26</td>
<td>26-75</td>
<td>76-150</td>
<td>&gt;150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.51 df 8, p = .0063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>&quot;Percent of part-time to full-time&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;26%</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table contains data on the number of faculty reporting to the dean and the percentage of part-time to full-time faculty, categorized by type of college (Two Year College, Liberal Arts, University). Chi-square statistics are used to test the significance of the differences observed.*
entire faculty in one two year private college was part-time. A review of the two year private college questionnaires revealed that this was the case in three other colleges, or in a total of fifty percent of these colleges. The interviews with the community college deans revealed that they currently cannot hire any new full-time faculty; this has been a budgetary fact for the last few years. One dean showed the researcher two books just recently written on supervising part-time faculty, saying that she must do as much faculty development with the part-time faculty as with the full-time because part-time faculty are a reality of college campuses today.

It is important to analyze this finding in view of the research questions of this dissertation. If institutions are hiring more and more part-time faculty, it is questionable as to how committed they are at this time to the improvement of teaching in their institutions. Part-time faculty come and go, are not available to students during regular office hours and are usually not available to attend any type of faculty development programs, no matter when they are offered. The reasons behind this statistic were explored through the personal interviews to see why the two year colleges and universities had such a large percentage of part-time faculty, how long they have had this reality, and how long they anticipate that it will continue.
It was found that hiring part-time faculty was the way in which public institutions were protecting themselves from a re-occurrence of the demographic fluctuations of the 70's. Many full-time faculty were hired in the early 70's to meet the expanding enrollments of the baby bomb generation. As these enrollments did not continue, the universities now have enough tenured faculty on their campuses for the next two decades. In order to avoid a re-occurrence of this problem, policies now prohibit hiring new full-time faculty unless they are taking the place of a retiring faculty.

The crosstabulation of size of college with number of faculty and number of part-time faculty is found in Table X. For number of faculty, the Chi Square of 33.55 with $p$ of .003 has a Contingency Coefficient of .5275 and shows that there is a strong relationship between the size of the college and the number of faculty that report to the dean. The larger college has a much larger number of faculty reporting to the dean. Therefore, not only in the large universities, but also in the large community colleges, the role of the dean in improving the teaching of the faculty was limited because of the large number of faculty involved. One questions why there are not a larger number of deans in these institutions, each with a more realistic span of supervision.

The number of part-time faculty in the different size institutions is also significant with a Chi Square of 30.81, $p = .002$ and the Contingency Coefficient is again a strong
This finding is similar, although stronger, than the statistic found when controlling for type of college. The larger institutions have a much higher percentage of part-time faculty than the smaller institutions. One could once again question this finding. The larger institutions is defined as having the larger enrollment. If there is a larger enrollment, there is a larger income budget due to the larger number of tuition. If these institutions have more income, why do they not they hire more full-time faculty? The researcher had this finding in mind as she conducted the personal interviews.

From the interviews it was discovered that the drastic drop in state funding over the past fifteen years has necessitated the hiring of part-time faculty. The state universities do not receive a per student capita, but individual allotments per university which are based more on the legislature's political interests than on demographic realities. During the current governor's term, the funding for education in the State of Illinois has dropped from being the third highest in the nation to the second lowest. This was an important fiscal reality to have discovered which is a measure of the state's commitment to improving teaching and educational quality of the state universities.
### TABLE X

**THE DEAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES BY SIZE OF INSTITUTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE COLLEGE</th>
<th>&quot;Number of faculty that report to you&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 26</td>
<td>26-75</td>
<td>76-150</td>
<td>&gt;150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square: 33.55 df 12, p = .0039  
Contingency C. \( \chi^2 = 0.5275 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE COLLEGE</th>
<th>&quot;Number of part-time faculty that report to you.&quot;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;26</td>
<td>26-75</td>
<td>76-150</td>
<td>&gt;150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square: 30.81 df 12, p = .0012  
Contingency C. \( \chi^2 = 0.5114 \)
Question three of the questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate the experiences which they have had which could be considered as preparation for the deanship. This question was taken from the questionnaire used by Gould thirty years ago. Table XI gives the frequencies of their responses.

**TABLE XI**

**PREPARATION FOR THE DEANSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean at another college</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences for deans</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took administration courses</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reading on college administration</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid Cases = 86

From this table it can be seen that the most common previous experiences were being a department chair, attending conferences for deans, taking administration courses and doing independent reading on college administration. Attendance at professional development conferences for deans was the most common way of preparing for the deanship (74%) followed by
doing independent reading on administration (71%). Gould did not include attendance at conferences for deans in his original question, at that time there probably were no professional conferences. Gould's respondents also thought that independent reading was important (see page 48 above) however only 4% found training in administration essential, while 59% of our respondents have now had this training.

A crosstabulation of preparation for the deanship by type of college is found in Table XII. For ease of reading it shows only the positive responses and the significant Chi squares and Contingency coefficients.

From this crosstabulation it can be seen that there is a significant difference in the type of school and the preparation of the dean in regards to whether he/she was a full professor, took administration courses, did outside reading on higher education administration and attended conferences for deans.
TABLE XII

PREPARATION FOR DEANSHIP BY TYPE OF COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>FULL PROF.</th>
<th>DEPT CHAIR.</th>
<th>DEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square 10.05 df 2, p = .0066
Contingency C. .3235

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>CONFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square 10.56 df 2
p = .0051
Contingency C. .3307
For full professor, the Chi Square of 10.05 is significant at the .01 level and shows that there is a relationship between the type of school and whether or not the dean was a full professor before becoming dean. The Contingency C of .3235 shows a moderate relationship. These statistics show that as the type of the college increases, the tendency to be a full professor before becoming a dean increases. In other words, most of the university deans, were full professors before becoming deans. In fact, of the six ways of preparing for the deanship, university deans indicated this method more than any of the others. This finding corroborates with the findings above as to whether or not the dean teaches and the terminal degree of the dean. The dean in the university is an academic, raised to the office of the dean, to be the "first among equals" as described in the collegial model of governance. An analysis of this fact relating it to the Getzels-Guba Model of Social Behavior in reference to role conflict would lead one to expect that the university dean experiences role conflict in this position as dean because the his personal dimension was preparation as an

academic, whereas the institutional dimension as a dean requires administrative competency and preparation, not a requirement for obtaining the position of full professor.

For courses, the Chi Square of 10.56 is significant at the .01 level and the Contingency C. of .3307 shows a moderate relationship. As the type of the college increases, the tendency to take courses in administration as a way of preparing for the deanship decreases. In other words, almost sixty one percent of the two year college deans have taken administration courses whereas only thirty six percent of the university deans have done so. This finding also corroborates with the findings above regarding the field of the degree and whether the dean teaches. The two year college dean is an administrator and prepares him/herself for the position by taking courses. The two year college dean can be seen to operate according to a more bureaucratic model of governance.\(^{14}\) Relating this finding to the Getzel's-Guba Model, one would expect to find less role conflict in the two year college dean as he personally prepared him/herself for the role of dean by taking administrative courses.

The Chi square for independent reading is 8.23 and is significant at the .05 level with a Contingency C. of .2956 that shows a moderate relationship. An analysis of the statistic leads one to conclude that as the type of the

\(^{14}\) Ibid.
college increases, the tendency to do independent reading decreases. Liberal arts deans use independent reading most often as a means of preparation for the deanship, followed by two year college deans, with the university dean using these means only thirty six percent of the time. Of the six ways in which one could prepare for the deanship, liberal arts deans use independent reading the most. Relating this to the Getzel's-Guba model, one would expect the liberal arts dean to have less role conflict; as they personally prepare themselves for their new role by doing independent reading.

The Chi square for attending conferences is 9.87, significant at the .05 level with a Contingency C. of .3209 shows that there is a moderate inverse relationship between type of school and whether the dean attends conferences for deans. The community college dean uses conferences more than any other means of preparation for the deanship (83%), the liberal arts dean used this means seventy seven percent of the time and the university dean uses this means only thirty six percent of the time.

The crosstabulation by size of institute revealed significant Chi Squares for `outside reading' `attending professional conferences' and `full professor' which are found in Table XIII.

As the other variables were not found significant when controlling for size of institute and these variables were
also significant when controlling for type of college, one can conclude that type of college is the more significant intervening variable in the dean's preparation for the job and influences the relationship more because the same relationships are found above when controlling for size. One could assume from the above table that the smaller colleges are two year colleges, the middle size colleges are liberal arts colleges and larger colleges are the universities. With this assumption, the findings and relationships expressed corroborate perfectly with the type of college crosstabulations.

Relating these findings to the Getzel's-Guba model, one could conclude that the two year college dean's observed behavior is that he has prepared himself for the role of dean by taking administration courses. This previous professional
preparation could be interpreted as showing a need disposition on the part of the individual who desires to be a dean and prepares him/herself accordingly. The liberal arts dean has not prepared previously for the role as dean, but once he is in it, he prepares himself to meet the expectations of the role by reading and attending conferences. The university dean does not seem to prepare for the job of dean either before or after assuming the position, except by having been a full professor.

From the interviews with the deans a similar finding was found. Three of the four deans interviewed in the two year colleges had prepared themselves for their current position. They had obtained degrees in educational administration and they each had an impressive record of other higher education administrative positions which they had had before becoming dean. These deans experienced no personal role conflict. Each had experienced institutional changes which had recently re-defined their span of control and job responsibilities as dean. This new institutional role expectation did result in some temporary role conflict for two of these deans.

The other two-year dean had a background in education and experience in administering K-12 schools. She however found high education "a different ballgame." She said, "For this job, you have to learn on the job. I don't think any college program prepares you for higher education administration, unless you do an internship."
The background of the deans with degrees in academic fields had two similar experiences. Each had been encouraged by a department chairperson to assume administrative functions or to think about going on in administration. One dean said, "I went into academic administration very quickly. It was not in my plans, but it did happen." Another dean stated, "My chairman sort of prepared me to pass the torch down."

The other recurring experience was participation in leadership seminars to prepare themselves for academic administration. One dean was an ACE Fellow. She explained to me that, "The ACE fellowship consists of seminars in higher education and an internship experience." Another dean attended the Harvard Summer Program for College Administrators. Each of these deans attended conferences for deans.

One could conclude from these findings that practical, on-the-job training is an important aspect of preparation for the deanship. Whether through an internship while completing an academic program, or through an internship such as that provided by the American Council of Education, practical, more than theoretical training seems to be what deans and "future deans" seek for their professional preparation for the new role. This finding supports the format of the Loyola administrative program which includes a mandatory internship experience and suggests that other administrative preparation programs which emphasize theory and research over practice,
should be re-evaluated. This finding also supports the idea of the "administrative sabbatical" mentioned in the review of the literature. One could thus assume that the best way to improve in one's administrative role, is to see how others do things and get new ideas of how things could be done at your institution.

In each of the offices of the deans, the researcher took note of the books on the shelves. All but one of the deans interviewed had become readers of higher education administration books. They had many of the latest books, and the classical handbooks. Whether they had been previously prepared for the position or not, each was continuing their professional preparation. One dean mentioned, "I love to read. I am always reading a book. However, now I no longer read books in my field, now I read about leadership and college management."

The only deans who experienced role conflict were two of those who had been at the institution prior to being appointed dean. One had found that some of her colleagues had not been able to accept her as their dean; another one mentioned that the institution had an outmoded concept of the dean (as one who exerted little educational leadership) which was the cause of the role conflict she felt in her position. Another dean who did not experience role conflict nevertheless responded to this question by stating, "You do have to distance yourself
from the everyday life of the faculty. Sometimes you have to make decisions contrary to their opinion."

The dean of the large university experienced some role conflict due to the large number of faculty for which she was responsible. The span of control was too large for her to do any kind of independent work with her faculty. She felt frustration at this limitation imposed by institutional organization.

In order to test whether there was any significant difference between the deans preparation for the job and the type of college in which the dean worked an analysis of variance was computed. The total ways in which deans could have prepared themselves, found in the answer to question four of the questionnaire where totaled to equal a new variable, "DEAN PREP." This variable was compared with the degree earned and the field of the degree while also comparing it by the type of college represented. Analysis of variance was also computed for size of institute, dean prep, field and degree, but it did not reveal other significant results. This confirms the above stated fact that type of college is the more significant intervening variable. Table XIV shows the results of the analysis by type of college.

The analysis of variance does not reveal significant results for type of college, field and degree; so the null hypothesis that there is no difference between dean's preparation, and type of college, degree and field of degree
### Table XIV
**Analysis of Variance**

**Dean's Preparation by Degree, Field and Type of College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>5.535</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of College</td>
<td>3.155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interaction</td>
<td>12.091</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.418</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeColl/Field</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeColl/Degree</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field/ Degree</td>
<td>11.127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.127</td>
<td>5.011</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interaction</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>20.422</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.042</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>111.020</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131.443</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87 cases were processed, 26 cases (29.8%) were missing.

is not rejected. One could analyze this non-significant statistic by noting that the main computed variable, DEAN PREP was constructed by adding the total ways in which a particular dean has prepared themselves for the deanship. It was found above that there are significant differences between which type of college dean uses full professorship, reading, attending conferences and/or courses as a means of preparation. However, when the total mean preparation is tabulated, the totals are similar as each dean usually uses one or two of the means of preparation the most.
significant at the .05 level. One can conclude from this relationship that the kind of degree one has influences the field of one's degree. This inter-relationship was not detected through the Chi Square or contingency coefficient used above as interaction can only be shown by using the analysis of variance test. This finding does make sense because all Ed.D. degrees are in the field of education and all academic degrees would be Ph.D.'s, as could be some education degrees.

Table XV is constructed from the answers that were given to question six of the questionnaire. This question was the same as the one found in Gould's questionnaire to Dean's and asks who assumes the primary responsibility for the following tasks performed with the faculty. This question was important to this study as the dean has been designated in this dissertation as the principal person responsible for working with the faculty to help them improve their teaching. There is mixed support in the literature for the dean having this responsibility. Some maintain that it is the department chairperson. Therefore the answers to this question are important to this study, and are found in Table XV.

From this table it can be seen that with the exception of scheduling courses/classes and registering students these tasks are more often the role of the dean than of the
TABLE XV

ROLE OF THE DEAN AND DEPARTMENT CHAIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Dean N</th>
<th>Dean %</th>
<th>Dept.Ch. N</th>
<th>Dept.Ch. %</th>
<th>Both N</th>
<th>Both %</th>
<th>Other N</th>
<th>Other %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview &amp; Hire Faculty</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules courses/classes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registers Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts faculty meetings</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes faculty develop.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves sabbaticals</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves conferences</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates instructors</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administers Course eval.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommends Promotions &amp; Tenure</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
department chairperson. It is also interesting to note that the department chairperson is never the chief person to approve sabbaticals and rarely (only 10-15%) the chief person to promote faculty development, approve conferences or recommend promotions and tenure. The three roles which concur with the highest percentage for the dean preforming the tasks are "Promotes faculty development", "Approves sabbaticals" and "Approves conferences". These are all faculty enhancement activities which improve teaching as well as enriching academic credentials. One could conclude from these data that the dean is in the key position to work with the faculty and is correctly designated as the main protagonist of this dissertation research.

Another interesting finding was the "other" that were written in by respondents as they were completing this form. Often the president was designated in smaller colleges as working with the dean especially in approving sabbaticals and conferences and recommending promotions and tenure, clearly the budgetary items. Faculty committees were also mentioned in liberal arts colleges as sharing responsibility for evaluating instructors, promoting faculty development and recommending promotions and tenure. The community colleges no longer have departmental chairs, so these tasks are now completed by division heads, and this was indicated on the questionnaire submitted from these colleges. Registering students is clearly today the role of the registrar, a
position which has grown in importance in the thirty years since Gould wrote his book.

The crosstabulation of these tasks by type of college was not significant for most of the variables, so only the tables for the significant variables are reproduced in Table XVI.

From this table, it can be seen that there is a significant relationship between the type of college and who interviews the faculty, who approves sabbaticals and who approves conferences. With a Chi Square of 17.96, significant at the .05 level with a moderately strong contingency coefficient of .4157, it can be seen that there is a relationship between type of college and who interviews and hires the faculty. In two year and liberal arts colleges, this is the task of the dean in almost fifty percent of these institutions, whereas seventy two percent of universities have the chair perform this task. This finding corroborates with those found above and a pattern is emerging which is key to the research question of this dissertation. There is a difference in the role of the university dean as compared with the role of the liberal arts and the two year college dean; however there does not seem to be as consistent and dramatic a difference between the liberal arts dean and the community college dean. The later two have many of the same roles whereas the university dean has delegated many of these role responsibilities to the chairperson.
### TABLE XVI
**TYPE OF COLLEGE BY FACULTY RELATED TASKS**

#### "Who interviews & hires faculty?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEAN N</th>
<th>DEAN %</th>
<th>CHAIR N</th>
<th>CHAIR %</th>
<th>BOTH N</th>
<th>BOTH %</th>
<th>OTHER N</th>
<th>OTHER %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 17.96 df 8 p = .021 Contingency C .4157

#### "Who approves sabbaticals and leaves?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEAN N</th>
<th>DEAN %</th>
<th>CHAIR N</th>
<th>CHAIR %</th>
<th>BOTH N</th>
<th>BOTH %</th>
<th>OTHER N</th>
<th>OTHER %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 20.68 df 8, p = .008 Contingency C .4404

#### "Who approves conferences and seminars?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEAN N</th>
<th>DEAN %</th>
<th>CHAIR N</th>
<th>CHAIR %</th>
<th>BOTH N</th>
<th>BOTH %</th>
<th>OTHER N</th>
<th>OTHER %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 18.33 df 10 p = .049 Contingency C .4191

#### "Who schedules course loads and classes?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEAN N</th>
<th>DEAN %</th>
<th>CHAIR N</th>
<th>CHAIR %</th>
<th>BOTH N</th>
<th>BOTH %</th>
<th>OTHER N</th>
<th>OTHER %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 15.73 df 8 p = .046 Contingency C .3932

The person to approve sabbaticals and leaves is the dean the majority of the time in all three types of institutions;
it is never the sole responsibility of the chairperson. In
the liberal arts colleges, this role is almost the exclusive
domain of the dean (80%). However, in two year colleges this
responsibility is shared thirty six percent of the time with
"others" which includes the provost or chancellor of the
system and in universities this activity is a combined task
of dean and chair forty five percent of the time. The Chi
Square of 20.68 is significant at the .01 level and has a
moderately strong Contingency C. of .4404. It is interesting
to note that approving sabbaticals is a major budget item;
therefore a consensus emerges from this finding that the dean
is the main person to approve budgetary items.

A consensus also emerges from the findings regarding who
schedules course loads and classes. As indicated above from
in Table XIII, this was not a major task of the dean. The
crosstabulation by type of college shows that this is true
across all three types of colleges: it is the task of the
department chairperson, not of the dean. The Chi Square of
18.33 is significant at the .05 level with a moderate
Contingency C. of .4191 shows that there is a relationship
between type of college and who performs this task. The dean
still performs this activity in forty percent of the two year
colleges; but this is because these colleges are so small,
that on their questionnaire, they indicated that they had no
department chairpersons, or only nominal chairpersons who
carried a full load of courses. The university dean never
performs this task alone, it is the task of the department chairperson eighty percent of the time.

Similar findings are found for who approves conferences and seminars. The Chi Square of 18.33 is significant at the .05 level with a contingency coefficient of .4191 which shows a moderately strong relationship between type of college and who performs this task. The dean of the liberal arts college does this activity almost eighty percent of the time, the dean in two year colleges does this role task almost sixty percent of the time, but the dean in the university does this activity only thirty six percent of the time. The university dean shares this responsibility with the department chair ten percent of the time and delegates this task to the chairperson thirty six percent of the time. The two year college dean shares this activity with the divisional head twenty percent of the time and delegates it to him/her less than ten percent of the time. An analysis of this finding would lead one to conclude that the liberal arts dean is very involved in overseeing this type of faculty development activity. The university dean, once again shows detachment from this faculty activity by delegating or sharing it with the department chairperson more than fifty percent of the time. As this activity is a high budgetary item, the two year college deans do this approval themselves only fifty eight percent of the time and find that this budget item must be approved also by their provost or president fifteen percent of the time.
The crosstabulation of these tasks by size of institution revealed two significant relationships, found in Table XVII. From this table, it can be seen that it is only in the smaller colleges that the dean schedules the course loads.

**TABLE XVII**

**SIZE OF COLLEGE BY FACULTY RELATED TASKS**

**SIZE COLLEGE**  "Who schedules course loads and schedules?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEAN</th>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=yes, % = Row %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>13 46</td>
<td>9 32</td>
<td>3 11</td>
<td>3 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>6 18</td>
<td>28 82</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>4 17</td>
<td>15 65</td>
<td>3 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 36.22 df 12 p = .0003 Contingency C .5444

**SIZE COLLEGE**  "Who promotes faculty development activities?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEAN</th>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>17 68</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>3 12</td>
<td>2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>23 70</td>
<td>6 18</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>13 59</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td>2 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 25.86 df 15, p = .0395 Contingency C .4919

Course loads are scheduled by the department chairperson in the medium and large size institute. The Chi-Square of 36.22, df 12, significant at the .001 level has a strong Contingency C. of 5444. which confirms that this is a valid relationship.

The Dean is the person who most often promotes faculty development in all three sizes of institutions. The Chi Square of 25.86 is significant at the .05 level with a
moderate contingency C of .4919 shows that there still is a relationship between the answer to this question and the size of the institution. Nevertheless, this finding once again supports the conclusion that faculty development is the role of the dean more often than the role of the department chairperson. The larger institutions have 'other' almost ten percent of the time. This statistic seems to indicate the presence of the separate office for faculty development, found on the larger institutions and this finding corroborates with the review of the literature finding of the Instructional Improvement Centers found on larger universities.

In three of the personal interviews with the deans, the deans outlined all of the tasks that they performed. One dean said, "I consider hiring new people the major responsibility of the dean, more than tenure or promotions decisions. I interview all faculty applicants as does the department chairperson." Another dean also mentioned that she interviews every faculty member that works in "her" college. "I even interview the part-time faculty," she said. "I sit them down right where you're sitting and I go through the whole handbook with them."

Only one of the deans interviewed did not have the expected role tasks found through the quantitative analysis of the questionnaire responses. This dean was in one of the colleges which had recently reorganized. Although he had the same title as one of the other deans interviewed, i.e. Dean
of Instruction, his role was now more administrative and he did not work directly with the faculty. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs at this college did more of the faculty tasks assigned above to the dean. The dean interviewed had only staff authority, no line authority.

One university dean interviewed was responsible for 600 faculty members, and admitted that with that span of responsibility, it was impossible for her to spend time with individual instructors to help them to improve their teaching. She had to depend on her 20 department chairs to each work with approximately 30 faculty members.

One can conclude from both the quantitative and qualitative data presented above, that there is a large difference in the role of the dean in the university, and the role of the liberal arts college dean and/or of the two year college dean. The dean in a university is quite distant from the faculty and must delegate most of the tasks for working with the faculty to the department chairpersons.

In summary, the data presented in this first section have helped to answer the first research question, as to who at the college level has the primary responsibility for instructional leadership activities. It is the college dean at all but the large universities. At the large universities, the instructional leadership activities studied in this dissertation research are done by the department chairperson. It was found that the type, size and kind of the college does
make a difference to the role delineation of the dean. The dean in the liberal arts college, which is often the middle sized institution, is active hiring faculty, conducting faculty development activities, approving conference and seminar expenses and evaluating and approving faculty for tenure. The two year college dean is also very involved in these activities, but in some cases must seek budgetary approval from the president or provost of the college. The university dean is only in approving sabbaticals and leaves, in all other tasks, he delegates or shares his authority with the department chairperson.

An analysis of these findings leads to the construction of different models of governance in the different kinds of colleges. The bureaucratic model is prevalent in the two year colleges. The dean has a job description with clear role expectations and limitations of his authority. He must seek presidential approval on budgetary items impacting faculty.

The liberal arts dean represents the collegial model of governance, the "first among equals", the instructional leader of the faculty who works closely with the faculty. The university dean operates according to a political model of governance. The institutional situation dictates limitations to his ability to work with the faculty. He must depend on the department chairperson to implement his goals with the faculty.
The data presented above also answer the research question asking how the dean or department chair prepare themselves for this instructional leadership position? The deans in the community colleges have prepared themselves for their position by taking educational administration courses and most often have their terminal degree in education or educational administration. The deans in the liberal arts colleges do extensive reading and attend conferences and seminars for deans; there are a significant number who also prepare themselves by studying and obtaining a higher degree in education. The deans in the universities use the means included in the questionnaire the least. The majority were full professors, but did not have the other experiences. In the interviews, it was discovered that some of these deans had prepared themselves for this position by becoming ACE Fellows, or by attending the summer workshop for college administrators at Harvard. Other programs were mentioned in the interviews, but the consensus opinion was that a low percentage of university deans actually take advantage of these opportunities.

Data were also generated during the personal interviews to answer the research question of whether or not they experienced role conflict in the position as dean. It was found that the majority of the deans who had experienced role conflict did so because they were promoted to the deanship from a position from within the institution. The other deans
came to the institution to be the dean, and thus experienced less role conflict. This finding could be very valuable to college presidents seeking to fill administrative posts within their institution. Perhaps, they would be well advised to seek candidates from outside of the institution, in order to ensure a more smooth transition with less role conflict.

The Supervisory Activities of the Dean

This second section will report on the findings of questions seven and eight of the questionnaire in which the deans were asked to indicate the ways in which they work with their faculty to assist them in the improvement and/or enhancement of their teaching. The deans interviewed were also asked the open ended question "How do you work with your faculty to help them improve the quality of their instruction?" As in the above section, the qualitative data will follow the quantitative data.

Table XVIII summarizes the responses given by the deans to question seven of the questionnaire which asked them to indicate the supervisory techniques which they use with their faculty to help them improve their teaching.

From the table, it can be seen that end of the course evaluations are used more than any other technique i.e. used by ninety six percent of the respondents. Students opinions
of faculty teaching are the most universally means of letting faculty know how they are doing and where they need to improve their teaching, according to the students. Attendance at professional conferences are promoted by eighty eight percent of the deans, followed by individual conferences (85%) and classroom visitation (81%). In-services and workshops, syllabus review and curriculum development with the faculty member are done in seventy to eighty percent of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table XVIII</th>
<th>SUPERVISORY TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual conferences</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the course evaluations</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom visitation by supervisor</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-services, workshops and lectures</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate education courses</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video taping an instructor</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observation by colleagues</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional conferences</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus review</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classroom observation by colleagues (peer review) is used in only sixty two percent of the institutions. In the personal interviews with the deans it was consistently given as a goal to be implemented in the near future by these institutions. Graduate education courses and video taping an instructor are not popular activities, checked by only twenty to thirty percent of the respondents.

An analysis of these finding reveals that college deans do engage in many supervisory techniques. This finding itself may be surprising to many readers. One does not usually think of the job of the college dean as similar to a school principal, but these findings indicate that there is great similarity in their roles. K-12 students are not usually asked to complete end of the course evaluations so this technique does not correlate to K-12 supervisory techniques. End of the course evaluations are a questionable supervisory technique, perhaps they should be considered as outcome measures; then they could be correlated to the basic skills tests which K-12 students take each year, and are used to measure the teachers' effectiveness in teaching as well as the students' achievement in learning.

Professional conferences, classroom visitation by supervisor with individual follow-up conferences and in-services, workshops and lectures are techniques commonly used by school principals, as well as the college dean to work with the faculty to improve/enhance the teaching. Syllabus review
for the college dean could be compared to lesson plan approval, and curriculum development with the faculty member is common once again to both K-12 supervision as well as the college dean's supervisory activities.

These findings are considered to be very important to this dissertation research as they give validity to the theory proposed in the review of the literature chapter that there is more similarity than difference between administration in schools and colleges. One can conclude from these findings that the two types of educational institutions would benefit if they were to share paradigms, research findings and literature.

Crosstabulations were made of supervisory activities by type of college. Only the significant crosstabulation tables will be reproduced in this dissertation.

From Table XIX it can be seen that the only variables which showed a significant dependance on type of college are classroom visitation by supervisor and graduate education courses. In both cases it can be seen that these activities are most often used in the two year colleges. Classroom visitation by supervisor has a Chi Square of 21.99 which is significant at the .001 level. The contingency coefficient of .4513 shows a moderately strong relationship between type of college and classroom visitation. It is used in ninety eight percent of the two year colleges, in seventy seven
### TABLE XIX
**TYPE OF COLLEGE BY SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES OF DEAN**

#### "Classroom visitation by Supervisor"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 21.99 df 2 \( p = .0001 \)
Contingency Coefficient .4513

#### "Graduate education courses on teaching"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL ARTS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 12.42 df 2 \( p = .0020 \)
Contingency Coefficient .3553

percent of the liberal arts colleges and in only thirty six percent of the universities. As the size of the college increases the tendency to use classroom visitation decreases.

Graduate education courses on teaching has a Chi Square of 12.42 which is significant at the .01 level. The Contingency coefficient of .3553 shows a lower relationship than that found in classroom visitation, however it is significant and expresses the relationship that as the type of the college increases, the tendency to use this supervisory technique decreases. This statistic shows that this supervisory techniques is found almost exclusively in the two
year colleges (48%); it is rarely used in liberal arts colleges or universities.

These findings allow us to answer the second research question which asks if there is any significant difference between the supervisory activities of college deans in two year and four year colleges. There are two supervisory techniques, classroom visitation and graduate education courses, which are used most often in the two year colleges. These techniques point to a more bureaucratic structure with close supervision and course requirements in order to be promoted to a higher salary schedule.

Crosstabulation of these supervisory activities by size of institute did not reveal any significant relationships. This lack of finding in itself is significant. It indicates that the difference is supervisory techniques used is more a factor of the different philosophies prevailing in the different types of colleges in which the dean works, than an organizational factor, such as span of supervision or monies available, based on size of the institute. Does the mission of the college which expresses the type of college which it is, encourage the supervision of faculty to improve their teaching, or is the mission of the college research, with teaching secondary to its true purpose?

For each college, a new variable, "SUP TECH" was formed by adding up each of the supervisory techniques used by the dean of that college. Through analysis of variance, this
variable was then compared to type and size of college, title, degree and field of respondent, in order to assess whether there was a significant difference in this variable when controlling by these other factors. There was no difference found in supervisory techniques when controlling by title, field and degree of respondent. However, when controlling for type and size of college, some interesting relationships were found. They are shown in Table XX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE XX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISORY TECHNIQUES BY TYPE AND SIZE OF COLLEGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>52.232</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.058</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of College</td>
<td>33.599</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.800</td>
<td>4.305</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Institution</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Way Interaction</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size by Type</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>56.309</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.044</td>
<td>2.061</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>300.515</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>356.824</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(87 cases were processed, 2 cases (2.3%) were missing.

Table XX confirms the findings above that there is a difference in the total supervisory activities engaged in by deans in the different types of colleges. The main effects of the variation between the different groups of respondents has a F ratio of 3.346, p = .014. There is also a difference
between the supervisory techniques used and the type of college. This F ratio of 4.305 has a p of .017. There is no significant difference between supervisory techniques used in the different sizes of institutions and there is no interaction between type of college and size of institution.

This statistical table helps us to answer the research question, "Is there a difference in supervisory techniques used in different types and sizes of institutions?" As stated above, there is a difference in the different types of colleges, but not in the different sizes. One can thus relate the above findings about the preparation of the dean, and the common characteristics of the supervisory techniques engaged in by the dean and the school principal to formulate a plan for the joint administrative training and preparation of college deans and school principals. To date, only the two year college dean takes advantage of this program; the liberal arts college dean would be well advised to take some supervision courses in order to help him/her work most effectively with his/her faculty to improve their teaching. The dean is a professional who schedules how he/she will use his time. The dean that takes time to work with the faculty tells the faculty that they, their needs and their courses are of interest to the dean. That there are differences in how the dean chooses to use his time in the different types of colleges leads one to conclude that there are different messages being conveyed on the different campuses as to how
important teaching, the faculty and the students are to the institution.

Question eight on the questionnaire asked for an open ended response. It asks the respondent to indicate their opinion as to what was the most important change that could be made at their institution to improve the quality of instruction. The answers to this 'qualitative' question were grouped by the researcher into categories. Table XXI shows a rank ordering of these responses by the general categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Faculty Development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased funds</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Faculty Evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Changes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Student Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Law Changes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Changes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among those who designating some type of improvement in faculty development, three mentioned stimulating conversation between faculty, five requested faculty development seminars on teaching and pedagogy, two suggested recognition of excellent faculty teaching, one suggested giving money to those who do attend workshops on teaching techniques and one suggested setting up mentoring. New technology was mentioned three times as a focus for faculty development, computer literacy was mentioned twice. Three times more money for faculty development was mentioned, so this was included in both categories.

Under increased funds, better salaries were mentioned twice, funds to hire more full-time faculty was mentioned once as was money to pay faculty to attend seminars on teaching. More money could also be used for travel, to purchase needed equipment and to provide resources.

Suggestions for improving faculty mentioned hire more full-time faculty five times; a finding which concurs with the unexpected finding of this survey research, i.e. the high percentage of part-time faculty now found on campuses. One respondent suggested hiring more faculty with Ph.D.'s, one dean mentioned hiring more faculty, and another responded "hiring even better faculty than we do". One respondent designated the need to get rid of unproductive faculty.

Better faculty evaluation is a category that had many different suggestions. Twice the observation of the classroom
by colleagues was mentioned (peer evaluation), structured formative evaluation was noted. Instituting a statement of expected performance for evaluation with feedback was also mentioned twice. Merit based pay was also mentioned twice. This is one of the ways found through this research, that more and more institutions are encouraging good teaching.

It is interesting that both in the literature and in this research it was found that one of the ways to improve teaching in higher education is to release faculty from "so much teaching responsibility." Answers to this question also mentioned two times, giving the department chairperson released time and hiring more faculty so that there would be a lighter course load (mentioned three times) and smaller classes (mentioned once).

Organizational changes mentioned the department chairperson twice. As noted above, the community colleges have an organizational structure in which a divisional head has taken over the position of department chairperson, but now has a span of control that is too large. Eliminating unions was also mentioned once.

Improved student relations included treating students as humans, giving more personal attention to students and using student data better for assessment purposes.

Tenure law changes were mentioned three times; either eliminating tenure, instituting post-tenure review or providing for the elimination of poor faculty members.
Attitude changes is an interesting categorization. Mentioned were changes in attitude toward teaching, improving instructors attitudes and improving attitudes towards students.

Sixteen respondents left this question blank, one person wrote that everything was "okay as is."

An analysis of these findings would lead one to conclude that in the majority of the colleges, the major suggestion given as a way to improve the quality of instruction at the institution involved some aspect of faculty development. This finding leads one to conclude that, even though section three of this chapter documents that there is much faculty development taking place on campuses today, the consensus opinion is that it is not adequate. Faculty development needs to be expanded, made more effective, given more funding or improved to include formative peer evaluation if it is really to help improve the quality of instruction on the campuses.

The second major area which emerges from the answers to this question involves institutional organizational changes which, according to the respondents, are currently impeding the development of quality teaching. Hiring more full-time faculty, instituting merit pay, eliminating unions with their tenure protection powers and reorganizing the organizational chart as well as policies regarding course loads were all institutional changes which the respondents thought would facilitate the improvement of teaching.
In the interviews with deans, they were asked to designate which of the supervisory activities they had checked were considered by them to be the most effective. The deans were also asked to elaborate on the particular suggestion they made in question eight which would improve the quality of teaching at their institution. In additions, the deans were asked 'how they work with their faculty in order to help them improve their teaching.' The researcher was surprised at how much the deans did to supervise instruction and why they did it.

All of the deans who checked individual conferences with faculty members felt that was the most effective means of working with the faculty. "Each has different needs. It is really only by talking with them that you know what their particular problem or need is. If you talk with your faculty you can then plan your in-service presentations, or encourage them to attend some upcoming conference which you think would help them." The only dean who did not use individual conferences was a dean of a large, public university.

The deans interviewed regarded student evaluations of instruction as valid ways of identifying poor instructors, but not as effective in identifying excellent instruction. "Some students may like a particular teacher because he gives out all A's, that does not necessarily mean he is a good instructor." "Bad news travels fast, good news takes a long time to arrive at this office," one dean stated. These deans
found that classroom visitation was a far superior instrument for judging a professors competence than student course evaluations.

The only deans who did not visit the classrooms for observation of teaching, were the deans in the universities. This corresponds to questionnaire findings and the literature. Both of the deans in the liberal arts colleges made a point of visiting each faculty members class, if not every year, every other year. In the private universities, the deans are working to have peers visit one another's classes, not for evaluative purposes, but for enhancement purposes. "Evaluation of instruction has too often been tied to summative, personnel decisions and has not been used in a collegial supportive sense."

One college dean explained her work with the faculty. "I review their course syllabi. I ask them to include course objectives. Sometimes I ask them to revise them, if I see that they expect graduate level work of undergraduates. I talk to all of my faculty on a regular basis. I know when they are absent and I know how their class is going. I have an open door policy."

The researcher was surprised to hear Bloom and Tyler, Mager and Flanders, mastery learning, accountability and assessment mentioned in the conversations with the deans. They were knowledgeable about educational theory, and they saw their role as passing on this educational theory to their
faculty through one-to-one conversations and through inservices. "You get them into your college and then you have to brain-wash them into your mission and how to teach at your institution."

One four year college dean, (not trained himself in education) had the methodology of college teaching down to a science. "I sit down with a new faculty member and in one session, I can tell them the basics of what they will need to know about writing a syllabus and planning their classes. They need to know the building block concept, i.e. that there are certain learnings the students must have after their course in order to go on to the next course."

Some supervisory activities are necessarily prescribed for tenure decisions. Student evaluations of courses are used in all colleges. One school includes students on the tenure committee. They candidly and randomly survey students opinions regarding the faculty. Other institutions require classroom visitation by colleagues, some require a visit by an administrator. Others require recommendation letters from one's colleagues and department chairperson. A portfolio of the faculty member's research is also reviewed. In the community colleges, attendance at professional development courses is mandated for tenure and for increases in salary.

An analysis of these findings would lead one to conclude that the deans do take their supervisory role seriously. The deans are committed to ensuring that quality teaching is
taking place on their campuses. Whether or not the deans have been trained professionally in supervision, they employ many of the same supervisory techniques used by school principals to work with their faculty. This finding adds support to the hypothesis stated in the review of the literature that there is more similarity than difference between the role of the college dean and the school principal.

The deans were asked in the interview how important good teaching was to receiving tenure? Several deans outlined the tenure criteria for me. One even showed me the manual which explained the measurement of each criteria in detail.

We have four criteria for promotion and tenure. Academic credentials is one. Two, Teaching effectiveness. Third, Research and publication. Fourth, service to the college and community. Teaching is number one in importance. We cannot afford to have teachers who are not effective in the classroom. Private schools are expensive. They have to be very good. They have to build their reputation on teaching, so this is one area in which I take a great deal of personal interest in.  

Another dean suggested that the dichotomy between teaching and research is not necessarily true. "I find that the best teachers are also the best researchers. It's not that people are good at one thing and not the other. I just don't find that to be the case."

The answers to this question led the researcher to conclude that the reform report recommendation "to

15 From interview transcript of a dean from a four year liberal arts college.
institutionalize a system which provides incentives for good teaching" is being realized today by a new philosophy regarding tenure. Research alone is no longer the main criteria for tenure. Teaching is now also considered through quantifiable measures as a tenure criterium.

The interviewer also asked the deans the open ended question of how they worked with their faculty to help them improve their teaching? Three of the deans interviewed admitted that they still needed to develop a program for "the evaluation and enhancement of teaching effectiveness." Those who had a program in place admitted that it was for tenure and promotion purposes and thus was for summative purposes, not formative.

"We have an evaluation process with four components: self evaluations, peer evaluations, administrative evaluation and department evaluation." A community college dean explained what he did if he had a faculty member who needed 'enhancement'. "I suggest that he sit in on the class of a 'distinguished professor,' or I recommend that they video-tape themselves teaching, just for their own review; or I suggest he attend our faculty development seminars on methods of teaching and learning."

Another dean mentioned the importance of developing assessment strategies for feedback to faculty.

Students come to us with different abilities, that is a given. It is what we do with them after we get them which is the most important. We don't know if we are effective. We need to have a test at entry
and then at graduation. What have we added to their intellectual growth?. That value added component. Assessment and accountability is what everyone is asking for today.\textsuperscript{16}

In the public two year colleges, post-tenure review of faculty has been in place for the last two years. This is a significant development; which could be designated as one of the effects of the reform documents, as it was suggested in their recommendations. Post-tenure review necessitates that the dean use approved supervisory and evaluation techniques, so it is valuable that the majority of these deans have prepared themselves for their role through formal course work in administration and supervision.

Three of the deans interviewed did not have tenure problems: the two year private colleges did not have tenure, only longevity pay increases; one of the liberal arts colleges had five year renewable contracts. All of the other institutions had tenured faculty, who were basically secure (no matter how poor their teaching was), as tenure review had not been implemented in these institutions.

What do these college deans do if they have a tenured faculty member who is not teaching effectively? A similar pattern emerged from the interviews. First, the dean has the department chairperson talk with the faculty member. If the situation continues, the dean will then usually meet

\textsuperscript{16} From the transcript of an interview with a Dean of a public university.
themselves with the faculty member, make suggestions, type up the meeting recommendations and file it in the faculty member's personnel file. Sometimes the situation improves, but sometimes it continues. Most of the colleges have no other resource. "If they don't improve, the only thing you can do is hope that they will find another place to go, or that they will retire. It's really a problem."

Two of the university deans interviewed are on institutions which have merit pay; that seems to be the only institutional incentive in place. "My philosophy is that faculty are salvageable until they prove to me that I am wrong," one dean stated. "You work with them, you try to give them special projects or have them work with exemplary faculty."

From an analysis of the answers to these questions, one could conclude that there are three major movements supported by the deans in order to improve the quality of instruction on campuses today: 1.) The faculty development component, i.e. improved seminars and in-services on teaching techniques and learning theory. 2.) The post-tenure review tied with merit based pay, so that quality instruction can be rewarded and there can be some way to penalize poor instructional effort. 3.) The movement to better evaluation of instruction, and especially by peers, for formative purposes.

It is important to note that the deans interviewed were proud of their institutions and proud of their faculty. Most
would admit of only having about five percent of their faculty which they felt needed to work on developing their teaching and felt that the majority were excellent teachers and dedicated professionals. One community college dean stated the following.

I think the teaching here is as good if not better than in the four year college. Our faculty do not have to publish or perish. Faculty here are paid to be in the classroom. Union contract limits the class size to 35. So there are no 500 student lectures. Therefore there can be a more intimate relationship between teacher and student. I would argue that our instruction is as good if not better than in the four year colleges.

A liberal arts college dean was just as proud of her faculty. She explained that teaching at a denominational college necessitated a special philosophy of education in which the faith was integrated in each of the classes. "The vast majority of my faculty are very capable and they have a holistic view of learning. We really believe here that you are a whole human being created in the image and likeness of God and therefore you're moral development, your social development, your emotional development is as important as your intellectual development."

In summary, this section has answered the second research question. It has shown the college deans do use supervisory activities to work with their faculty to improve their teaching. Although student evaluations of instruction is used by the largest majority of the responding colleges, personal conferences with instructors is considered to be the most
effect means of working with faculty. There is a difference in supervisory activities by type of college and also by size of college. Two year colleges use graduate education courses and classroom visitation more than liberal arts colleges or universities. Two year public colleges now have a contract agreement which requires the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty. Universities, due to their size cannot have individual conferences with faculty. Liberal arts colleges and private universities are moving toward peer review as a means of formative and summative evaluation.

An analysis of the responses to the open ended question, "What is the single most important change which would improve the quality of instruction on your campus?" revealed that the majority indicated some aspect of faculty development. This finding attests to the appropriateness of this dissertation research. As stated in the first chapter, four year liberal arts colleges pride themselves on the "excellence in teaching" as part of their mission. The two year community college states that they emphasize excellence in teaching over research and publication. The next section will answer the research question as to whether one of these types of colleges is more committed to excellence in teaching, as measured by the faculty development activities which they sponsor?
Faculty Development in the Colleges

One of the purposes of this dissertation was to study the effect which the higher education reform documents issued in 1984 and 1985 have had on colleges campuses and to see what changes have been made in the past five years in order to address the recommendation to "institutionalize an incentive system for quality teaching" in undergraduate institutions of higher education.

Each dean interviewed was asked to summarize any significant changes that had been made by their institution in the last five years to facilitate and encourage good teaching. All of the deans were aware of the reform document "A Nation at Risk." One dean, at her position for only three years, admitted "right up front" that she was not familiar with the higher education reform documents. Another dean had all three documents right at her desk in an appropriately labeled stack file. All of the other deans acknowledged that they were familiar with the reform movement, however the researcher was not aware until later in the process that perhaps some of them were only aware of the K-12 reform reports and not familiar with the specifics of the higher education reform documents.

Eighty percent of the deans interviewed mentioned that it was not the reform documents per se as much as meeting the challenges of educating today's college student which had
moved them and their institution to promote faculty development.

Have the reports made a difference to us? It is the student that is so different and our faculty has had to adapt. Our American concept of higher education has changed enormously over the years. If a faculty member continues to "dump it out" like he did two or three decades ago without facing the reality of what is in front of him, then things are really going to be bad. And yet you don't want your standards to go down, down, down. It's not that they're not intelligent, it's just a whole different student. The world is not reading like it used to read. We're so visual. The people sitting out in front of us are visually oriented. We have to be more realistic, deal with what you have and bring them up. ¹⁷

The faculty development seminars mentioned by the deans in interviews reflected the areas currently of concern. Writing across the curriculum, seminars on teaching and learning styles, critical thinking, global education, multicultural awareness, computer literacy, seminars on William Perry's theories and Benjamin Bloom's research and also on Allan Bloom's The Closing of the American Mind were mentioned by several deans as topics for faculty development seminars which they have found help faculty meet the challenges of teaching in this decade.

One dean stated how she has worked with her faculty as she saw the student population changing.

I addressed the faculty in a positive way. I said that I know that you with your intellectual background have been able to see in your classes that the population is changing. The student

¹⁷ Transcript of an interview with a liberal arts college dean.
clientele is changing so that means you will have to address your planning for instructional purposes. I asked them what were some of the things that they felt they needed help in and I brought in some people to do some workshops here on campus.\(^\text{18}\)

One can conclude that changes have been made on college campuses in the past five years. Some changes in supervisory activities have been noted above, i.e. evaluation of tenured faculty, institutionalization of merit pay, that could be credited to the impact of the reform documents. However, the majority of the changes made on campuses in the last five years have not been due to the reform documents per se. These changes are more a result of the changing student population: less traditional age students, more part-time students working full-time, more returning adults, and open access to higher education.

**TABLE XXII**

**DOES INSTITUTION HAVE FORMALIZED PROGRAM OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two year</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square 2.654, df 4, \( p = .6172 \), Contingency C. = .1720

\(^{18}\) From the interview transcript with a community college dean.
Table XXII shows the answer to the first part of question ten on the questionnaire by respondents from each type of college. This question asks if the institution has a formalized program of faculty development.

Sixty three of the respondents answered yes (72%), twenty answered no (23%) and four answered with an indirect yes, but using such expressions as "sort of", "not really, but we're doing some things", etc. The Chi Square was not significant for this question, that means that the answer to the question is independent of the kind of institution responding. The crosstabulation by size of institute also failed to have a significant Chi Square. Therefore, one can conclude that the answer to this question did not depend on type or size of institute responding.

This question was key for selecting deans to interview, two deans were interview from each type of institution. One dean had answered "yes" to this question and the other dean had designated "no". However, when interviewing those who had answered no, it was discovered that they did have faculty development going on in their institution, but it was not what they considered formalized. This is the value of qualitative research united to quantitative research. Probing deeper into a simple yes or no can uncover many hidden meanings. Two schools that answered no, did so because they did not have formalized faculty development sponsored by their institution;
however the institution was part of a larger system or of a consortium of like colleges and could participate in the system-wide faculty development activities. Another dean had written proposals to the Lilly Foundation and was anticipating the institutionalization of faculty development at her college in the near future.

A public university that did not have formalized faculty development, did have one system in place for obtaining release time and another system for obtaining funds. The serious faculty member could, by applying to both sources provide him/herself with development opportunities.

One dean who had indicated "no" as her response to this question because the institute only participated in a consortium of Christian colleges which sponsored faculty development activities, revealed during the interview many activities which had been sponsored by her office which the researcher considered as faculty development activities. One can conclude from these findings that the answer to this question depended greatly on one's interpretation of the words "formalized faculty development activities." In addition, this particular dean will be hiring by next fall an associate dean who will have faculty development as one of his specified job responsibilities.

The two year private colleges had the least amount of faculty development going on or able to be sponsored; even the one which indicated that they did have a formalized program
had very few elements in place. The main avenue of faculty development in these colleges was the faculty meeting. One college with all part-time faculty paid their instructors to attend the faculty meeting, so as to ensure participation.

An analysis of the interview findings lead the researcher to conclude that faculty development activities were happening at all campuses, no matter how this question was answered on the questionnaire. In fact, plans for setting up formalized faculty development are in the workings at three of the five institutions that had answered "no" to this question.

Table XXIII exhibits the answers to question 10 a. of the questionnaire which asked the dean to check the goals of faculty development at his/her institution. This question was included in the questionnaire in order to provide a test of the Bergquist model of faculty development explained in Chapter II on the review of the literature; pages 78-79 above. The goals were taken from those specified by William Bergquist and Steven Philips in their seminal article on faculty development written in 1975.\textsuperscript{19} It also provides data for answering the research question of whether there is any difference in the kind of faculty development sponsored in the different types of colleges by documenting whether the goal

of faculty development is different in the different kinds of colleges.

From this table, it can be seen that there is very strong agreement that a goal of faculty development is the personal development and renewal of the faculty (90%) and that a goal of faculty development is to help improve the instructional abilities of the faculty (85%). Developing the curriculum by keeping current with new methods and technology is also a well accepted goal (72%). Developing a supportive environment was considered important by sixty eight of the respondents. Interpersonal skills training for faculty and developing conflict management/problem solving skills were not considered important goals.

**TABLE XXIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement with stated goal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Personal development and renewal of the faculty</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Interpersonal skills training for the faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONAL DIMENSION a + b</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improving the instructional abilities of faculty</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Curriculum development, new instructional methods</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL DIMENSION c + d</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Developing a supportive environment</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Developing conflict mgmt./problem solving skills</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ORGANIZATIONAL DIMENSION e + f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Total missing observations to this question equals 20.)
These separate goals were then combined to formulate the three dimensions of faculty development found in the Bergquist model - the personal, instructional and organizational dimensions. The total response indicates the number of people who agreed with both goals of that dimension. From Table XXII it can be seen that sixty nine percent of the respondent agree with the instructional dimension of faculty development. However there is not significant support for the total components of the personal dimension nor for the organizational dimension. The majority of the deans see the main goal of faculty development as the improvement or enhancement of the instructional skills of the faculty.

A crosstabulation of these goals by type of college revealed three significant relationships which are shown in Table XXIV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>Personal development</th>
<th>Supportive environment</th>
<th>Interpersonal skills training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree with goal</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two year</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.55 df 2</td>
<td>6.578 df 2</td>
<td>6.918 df 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p =</td>
<td>.0139</td>
<td>.0373</td>
<td>.0315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency C.</td>
<td>.3507</td>
<td>.2999</td>
<td>.3059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The personal development of the faculty is considered a goal of faculty development in ninety two percent of the reporting two year colleges and in ninety one percent of the liberal arts colleges. However it is a goal in only seventy seven percent of the universities. The Chi Square of 8.55 is significant at the .01 level with a contingency coefficient of .3507 which shows a moderate relationship; as the type of college increases, the agreement with this goal decreases.

Developing a supportive environment is considered a major goal for eighty seven percent of the liberal arts colleges and sixty three percent of the two year colleges. Once again the universities do not show strong support for this goal. The Chi Square of 6.57 is significant at the .05 level with a contingency coefficient of .2999 and shows a moderate relationship between type of college and this goal.

Interpersonal skills training is considered a goal of faculty development at fifty nine percent of the two year colleges but is not supported strongly as a goal of the liberal arts colleges or universities. The Chi Square of 6.918 is significant at the .05 level and has a moderate contingency coefficient of .3059 which expresses this relationship; as the type of college increases, the concurrence with this goal decreases.

There were no significantly different findings when controlling for size of institution, so one could conclude that the goal of faculty development at an institution has
more to do with the mission and philosophy of the institution as expressed by the type of college it is, than with its size.

An analysis of these findings reveals that although there concurrence among respondents that personal development is the major goal of faculty development, this goal is most important to the two year and liberal arts colleges. Developing a supportive environment is more important to the liberal arts dean than the two year dean, which could reflect the difference in the governance structure documented above. The liberal arts college stresses more of a collegial governance structure, so a supportive environment is essential. The two year college supports interpersonal skills training stronger than the other two kinds of colleges. This could reflect the fact expressed in the review of the literature regarding two year colleges, that one of their main tasks is advising students. Interpersonal skills training is essential for anyone with this role demand. Although more data is necessary to substantiate this claim, a patterns seems to be emerging that, in general, universities do not consider support of faculty development, in any of its aspects, as a major concern of the dean.

In the personal interviews, each dean was asked to define what faculty development meant to them. One community college dean emphasized faculty responsibility in her definition. "Faculty development includes any activity that is deemed necessary by the faculty or considered b the faculty as
something that would enhance their ability to better their instructional performance." Another community college dean emphasized the institutional responsibility. "There are a number of spokes on this wheel. You hire faculty where they are, right out of the business world, or from the hospitals. They have had very little, if any teaching experience. The institution needs to provide them with the development they need in order to be effective teachers."

A liberal arts college dean emphasized the components of faculty development in his definition. "In my case faculty development means attendance at professional meetings, a must today as things are changing so rapidly. It includes research and publication and working on projects with peers." A university dean defined faculty development as "providing opportunities for continued enhancement of teaching skills, professional involvement and professional service."

In conclusion, both the quantitative and the qualitative data support the instructional component of the Bergquist faculty development model, but show little confirmation of the personal and organizational components.

Table XXV shows the most common relationship between the office of the dean and faculty development. In seventy percent of the responding colleges, the office of the dean suggests topics for faculty development. In over half of the responding colleges, faculty development was funded from the office of the dean. It was begun by the office of the dean
in forty two percent of the institutions, and is still run by the dean's office in forty one percent of the colleges. Faculty development is completely independent from the dean's office on only twenty percent of the campuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE XXV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF THE DEAN IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development was begun by this office</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development is funded from this office</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. dev. for this college is run from this office</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This office suggests topics for faculty development</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. dev. is completely independent from this office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(19 missing observations)

The crosstabulation of type of college by the answers given for these questions revealed only one significant relationship, that regarding the funding of faculty development. Table XXVI shows these values. From this table it can be seen that almost eighty percent of the time faculty development is funded from the dean's office in liberal arts colleges. Forty six percent of the time it is funded from the dean's office in the two year college. However, it is only funded from this office twenty two percent of the time in the
universities. The Chi-Square of 11.53 is significant at the .01 level with a moderate Contingency C. of .3807. The relationship is not a direct linear correlation, but a strong nonlinear relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 11.53 df 4,  p = .021
Contingency Coefficient .3807

From the interviews, it was found that many deans are able to use unused funds from their office for extra faculty development activities. One of the respondents who had indicated that the institution did not have formalized faculty development, told of how she sponsored faculty development activities from her office budget. This dean took monies from other fund accounts to sponsor seminars and special lectures on teaching topics, summer stipends to develop new courses and to promote other faculty development activities.
The crosstabulation by size of institute with these variables referring to the relationship between the deans office and faculty development revealed two significant relationship. They are found in Table XXVII and show that the size of the institute is a strong factor in whether faculty development is funded from the deans office or is completely independent from the deans office. More than half of the small and medium size colleges fund faculty development from the dean's office, whereas this is the case in only fourteen percent of the larger universities. Faculty development is completely independent of the deans office in forty percent of the larger college, but is rarely independent from the dean's office in the smaller colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE COLLEGE</th>
<th>FUNDED</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 17.04 df 6, p = .0091 8.55 df 3, p = .036
Contingency C .4476 .3341
Analyzing the findings from these two tables concurrently, one can conclude that the liberal arts college dean (usually found in small or medium sized institutions) funds faculty development. If the dean funds the faculty development, one can assume that the dean is very much involved in what goes on in this program, and also is very aware of who from the faculty participates in these activities which he/she is so "generously" funding from the office of the dean. One can image that in this situation, faculty will probable be very involved in the process of planning faculty development.

In the universities, which usually correspond to the larger sized institutions, faculty development is completely independent from the office of the dean. From the review of the literature, this indicates the presence of the "Instructional Development Office," found on many major university campuses. In this situation, the dean is distant from the process, as are the faculty. Seminars are planned by the instructional development office staff, and each faculty member at the university is free to participate or not as he or she sees fit. Although all of the resources for improving instruction are present in this situation, many times the personal motivation resulting from encouragement by the dean to participate in these activities is absence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New faculty orientation</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors handbook</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty meetings</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty needs analysis</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus seminars</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution sponsored seminars</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty mentors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional travel reimbursement</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development library</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition reimbursement</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty retreats</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-taping instruction</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer evaluation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation questionnaires</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching demonstrations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini courses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coops with other Colleges</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical leaves</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With 14 missing observations.
Question 10 c asked the respondents to check all of the elements included in the faculty development program at their institution. The elements included are found in Table XVIII.

From the table it can be seen that professional travel reimbursement is the most common faculty development element, found in ninety four percent of the reporting colleges. New faculty orientation, faculty meetings, institution sponsored seminars and sabbatical leaves are the next most common elements, found in over eighty percent of the institutions. Peer evaluation is currently found in only sixty seven percent of the colleges, however from the personal interviews, it was the most commonly mentioned faculty development component mentioned as a change that deans hoped to institute in order to improve the quality of instruction in their institution. The crosstabulation of faculty development elements by type of college revealed only two significant relationships. These are found in Table XXIX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>Faculty Meetings</th>
<th>Faculty Retreats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=Yes, % =Row %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Year</td>
<td>30 81</td>
<td>8 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>25 96</td>
<td>15 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>5 50</td>
<td>4 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 10.57 df 2, p = .0051 8.569 df 2, p = .0138
Contingency C. .3557 .3241

(14 missing observations.)
From this table, it can be seen that ninety six percent of the liberal arts colleges use faculty meetings for faculty development and over half of them also use faculty retreats. Eighty one percent of the two year colleges have faculty meetings, but only half of the universities do. The Chi-Square of 10.57 is significant at the .01 level with a moderate contingency coefficient of .3557. In contrast, faculty retreats are used at forty percent of the universities and only twenty two percent of the two year colleges. The Chi-Square of 8.56 is significant at the .01 level with a moderate contingency coefficient of .3241 and shows that as the size of the college increases, the use of faculty retreats for faculty development also increases.

The consistent non-linear relationship for these faculty development elements shows that liberal arts colleges use more of these elements that the other two types of colleges. They are consistently followed by the two year colleges. The universities use these elements the lowest percentage of the time. An analysis of this finding leads one to conclude that the liberal arts colleges, by the consistent effort they expend in sponsoring faculty development activities show their commitment to improving/enhancing the teaching on their campuses. The two year colleges follow right behind the liberal arts colleges in sponsoring faculty development activities which help their faculty to meet the challenge of teaching the different kinds of students they have in class.
The universities do not seem to be committed to improving teaching, if measured by faculty development elements. One can only conclude that they are indeed more committed to research.

The interviews confirmed this finding, but also revealed another interpretation of these statistics. One liberal arts dean stated that they had faculty meetings, but that faculty development activities were not done during the faculty meeting as there was too much business to conduct during the meeting. Perhaps some of the other respondents checked this item because they had faculty meetings, however, they do not necessarily mean they use faculty meetings for faculty development. Nevertheless, one dean interviewed had just come from a faculty meeting in which they had a discussion on "integrating the college curriculum" chaired by several of the college's own professors. Another dean mentioned that faculty development seminars were sponsored, but they were usually attended by the faculty who were already excellent teachers, not by those who most needed enhancement. An area for further research would be to measure the participation rate at these different faculty development activities.

Table XXX shows the crosstabulation by size of institution, including those elements which showed significant Chi Squares. It should be noted that there are four significant elements when controlling for size of institution, and there were only two when controlling for type of college.
It is also interesting to note that the significant elements are different in each cross-tabulation.

From this table it can be seen that Newsletters, Institutional Seminars, Demonstrations and Mini Courses are each more predominant in the medium sized institutions, then are found in the smaller sized institutions, and are found least often in the larger sized institutions. The larger sized institutions correlate most often to the universities.

**TABLE XXX**

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMPONENTS BY SIZE OF INSTITUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>Newsletters</th>
<th>Institutional Seminars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=YES, % = ROW</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 11.28 df 3, p = .0103 11.034 df 3, p = .0115
Contingency C. .3658 .3623

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE COLLEGE</th>
<th>Demonstrations</th>
<th>Mini courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 9.177 df 3, p = .0270 9.677 df 3, p = .0215
Contingency C. .3190 .3266

(0 missing observations.)
An analysis of these findings leads one to conclude that size is an important intervening variable affecting the types of faculty development activities sponsored in institutions. Financial elements do not seem to make a difference. One would assume that they should find more faculty development activities available in the larger universities, because they have more funds. When talking with deans in the smaller institutions, lack of funds is one of the main elements holding them back from doing more faculty development. However, the larger universities, with the funds are doing less than the liberal arts colleges. This is a very surprising finding, but one which has been corroborated consistently in each of the categories: the universities are doing much less faculty development that the liberal arts colleges. The liberal arts deans often must find unused funds in different categories, which they can use to sponsor faculty development.

Small size does seem to be a factor which affects faculty development. Some of the colleges are so small that they are limited as to what faculty development is needed, and effective. A small college may not need a newsletter, as the news can be communicated personally. Seminars and demonstrations are used, but not as often as the liberal arts college.

These findings were corroborated through the analysis of variance to see if there was a difference between the faculty
development activities sponsored and the size of the college. As done above for the other grouped variables, the total number of faculty development elements were summed for each college to form a new variable called "FACDEV." The values for this variable were then compared with type of college and size of institution in an analysis of variation in order to see if there was any difference in the values for this variable given different types and sizes of colleges. These values are found in Table XXXI.

| TABLE XXXI |
| ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE |
| FACULTY DEVELOPMENT BY TYPE AND SIZE OF COLLEGE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>412.599</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103.150</td>
<td>2.991</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of College</td>
<td>169.050</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84.525</td>
<td>2.451</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Institution</td>
<td>223.993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111.996</td>
<td>3.248</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Way Interaction</td>
<td>64.654</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.551</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size &amp; Type Coll</td>
<td>64.654</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.551</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>477.243</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68.179</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2413.734</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34.482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2890.987</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(81 cases were processed, 3 (3.7%) were missing)

From the above table it can be seen that there is a significant main effect. The F ratio of 2.991 is significant
at the .05 level and shows that there is a difference in the faculty development sponsored by the responding institutions. The type of college does not significantly explain this variance, however the size of the college does effect the kinds of faculty development sponsored by the college. Size of institution has a F ratio of 3.248, significant at the .05 level.

This is the first time that size of institution has been a more significant intervening variable than type of college. As mentioned above, this is because small size prohibits the use of some forms of faculty development. Due to small size, many things can be done less formally. The larger sized institutions are not prohibited from offering certain types of faculty development activities due size, as was the case when examining supervisory activities used in the larger universities. The larger sized institutions do not seem to place an emphasis on these elements.

Question 10 d of the questionnaire asks the respondents to approximate the dollar amount budgeted at their institution for faculty development and the total percentage of the budget which this represents. As indicated in the review of the literature, this is a difficult question to answer and to interpret, because it depends on whether the respondent considers all monetary allocations which impact faculty and thus aid in their professional development, or if one only considers the line item in the budget for faculty development.
This is the one question which was most consistently left blank or answered with "do not know" or "not available", this perhaps reflects the complexity of the question indicated above. Table XXXII shows the range of answers for this question.

From this table, it can be seen that there is a large range of amounts budgeted for faculty development, from $2000. to $500,000. The crosstabulations of amount budgeted by type of college did not reveal any significant relationship. In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE XXXII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOW MUCH IS BUDGETED FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Budgeted</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$10,000.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Missing Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20,000.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>or Did Not Know</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$30,000.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Minimum = $2,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$40,000.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maximum = $7000,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$50,000.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mean = $32,290.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$60,000.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard Deviation = 1.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$70,000.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$80,000.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$90,000.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$100,000.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$300,000.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=$500,000.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fact, a surprising finding was that the maximum of $700,000. was in a two year college, followed by a maximum of $250,000. in a liberal arts college with the highest a university reported was $200,000. The crosstabulation of amount budgeted by size of college was also not significant. One could only conclude that the amount budgeted for faculty development at a particular institution reflects more the institutional philosophy regarding faculty development than other external qualities of the college such as size or type.

The total percent of total budget allocated for faculty development ranged from .1% to 7%; the average amount was 1.5% of the budget with STD of .015. Correspondingly, the crosstabulation of percent of budget by type of college or size of college was not significant.

In the personal interviews, several of the deans mentioned their difficulty in answering this question, explaining the different ways it could be answer as mentioned above. Monetary constraints were a significant factor in the amount of faculty development that a private college can sponsor. One liberal arts dean said, "I wish that we had the money of the community colleges. I envy the community college that can have the support centers." Even so, a dean from a community college mentioned more funds as the main change that would improve teaching at her institution. When questioned during the interview about what she would do with these additional funds, she stated, "If I had more funds, I could
offer more workshops for the faculty with outside people conducting them, plus we could implement more programs such as the honors program, I started."

A surprising finding was the consistent support of foundations for faculty development activities. The Pew Foundation has helped two campuses, the Lilly Foundation had funded three of the colleges' faculty development programs, the American Council on Education funded one dean's pre-service preparation for the deanship, the Caterpillar Foundation, the Johnson Foundation and the Sears Foundation have all supported faculty development projects and/or have sponsored Excellence in Teaching Awards for faculty. The federal government also has funding available for faculty development if tied to improving the curriculum through the Title III program. The private sector is well aware of the reform report recommendations and has made significant monetary contributions to implement improvements.

In order for the institutions to receive these funds, proposals must be submitted. In all but the large public universities which have offices for development, these proposals are initiated and submitted by the dean.

In summary, this section has provided data to answer the third research question. It has shown that the general goal of faculty development is improving the instructional abilities of faculty. It has shown that faculty development is most often funded from the office of the dean in liberal
arts colleges, in two year colleges it is from the office of the dean or funded from another office (usually the president's or provost's office); in universities, faculty development is most often an independent center.

The most common faculty development elements are travel reimbursement, new faculty orientation, faculty meetings, and institution sponsored seminars.

There is a difference in the kinds of faculty development sponsored and the different types and sizes of colleges. Type of college influences whether there are faculty meetings or faculty retreats. Size of institution is the more significant influence on whether the institution has newsletters, institutional seminars, demonstrations or mini courses.

The underlying purpose of this dissertation was to assess the difference in faculty development activities in two and four year colleges to see if one type of institution could be judged as "better" based on the vitality of the teaching as reflected by the supervisory activities of the dean and faculty development sponsored by the institution. Based on the evidence, one would have to conclude that although the situation is different in two year colleges versus liberal arts colleges, both institutions are making significant efforts to work with their faculty to improve their teaching.

The situation in the universities, especially the research universities, i.e. those universities that did not classify themselves as liberal arts institutions, is
significantly different. The dean's span of control is so large that it is almost impossible for him/her to work with the faculty. The dean employs few supervisory techniques and the universities usually have faculty development as separate from the dean's office. Those faculty who want to may participate in these activities, however it is really left up to them.

The majority of the deans in the two and four year colleges are working diligently on improving teaching in their institution. Although the total number of these institutions is the majority of the colleges in the State, the total number of students enrolled in these institutions is less than half of the enrolled students. From the North Central Quarterly one can approximate that 158,250 students are enrolled in the one hundred two and four year liberal arts colleges as compared with a total number of 189,267 students enrolled in the twenty large public and private research universities. There is a need for the universities to response better to the reform report recommendations in order to seek to improve and enhance the teaching of their faculty.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary

The purpose of this dissertation was to study the educational leadership activities of college deans and department chairs in their role of working with the faculty to improve and/or renew their teaching. The 1984 higher education reform documents provided the historical perspective to this dissertation. This research sought evidence that the recommendations in these reports to improve teaching through institutional incentives had been implemented.

The conceptual framework of this dissertation was the Getzel's-Guba model of social behavior. Using the terms of this model, the role of the dean was studied to see if he/she was able to carry out the role of the dean according to the institutional expectations, or if there was role conflict.

The methodology of this dissertation was a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data. The first data source was an extensive review of the literature which revealed the prevailing understanding of the roles of the dean and the department chairperson in working with the faculty to improve and or develop their teaching expertise. From the literature review, it seemed that faculty development had diminished greatly in the early 80's, so it was important to conduct this
dissertation research in order to assess the situation as the 90's are begun.

The quantitative data source was a mailed questionnaire sent to all accredited two and four year colleges in the State of Illinois. A total of 124 questionnaires were sent out, 87 were returned, for a return rate of 70.2%. The questionnaire responses were entered into the computer. The statistical findings were reproduced in Chapter III in thirty statistical tables.

The third data source was personal interviews with a systematic sample of the questionnaire respondents. A total of 65 pages of transcribed interview conversation provided the third data source. This qualitative data source was used to corroborate the findings of the questionnaire, and where applicable, to indicate rival hypothesis or alternate interpretations of the data.

These three data sources, the review of the literature, the quantitative questionnaire response results and the qualitative interview findings are now used in this chapter in a triangulation in order to summarize the findings of this research. To review, the following are the three main research questions to be answered:

1. Who at the college level has the primary responsibility for instructional leadership activities, i.e. working with the faculty to help them to enhance and/or improve their teaching; is it the college dean or the department
chairperson? Does the type, size or kind of college make a difference to this role delineation?

a. How does the dean or department chair prepare themselves for this instructional leadership position? Do they experience role conflict?

b. Have the higher education reform documents asking for the improvement of college teaching been implemented in any way in the past five years by college deans or department chairs?

c. Is the movement to improve teaching more evident in the two year or four year college?

2. What instructional leadership activities are engaged in by deans and department chairs in order to improve the teaching ability of their college faculty?

a. What is the most commonly used and most effective supervisory techniques at the higher education level? Are they similar to K-12 supervisory techniques?

b. Is there a difference in supervisory techniques in different types and sizes of institutions?

c. What can/does a college dean do if he has a tenured faculty member who is teaching poorly?

3. Is there any difference between the kinds of faculty development sponsored by an institution and the type and size of the institution?
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a. Have any of the faculty development ideas found in the reform documents been implemented? Is the Bergquist model of faculty development the accepted paradigm?

b. Who is responsible for faculty development: the dean, the faculty or the institution?

c. Do faculty participate in faculty development activities? How are they encouraged to do so?

These questions will be used as the organizing framework in the next section which will summarize the conclusions of this research. It should be noted that these conclusions are based on the data generated from an area sample; two and four year accredited colleges in the State of Illinois. The conclusions can validly be generalized to the other midwestern states but should be generalized with caution as representative of the situation of higher education in the whole United States in the 90's.

Conclusions

Research Topic One

Who at the college level has the primary responsibility for instructional leadership activities, i.e. working with the faculty to help the enhance and/or improve their teaching; is
it the college dean or the department chairperson? Does the type, size or kind of college make a difference to this role delineation?

1. The college dean has the primary responsibility for instructional leadership activities at all but the large universities. At the large universities, the instructional leadership activities are delegated by the dean to the department chairperson.

2. There is a difference in the role delineation of the dean in different types, kind and sizes of institutions.
   a. Type of college is the more significant intervening variable, however there is also a difference in role when controlling by size of institution.
   b. The dean in the liberal arts college is most often engaged in working with the faculty, followed by the dean in the two year colleges, the dean in the university, may not even work directly with the faculty.
   c. In the smaller sized institutions, the dean fulfills main roles filled by other personnel in larger sized institutions.
a. How does the dean or department chair prepare themselves for this instructional leadership position? Do they experience role conflict?

1. There is a difference in the way the deans in the different types of colleges have prepared themselves for their role as deans.
   a. The deans in the community colleges have prepared themselves for their position by taking educational administration courses and most often have their terminal degree in education or educational administration.
   b. The deans in the liberal arts colleges do extensive reading and attend conferences and seminars for deans; there are a significant number who also prepare themselves by studying and obtaining a higher degree in education.
   c. The deans in the universities prepare themselves the least before or after becoming dean for the role of the dean.

2. Role conflict was detected in some of the deans.
   a. Prior professional preparation is one factor which helps reduce role conflict.
   b. A dean who comes to an institution as a dean experiences less role conflict than a dean who was promoted from within the institution.
b. Have the higher education reform documents asking for the improvement of college teaching been implemented in any way in the past five years by college deans or department chairs?

1. Changes in supervisory activities which have been made in the past five years and can be credited to the impact of the reform documents are the evaluation of tenured faculty, institutionalization of merit pay and the encouragement of peer evaluation.

2. It was found that it was not the reform documents per se as much as meeting the challenges of educating today's college student which had moved deans and their institution to promote faculty development.

c. Is the movement to improve teaching more evident in the two year or four year college?

1. Based on the evidence, one would have to conclude that although the situation is different in two year colleges versus liberal arts colleges, the majority of the deans in both institutions are making significant efforts to work with their faculty to improve their teaching.

2. There is a need for the universities to response better to the reform report recommendations in order to seek to improve and enhance the teaching of their faculty.
Research Topic Two

What instructional leadership activities are engaged in by deans and department chairs in order to improve the teaching ability of their college faculty?

1. College deans and department chairpersons do engage in instructional leadership activities and that they do work with their faculty to help them enrich and/or improve their teaching ability.

2. The most commonly used supervisory techniques is end of the course evaluations.
   a. Attendance at professional conferences was the second most common way of helping faculty to improve their teaching.
   b. Individual conferences, in-services, workshops and seminars on teaching and learning topics, classroom visitation, syllabus review and curriculum development with faculty members also used by deans to work with their faculty.
   c. Peer review is one of the main goals towards which many institutions are heading in order to improve faculty teaching.
a. What is the most commonly used and most effective supervisory techniques at the higher education level? Are they similar to K-12 supervisory techniques?

1. Individual conferences with faculty members are considered the most effective means of working with the faculty. Classroom visitation is considered a far superior instrument for judging a professor's competence than student course evaluations.

2. It was found that the deans in the two year colleges employ many of the techniques used by school principals to work with their faculty. There is more similarity than difference between the role of the college dean and the school principal.

b. Is there a difference in supervisory techniques in different types and sizes of institutions?

1. The only supervisory activities which showed a significant dependance on type of college are classroom visitation by supervisor and graduate education courses; these activities are most often used in the two year colleges.

2. There is a difference in the total supervisory activities engaged in by deans in the different types of colleges, however, there is no significant difference between
c. What can/does a college dean do if he has a tenured faculty member who is teaching poorly?

1. The dean can meet with the faculty member, makes suggestions, types up the meeting recommendations and files it in the faculty's personnel file.

2. A dean can suggest that the faculty member sits in on the class of a 'distinguished professor,' recommend that he video-tapes himself teaching, just for his own review; or suggest that he attends faculty development seminars on methods of teaching and learning.

Research Topic Three

Is there any difference between the kinds of faculty development sponsored by an institution and the type and size of the institution?

1. There is a difference in the kind of faculty development sponsored and the type of college.
Professional travel reimbursement was the most common faculty development sponsored in all institutions followed by new faculty orientation, faculty meetings, institution sponsored seminars and sabbatical leaves.

Faculty meetings and faculty retreats are used most often in liberal arts colleges then used in two year colleges and least used in the universities.

There are even more differences in faculty development elements in the different sizes of institutions.

Newsletters, Institutional Seminars, Demonstrations and Mini Courses are each more predominant in the medium sized institutions, then are found in the smaller sized institutions, and are found least often in the larger sized institutions.

The analysis of variance statistical test showed that there was a significant difference in the faculty development sponsored in different types and sizes of colleges with size being the more significant variable.

Is the Bergquist model of faculty development the accepted paradigm?
1. The data supported the instructional component of the Bergquist faculty development model, but showed little confirmation of the personal and organizational components.

2. It was concluded that the goal of faculty development at an institution has more to do with the mission and philosophy of the institution as expressed by the type of college it is, than with its size.

b. Who is responsible for faculty development: the dean, the faculty or the institution?

1. The type and size of the college are strong factors in determining who is responsible for faculty development.

2. Eighty percent of the time, the office of the dean is responsible for faculty development in some way.

3. Faculty development was completely independent from the dean's office most often on large university campuses.

c. Do faculty participate in faculty development activities? How are they encouraged to do so?

1. Good faculty do participate in faculty development activities, however those who need it the most usually do not attend unless encouraged.
2. In the two year public colleges, participation in faculty development activities is required for lane and salary advancement.

3. In liberal arts colleges and universities, most special faculty development projects require some type of proposal to be submitted which will allow the faculty member release time and funding.

Recommendations of this Study

1. The college dean has been shown in this research to have the primary responsibility for the instructional leadership activities at two and four year colleges. The main person to promote faculty development activities is also the dean. If teaching is to be improved on the college campuses, it will be the main role of the college dean. The job expectations of the college dean, especially regarding administrative paper work and report expectations, need to be reevaluated in order to allow for the time necessary for the dean to meet with and work with his/her faculty to enhance their teaching.

2. This research has shown the growing prevalence of degrees in educational administration in college deans. Educational administration programs would be well advised
to include higher education administration courses in their program of studies.

3. There is less role conflict when a person comes to a college as the dean, instead of being hired from within the faculty ranks. Administrators would be well advised to keep this fact in mind when seeking to fill academic administrative positions such as the deanship.

4. This research has shown that deans in liberal arts and two year colleges, in small and middle sized institutions, place more emphasis on good teaching as measured by the supervisory and faculty development activities sponsored on these campuses. Students or parents seeking quality higher education would be well advised to consider the educational quality at these institutions (measured by good teaching) as superior to that at the large universities.

5. This study has shown that the challenge facing higher education today is meeting the needs of the changing population of students. In order to do this, college faculty need to be well versed in teaching and learning theory, adult education psychology and alternate methods of instruction. It is urgent that all doctoral programs add a required teaching methods course to the required preparation of their graduate students.

6. This study has shown that the dean is in a key position to work with the faculty in two and four year liberal
arts colleges to improve their teaching. Administrative preparation programs such as the ACE Fellowship and the Harvard Summer School for College Administrators need to be expanded and made available to many more deans in order to help them improve their skills in this area.

7. This study has shown the similarity between the tasks of the dean working with the faculty and the principal who works with his teachers. The distinction between higher education administration and K-12 administration is contrived. It would be to the advantage of both fields of study if they could combine forces and use one another's research findings, models and paradigms to construct a shared field of educational administration.

8. Individual conferences with instructors was found to be the most effective supervisory activity. In order to facilitate this type of contact with the faculty, the dean would be well advised to be available, to be visible and to have an open door policy. Many times informal exchange is more effective than formalized, summative evaluation.

9. It was found that some of the reform report recommendations have been implemented in the past five years. Among these are peer evaluation, review of tenured faculty, and merit pay, although these are mostly
found on unionized college campuses. More institutions should adapt these methods of ensuring quality teaching.

10. Universities were consistently found to be behind the other types of institutions in their support for quality teaching as measured by supervisory activities and faculty development programs sponsored by the institution. Administrators and presidents of these institutions should reexamine their mission as an institution of higher education and address these areas of concern in order to provide a better quality education for more than half of the currently enrolled college students.

Suggestions for Further Study

Good research always points the way to further inquiry. This study was limited to the role of the dean and the department chairperson in working with the faculty to help improve their teaching.

1. This study identified the supervisory activities and faculty development elements in place at the different types of colleges. Another study with an experimental design could be done to measure the effectiveness of these techniques on improving the teaching of faculty.
2. This study identified the various ways people are trained to be dean. Another study could measure the effectiveness of these various means of preparation by measuring the perceived effectiveness of the dean by the faculty.

3. Another study could be conducted to ascertain what other individuals and what other factors significantly affect a faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher. The study could look at the staff of the college, the resources provided, the audiovisual and library support and other factors to see how important these are to faculty's effective teaching.

4. This study was limited to the State of Illinois. It was a total area sample. This study could be expanded to be a random sample of all the college deans in the United States. An international study could also be conducted to see what deans in colleges in Europe are doing to work with their faculty to improve their teaching. The pre-service training of faculty in other countries could also be researched in order to provide a model to the United States.

5. A study could also be made of the kinds of human resource development and in-house training conducted by businesses and industry, in order to see if there are any models or paradigms that could be used in faculty development.
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Dear Dean:

My name is Madonna Murphy and I am currently on a sabbatical leave from my position as Dean at Lexington Institute of Hospitality Careers. This year, I am working on my dissertation for a Ph.D. in Administration and Supervision at Loyola University of Chicago.

I am researching the role of the Dean in helping to improve teaching in the colleges. I am especially interested in how you work with your faculty to help them be better teachers.

If you supervise and work directly with faculty members, in your role as Dean, would you please take a few minutes to fill out this questionnaire? If you supervise other Deans and/or Department Chairs, who thus work more closely with the faculty, would you kindly give this questionnaire to one of them to fill out?

I realize that you have a very busy schedule with a tremendous amount of work to complete. That is why I have timed the mailing of the questionnaire to correspond with your semester break. I hope that this finds you at a time which is a little less hectic than usual, and with a few moments which you could give to this questionnaire. It should take no more than 10 minutes to complete. I ask you to please return the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope on or before January 31.

Thank you for your assistance.

Madonna Murphy

P.S. If you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study, please indicate this at the end of the questionnaire.
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your official title?

2. What is your highest earned degree and field?

3. Do you still teach? _____ If so, how many courses?_____

4. Which of the following experiences have you had which could be considered as a preparation for the deanship? (Check all that apply.)

   - Full professorship
   - Departmental Chairperson
   - Dean of another institution
   - Formal course training in administration
   - Independent reading of college administration literature
   - Attendance at professional development/conferences for deans

5. How many department chairs currently report to you?_____
   How many faculty members currently report to you?_____
   I.) How many are full-time?_____
   II.) How many are part-time?_____

6. Who assumes the primary responsibility at your institution in performing the following tasks with the faculty?

   1. Interviewing and hiring instructors
   2. Scheduling course loads/classes
   3. Registering students for class
   4. Conducting faculty meetings
   5. Promoting faculty development activities
   6. Approving sabbatical and special leaves
   7. Approving conference and seminar expenses
   8. Evaluating instructors
   9. Administering student course evaluations
   10. Recommending promotions, tenure

   Dean Chair

7. Of the following supervisory activities to help faculty improve their teaching, please check those that you use.

   - individual conferences with professors/instructors
   - end of the course evaluations filled out by students
   - classroom visitation by supervisor with follow-up conference
   - in-services, workshops and guest lectures on teaching techniques
   - graduate education courses on teaching and learning
   - video taping an instructor's presentation for observation
   - observation of the classroom by other instructors
   - attendance at professional conferences
   - syllabus review
   - curriculum development with faculty member

8. In your opinion, what is the single most important change that could be made at your institution to improve the quality of instruction?
9. Circle the factors that best describe your Institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CONTROL</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TYPE OF INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. public</td>
<td>1. 2-year</td>
<td>1. urban</td>
<td>1. vocational/professional college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. private</td>
<td>2. 4-year</td>
<td>2. suburban</td>
<td>2. community college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. university</td>
<td>3. rural</td>
<td>3. liberal arts college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF INSTITUTION (number of F.T.E. students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 500-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1000-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2000-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 5000-10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 10000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Does your institution have a formalized program of faculty development? ______

If yes, answer a, b, c, and d.

a. What is the goal of faculty development at your institution in your opinion? (Check all that apply.)

- The personal development and renewal of the faculty
- Seeking to develop a supportive environment for the faculty
- Improving the instructional abilities of the faculty
- Helping develop conflict management and problem solving skills in faculty
- Interpersonal skills training for the faculty
- Curriculum development, keeping current with new methods and technology

b. What is the relationship between your office and faculty development? (Check all that apply)

- Faculty development was begun by this office
- Faculty development is funded from this office
- Faculty development for this college is run from this office
- This office suggests topics for faculty development
- Faculty development is completely independent from this office

c. Check all of the elements below which are included in the faculty development program at your institution.

- New faculty orientation
- Instructor's handbook
- Faculty meetings
- Faculty needs analysis
- Off-campus seminars
- Institution-sponsored seminars
- Consultations
- Faculty mentors
- Professional travel reimbursement
- Professional development library
- Other (please specify)

- Tuition reimbursement
- Faculty retreats
- Newsletters
- Video-taping of instruction
- Peer evaluation
- Self evaluation questionnaires
- Teaching demonstrations
- Mini courses
- Coops with other colleges
- Sabbatical leaves
- This represents what percentage of the total budget? ______

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO FILL OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!!!
PLEASE RETURN IT BY JANUARY 31, 1990. USE THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE
Check here for copy of the results of this questionnaire ______
Your name ____________________________
February 12, 1990

Dear Dean:

My name is Madonna Murphy and I am currently on a sabbatical leave from my position as Dean at Lexington Institute of Hospitality Careers. This year, I am working on my dissertation for a Ph.D. in Administration and Supervision at Loyola University of Chicago.

I am researching the role of the Dean in helping improve teaching in the colleges. I am especially interested in how you work with your faculty to help them be better teachers.

In December, I sent you a questionnaire to fill out regarding your supervisory role and the faculty development sponsored by your institution.

I realize that you have a very busy schedule with a tremendous amount of work to complete. However, your response is very important to my study as there are a limited number of public research institutions in the State of Illinois.

I hope that you could find a few moments which you could give to this questionnaire. It should take no more than 10 minutes to complete. I ask sending you another questionnaire so that you do not have to spend any time looking for the original. I ask you to please return the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance.

Madonna Murphy

P.S. If you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study., please indicate this at the end of the questionnaire.
QUESTIONS FOR PERSONAL INTERVIEWS WITH DEANS

1. What have been your previous experiences before becoming dean? Have you experienced any role conflicts upon becoming dean? Do you still teach? Do you miss teaching.

2. In what ways have you or your institution tried to respond to the recent reports advocating the need to reform the quality of college teaching and the integrity of undergraduate education?

3. How do you work with your instructors to help them improve their teaching? How important is teaching ability in your decision to recommend for tenure?

4. What do you when you have a professor who is so poor at teaching that you constantly receive complaints from the students?

5. The words "faculty development" can be defined in many ways. Please describe briefly what "faculty development" means to you.

6. What kinds of faculty development activities do you have here? What is most effective in your opinion? How involved are you personally in faculty development?

7. How many of your faculty participate in the faculty development program here? How do you encourage them to do so?

8. In your opinion, what is the single most important change that could be made at this institution to improve the quality of instruction?
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