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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The issue that dominates higher education in the 1990s is the nature and quality of teaching and learning. The issues of student activism and declining enrollment held the spotlight for the previous three decades, but external pressures on colleges and universities to provide graduates who can function effectively in an increasingly complex society have shifted the focus to the classroom. These pressures began in earnest in the late 1970s and continue to escalate.

[C]itizens' groups, business task forces, governors, legislative leaders, congressional committee chairpersons, editorial writers, the mainstream foundations, and miscellaneous critics, pundits, and savants [have made] a huge ruckus over the standards and performance of colleges and universities. (Finn, 1984, p. 29)

The "ruckus" has been directed at those who teach--so much so that Cole indicates that the role of teaching in higher education has now come under such intense scrutiny that it "faces a crisis" (p. 1).

The roots of this current crisis go deep into the history of higher education in this country. Traditionally, the college professor has had a tripartite role: teaching, research, and service. But, from the days of the colonial colleges until the middle of the 19th century, the emphasis was on teaching. Then, in an attempt to emulate the German universities, university presidents consciously moved their institutions away from teaching and toward the production of knowledge (Brubacher and Rudy, 1968).
"[I]n due course, the expectation [was] that the professor's main obligation was] not the teaching of students" (Parilla, 1986, p. 3). Rather, "publish or perish" became the oft-repeated warning that seemed to describe the role and plight of the professorate.

Throughout the twentieth century, questions have given rise to debate about the proper emphasis of teaching and research in the role of the professor. Since the late 1970s, the debate has increased and has produced a significant body of literature (Cole, 1982). By the mid-1980s, there was a dramatic explosion of national reports, conferences, and publications that called for a return to an emphasis on teaching. The National Institute of Education, for example, with the publication of Involvement in Learning (1984) offered specific suggestions for teaching, and the Association of American Colleges suggested in its major report, Integrity in the College Curriculum (1985), that the undergraduate curriculum was in disarray, that the role of the professor had changed, and that there was a need for "a reassessment of the profession of college teaching in the United States . . ." (p. 94).

The pressure to improve college teaching continues into the 1990s, especially at state-supported, public two- and four-year institutions where calls for accountability and attention to consumer demands have urged both administrators and faculty to pay more attention to the classroom. For their part, faculty have indicated that the lack of attention to teaching is not due to a lack of interest in teaching. A Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching study (Clark, 1986) found that over seventy percent of all postsecondary faculty identified teaching as their main interest.
"[I]n due course, the expectation [was] that the professor’s main obligation [was] not the teaching of students" (Parilla, 1986, p. 3). Rather, "publish or perish" became the oft-repeated warning that seemed to describe the role and plight of the professorate.

Throughout the twentieth century, questions have given rise to debate about the proper emphasis of teaching and research in the role of the professor. Since the late 1970s, the debate has increased and has produced a significant body of literature (Cole, 1982). By the mid-1980s, there was a dramatic explosion of national reports, conferences, and publications that called for a return to an emphasis on teaching. The National Institute of Education, for example, with the publication of Involvement in Learning (1984) offered specific suggestions for teaching, and the Association of American Colleges suggested in its major report, Integrity in the College Curriculum (1985), that the undergraduate curriculum was in disarray, that the role of the professor had changed, and that there was a need for "a reassessment of the profession of college teaching in the United States . . ." (p. 94).

The pressure to improve college teaching continues into the 1990s, especially at state-supported, public two- and four-year institutions where calls for accountability and attention to consumer demands have urged both administrators and faculty to pay more attention to the classroom. For their part, faculty have indicated that the lack of attention to teaching is not due to a lack of interest in teaching. A Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching study (Clark, 1986) found that over seventy percent of all postsecondary faculty identified teaching as their main interest. In addition, the study found that over seventy percent of faculty time is spent
indirectly or directly on teaching (Clark, 1986, p. 15).

The response from the administrators at the vast majority of postsecondary institutions is to insist that quality teaching is the main focus of their institutions (Seldin, 1990). As evidence, they point to their mission statements or refer to their brochures and catalogs that proclaim dedication to high-quality instruction. And yet, many of the faculty at these institutions would challenge this portrayal, "noting that their personal experiences belie this official reverence for college teaching" (Seldin, 1990, p.1).

The views of administrators differ from those of the faculty not about whether the teaching/learning process is "the essence of what an institution of higher learning is all about, but rather about the manner in which these activities are practiced, nurtured, and rewarded" (Cochran, p. 15). Even though "presidents claim in public speeches that teaching is the primary responsibility of the college, the reward system does not support this contention" (Mayhew & Ford, 1971, p. 59). The major cause of a lack of attention to quality teaching according to Seldin (1990), resides with the administrators and their behavior and attitudes. "Teaching is widely undervalued today. . . . Very little in today’s campus climate supports improved teaching . . ." (p. xvii).

The need for administrators to provide an organizational context supportive of quality teaching is as important on two-year college campuses as it is at four-year colleges and universities. Boyer (1987 reminds his readers: "Much of what we say about four-year colleges will be recognized as relevant to two-year institutions as
well" (p. xii). With over one-half of the nation’s students--many of them marginally prepared (Cross, 1971)--enrolled in community colleges, the administrators of the approximately 1200 two-year institutions join their counterparts at four-year schools in responding to the call for attention to quality teaching.

It can be argued that community college administrators have a special obligation to support quality teaching. Historically, community colleges (once known as junior colleges) began and grew alongside of, and partly in response to, the growing preoccupation with research at many of the four-year institutions. Traditionally, proponents of the community college have billed the two-year college as student-centered, teaching institutions where faculty have no pressure to publish and therefore have more time to spend with their students and on their teaching (Stevens, Goodwin & Goodwin, 1991). But, because community college faculty are not expected to do research or to publish, teaching responsibilities are usually heavier and less diverse than at four-year institutions. The combination of a heavy, repetitive, teaching load and few opportunities for professional development increases the need for administrative action and support for teaching if community colleges are going to continue to be heralded as the teaching institutions in higher education.

Conceptual Framework

The focus of the debate surrounding the issue of quality teaching is not on whether there is a need for, or if there is an interest in, improved instruction at the postsecondary level. Few professionals would deny that there is a continuous need
for growth and that improved teaching will produce more effective institutions. Rather, the question that emerges is one that is central to the issues raised by the call for a greater emphasis on quality teaching: With whom does the responsibility for quality teaching lie? The most likely response is that it lies with the faculty. But, as Peterson (1991) asserts, administrative support is essential: "There are a wide variety of intentionally organized administrative processes and activities that can affect the institutions'... teaching and learning process" (p. 1). Of the twenty recommendations the National Institute of Education (1984) offers for the improvement of learning, no less than thirteen have primary implications for administrators.

The Need for Administrative Commitment

The call for strong administrative commitment to quality teaching comes from many directions. The literature on teacher change, faculty satisfaction, and faculty development are three sources that clearly identify the need for such commitment. The literature on teacher change, which generally focuses on elementary and secondary schools, can, nevertheless, inform those in postsecondary institutions as well. March and Simon (1958) suggested that individual behavior and decision to change within an organization is influenced as much by cues from the organizational environment as it is by individual beliefs, attitudes, goals, and knowledge acquired from experience. Richardson (1990) suggests that there are two factors that explain why teachers do not willingly adopt the practices called for by the "experts." One of those relates to organizational factors and the other relates to the personal traits of the
individual. Others also suggest that the structure of the organization and the policies of the administration account for, in large part, teachers' engagement, commitment, and willingness to change or to implement new procedures (Richardson, 1990). Little (1987) concludes that the sense of the organizational structure and environment "is more important than the nature of the individual teacher working within the organization" (p. 517). Administrative policies and actions, according to Little (1987), create the organizational structure and environment that can support teacher change.

In addition to the literature on teacher change, the job satisfaction literature also offers evidence that administrative policies and actions are important to faculty efforts. However, many of the studies point to administrative actions and policies as the source of dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction. For example, Cohen (1974, 1978) found that the least satisfying features of the workplace are those that result from specific administrative policies and actions. Diener (1985) drew similar conclusions from a study of community college faculty and found that the category "bureaucracy and administration" outscored four other categories (which included "salary," and "heavy work load") as a leading factor causing dissatisfaction. Wood (1976) argued that it is important for administrators in community colleges to be concerned about faculty satisfaction. Not only could satisfaction lead faculty to acceptance of retraining but also to the attainment of the objectives and purposes of the college. Finally, Cohen (1974) urged administrative attention to faculty satisfaction because faculty evaluation, faculty development programs, and "similar
administrative attempts to influence instructor behavior are of little effect unless combined with institutional support for that which faculty value" (p. 375).

Other researchers (Boyer, 1987; Cochran, 1987; Eble, 1985; McKeachie, 1980; Richardson, 1987; Seldin, 1990; Weimer, 1991) have identified the role of administrators in faculty development efforts. They stress that the success of individual faculty efforts or the success of faculty development specialists' programs to improve teaching will probably be sporadic until these efforts are supported and encouraged at key administrative levels.

Importance of Faculty Perception of Administrative Commitment

Creating an organizational context for effective teaching is dependent upon not only the administrative actions and policies supportive of instructional effectiveness, but also upon how the faculty perceives those actions. Grant (1988) states it directly: "There are two vital factors which interact and help determine the effectiveness of organizations: [1] leadership and [2] perceptions of leadership which influence organizational climate" (p. 4). One of the best-known reports on the importance of perception is found in the Hawthorne studies which were conducted from 1927 to 1932 (reported in Adair, 1984). The researchers demonstrated that productivity and morale increased when there was a perception by employees that they were cared for by management. This phenomenon has been named the "Hawthorne effect." When it is applied to educational institutions it can be translated to mean that when faculty perceive that "management" is truly committed to the faculty’s main role, that of teaching and learning, "productivity and morale" are likely to be high.
Locke (1969, 1983), studied job satisfaction in business organizations and educational organizations and concluded that productivity and morale are a function both of how much people receive from an organization and how much they feel they should or want to receive. In other words, the employees' perceptions of what they feel they should receive are as important as what they actually receive. Stephens (1989) reports that administrators are giving greater attention to identifying faculty perceptions of various administrative and institutional factors that affect them. "[Administrators] can then attempt to alter those policies which are negatively influencing satisfaction and morale and reinforce those which are having a positive influence" (p. 9).

The Nature of Administrative Commitment

The literature is replete with recommendations, discussions, and reports of investigations related to the specific policies and administrative actions that provide an organizational context essential to instructional effectiveness. For example, Menges and Mathis (1988) identify over six hundred books and articles on such topics. Cochran (1987) reviewed the literature on indicators of administrative support of postsecondary teaching, and grouped those indicators into five categories. He then conducted a nation-wide study of four-year college presidents. The five categories and the specific actions or policies that Cochran suggests are indicative of administrative commitment to quality teaching form the basis of the present study.

Cochran's (1987) first category, institutional climate, includes the more general administrative behaviors that create an organizational context supportive of
teaching and learning: administrative stability, faculty ownership, intellectual vitality, administrative leadership, and institutional pride. The second category, instructional development activities, includes such items as the availability of workshops and seminars for new faculty, for part-time faculty, and for all faculty. Questions about the existence of an organized unit for faculty development and the whether faculty play a key role are included. The third category, instructional enhancement efforts, focuses on the role of librarians, the existence of awards and released time to support innovation, and the emphasis given to teaching on the campus.

The fourth category, employment policies and practices, identifies efforts in the hiring, training, and use of evaluation in promotion and tenure as contributing to instructional effectiveness. Finally, the fifth category, strategic administrative actions, lists public presentations, news releases, projects, and the use of institutional data as evidence of an organizational context that promotes instructional effectiveness.

Assumptions

This study makes the following assumptions: 1) Administrators play a key leadership role in the instructional effectiveness of an institution; 2) there must be a high level of administrative commitment to policies and practices that affect instruction; 3) the faculty’s perception of the administrator’s level of commitment will either encourage or discourage faculty to be committed to instructional effectiveness.
Purpose

The purpose of this study was to answer three questions: What is the level of administrative commitment in Illinois community colleges to the policies and actions that the literature identifies as supportive of quality teaching? How does the level of administrative commitment to teaching, as reported by the administrators, compare to the faculty's perception of administrative commitment? Finally, what is the impact of financial, demographic, and contextual/organizational factors on the reported level of commitment.

Objectives

The major objectives of this study were as follows:

1) To identify the level of administrative commitment to teaching as reported by administrators and as perceived by faculty in Illinois Community Colleges.

2) To determine if the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by administrators differs from the perceived level of administrative commitment reported by faculty.

3) To determine if there is a relationship between selected institutional conditions, for example, size of institution, location of institution, financial conditions--and the reported level of administrative commitment to teaching.

For additional insight into the administrative commitment to teaching in Illinois public community colleges, comparisons were made to the level of commitment
reported by the presidents of four-year institutions in Cochran’s (1987) study.

**Significance of the Study**

This study is a partial replication of Cochran’s (1987) study of four-year college and university presidents’ commitment to teaching. It differs from Cochran’s study, however, in three ways. First, this study focuses on administrative support of teaching in two-year rather than four-year institutions. Information regarding the level of administrative commitment to teaching at two-year institutions will help administrators make decisions regarding policies and practices that affect instruction. Second, this research extends Cochran’s (1987) study by surveying both the vice-president of academic affairs and the president of the target colleges since presidents and academic vice-presidents often interact in the decision-making process regarding policies relating to academic change. Finally, and perhaps the most important, it includes faculty ratings of the administrators’ commitment to policies and actions that are supportive of quality teaching. By expanding the study to include the faculty’s views, a broader view of the institution’s commitment to teaching will be provided.

This study is also significant in that it identifies the specific practices and policies for which faculty and administrators reported a low level of administrative commitment. It also identifies the practices and policies for which the level of administrative commitment reported by faculty conflicted with the level of administrative commitment reported by administrators and vice versa. It is important for administrators to be able to identify practices and policies that are perceived to
have a negative affect on instruction so that they can use the power of their offices to
champion quality teaching by instituting and/or maintaining policies and practices that
courage, recognize, and reward quality teaching.

Finally, the study provides both the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) and the Illinois Council of Community College Administrators (ICCCCA) with information to consider when formulating guidelines and initiatives related to quality teaching and learning in Illinois community colleges.

**Methodology**

This study is a partial replication of Cochran's (1987) study that focused on administrative commitment to quality teaching in four-year postsecondary institutions. In the present study, Cochran's two-part, five-page questionnaire was adapted for community colleges (See Appendix A) and was mailed, with cover letters (Appendix B) to the forty-eight presidents and forty-eight vice-presidents of academic affairs in Illinois community colleges. The administrators were asked to rate the level of administrative commitment to teaching they believed existed at their institutions. The instrument was modified and mailed to a random sample of faculty in the forty-eight institutions. The sample consisted of 12 percent or 546 of the 4551 Illinois public community college faculty.

Part I of the instrument required the respondents to rate the level of administrative commitment to teaching on 30 items that were grouped into five categories: institutional climate, instructional development activities, instructional
enhancement efforts, employment policies and practices, and strategic administrative actions. Two additional items required all subjects to provide a rating of (a) overall satisfaction with the level of institutional performance and (b) the amount of personal attention administrators devoted to each of the five categories.

Part II of the instrument requested data related to demographic, organizational/contextual, and financial factors. This information was gathered in order to determine what relationship exists among these factors and levels of administrative commitment. A final, open-ended item gave respondents an opportunity to make additional comments relative to their beliefs and feelings about administrative commitment to teaching.

Data Analysis

A total commitment score, five subscale scores, and a total satisfaction score were computed for both faculty and administrators. These scores were identified as the dependent variables and were used when comparing the scores obtained from the faculty and the administrators.

In addition, independent variable categories included (a) size of institutions, (b) the location of the institution, (c) the existence of, or lack of, a faculty development position or center, and (d) the mean unit cost of instruction. Two-way MANOVAs were run to compare mean responses of faculty and mean responses of administrators with regard to the seven dependent variables identified above. Also, the MANOVAs were conducted to determine if the administrator versus faculty factor and some other
factor (identified as the four independent variables) were associated with the differences in the dependent variables.

One-way MANOVAs were also conducted to (a) analyze faculty responses to determine if there were differences between transfer faculty and career/vocational faculty, and (b) to analyze administrative responses to see if there were differences between those who claim it is important for administrators to teach (and actually do teach) and those who do not claim it is important for administrators to teach. All tests were conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences in the scores obtained from the seven dependent variables (i.e., the total commitment score, the five subscale scores and the satisfaction score) as a function of the independent variables. MANOVA analyses were conducted using faculty and administrators crossed with each of the other independent variables to test differences in the level of each of the dependent variables. In order to further determine which of the independent variables were associated with each of the dependent variables, multiple regression analyses were conducted.

**Definition of Terms**

**Administrators**: A group made up of those holding the title of (a) President or (b) Vice President for Academic Affairs (or other similar title that identifies the administrator immediately below the president who is ultimately responsible for decisions about the academic life in Illinois community colleges).

**Community colleges**: Public, postsecondary institutions (often referred to as
two-year colleges) whose mission is to offer a comprehensive education program in areas of transfer, career/vocational, adult education/remedial, and continuing education. Two-year Associate of Arts (A.A.) and Associate of Science (A.S.) degrees are offered along with certificate programs.

**Faculty:** Full-time career/vocational and transfer faculty.

**Level of commitment:** A subjective measurement of the amount of time, energy, and resources that an institution devotes to a specific area. Evidence of commitment includes policies, expenditures of time and resources, and discussion of specific concerns.

**Limitations of the Study**

The use of a survey instrument places some limitations on the interpretation of results in that "the scope of information sought is usually at the expense of depth. Survey research is best adaptive to extensive rather than intensive research" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 422). Furthermore, survey research can be limited due to the three major sources of error in a survey:

(1) sampling variability, generally called sampling error which depends on the sample size and design; (2) sample biases which are a function of how well the study design is executed; and (3) response effects which are the differences between reported and "true" measures of behavior, characteristics, or attitudes. (Sudman, 1976, p. 16-17)

In addition, it is acknowledged that since the survey will be conducted in only Illinois community colleges, the generalizability of results is limited to Illinois community colleges. Differences in regions, administrative authority, state mandates
and initiatives, and budgetary issues limit the generalizability.

Organization of the Study

This chapter presented a general introduction to the need for administrative commitment to teaching and the factors that indicate commitment to teaching. The purpose of the study--to determine the level of administrative commitment to teaching as reported by administrators and perceived by faculty and to ascertain the factors affecting the level--has been stated. The general hypothesis, the objectives, the significance and the limitations of the study, and definition of terms, have been included. Chapter II reviews the literature related to the need for administrative commitment and involvement, the nature of the administrative commitment and involvement that is needed, and a discussion of factors that are related to the level of administrative commitment to teaching.

Chapter III presents the procedures used in the study, including information pertaining to the population sample, methods of data collection and procedures for analysis of the data. Chapter IV reports the findings of the study. Chapter V includes a summary, conclusions drawn, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Concern about the quality and status of teaching in colleges and universities has been at the center of the educational agenda since the late 1970s. Calls for accountability continued to be heard as the decade of the 1990s began. It could be assumed that since faculty have control over what goes on in the classroom, the discussion surrounding the issue of quality teaching would focus primarily on them. The discussion--and a significant portion of the responsibility must focus, however on the administrators since they play a key role in creating the organizational structure and environment in which teaching occurs.

The opening section of this chapter will discuss how the organization of postsecondary institutions has evolved to the point where the present governance structure and conditions within the professorate create barriers to innovations and changes that would enhance teaching. Next, research that identifies and emphasizes the need for administrative action and involvement in areas that relate to a commitment to faculty and to teaching will be reviewed. Finally, the major portion of the chapter will include the specific administrative actions and policies that the literature identifies as supportive of teaching.
The Early Organization of Postsecondary Institutions

During the first half of the 19th century, largely because of the influence of German universities, there were conscious efforts to redefine the role of the North American university as a center for the production of knowledge rather than as a center for teaching as it had been since Colonial days (Brubacher & Rudy, 1968). During the last half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century two major developments occurred that further moved the university away from its position as the center for teaching. First, the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, and later, the G.I. Bill in the post World War II era, brought a new clientele and rapid growth in enrollment. The growth in enrollment not only produced many new institutions but also a plethora of academic disciplines. Faculty members gained new roles, greater specialization, and more control over the teaching profession.

Second, the formation of graduate schools and the desire for prestige shaped the role of the faculty. The influence from the German universities and the earlier emphasis on research attracted leading scientists and scholars to those institutions which set out to become great research universities. Faculty were dramatically affected by these changes; they became increasingly specialized as they retreated to their individual disciplines for identity and research opportunities. As Bess (1982) points out, the availability of governmental research dollars and the institutionalized norms supported the research and publication activity of the faculty.

Eventually, the predominant role of the professorate was described as,
"publish or perish." Ironically, over 70 percent of the faculty describe their main interest as teaching, not research and publication (Monney, 1989). Boyer (1987), acknowledges that the same realities of academic life that existed in the first half of the twentieth century, still exist today. "With few exceptions, young professors know that if they wish to gain tenure. . . they need to gain distinction, not by good teaching, but by an impressive record of research and publication" (p. 125).

**Conditions Within the Professorate**

Mayhew (1976) explores the topic of change and innovation and acknowledges the present realities of the reward system and explains how the governance of higher education institutions mitigates against change:

Institutions of higher education are managed and governed by two distinctive structures almost superimposed upon each other. The first system is a hierarchical structure with a Board of Trustees at the apex which is legally responsible for the entire institution and its activities. This Board appoints a president, establishes broad institutional goals and policies, and then delegates the actual conduct of the institution to the president. This officer, in turn, presides over a relatively straightforward line and staff organization.

Superimposed on this straight hierarchical model is a collegial structure which assumes that faculty members are professionals responsible only to themselves and their colleagues. These faculty members decide themselves who they will serve and with what technologies, and evaluate their own performance. What has eventuated then, is a dual structure with the two elements existing in a constant state of tension, and the net effect is a slowdown in the rate of adoption of changes. (p. 20)

Another factor that contributes to a slowdown in the rate of change is the socialization process that accompanies discipline specialization (Bess, 1982; Light, Mardsen, & Corl, 1973; Schuster & Bowen, 1985). Clark (1985) describes it best:
Academic groups set apart by subject and in part by type of institution become the unmeltable ethnics of higher education. One by one, they are very stubborn about their place in the sun. They root themselves in their basic operating units . . . until overall the system becomes essentially bottom-heavy; it is not vulnerable to easy tipping by winds of change nor can it be steered by those who think there is a rhetorical helm. [I]t is utopian to expect the system and the profession to be closely integrated by overarching common values. (p.41)

Furthermore, discipline specialization is seen as an important barrier to innovations in teaching because "it is the parochialism which is encouraged . . . that distributes the change-oriented faculty so they cannot develop a critical mass" (Sikes, Schlesinger, & Seashore, 1971, p. 40).

Mayhew (1976) expands the discussion even further by describing faculty personality types:

Resistance to changes and innovations in the realm of collegiate activity seems to be related to the professorate itself. Their interest in a subject deepens, . . . [and] by early graduate years they are convinced that college teaching is the only career which will provide income but still allow time for reading, collecting, the study of history, whatever. Thus are produced professors whose main concerns are their subjects, supported typically by the perfunctory performance of teaching obligations. Serious concern for the processes of teaching or the coordination of one subject with others is viewed as pure distraction. Suggested changes in how subjects are taught are likely to be viewed as excessively time-consuming and are resisted. (p. 21)

Along with governance issues, departmentalism and fragmented disciplines, there are career strands within the professorate that create additional barriers to change. Light, Mardsen, and Corl (1973) identify three distinct strands that are the building blocks for the academic career. First, are the status and roles that move one through the academic ranks; these constitute the organizational career. In this strand, depending upon the focus of the institution, publication and grant writing may take
precedence over teaching activity as there is limited agreement about how teaching can or should be evaluated. Second, the disciplinary career is independent of the organizational career and is the source of recognition from the community of peers in the discipline. Third, the external career takes place outside of the institution and also is the source of recognition from consulting, community service, and visiting professorships. These strands tend to focus the energies of the faculty on the research and service functions of the professorate rather than on the teaching role.

In addition to the strands found in the academic career, there are developmental stages through which faculty members tend to progress. Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) identify developmental stages that evolve and change according to the interests, values, and needs over the course of the faculty member's career.

"Faculty increasingly become comfortable with the teaching role [but] at the same time, pleasure with teaching steadily wanes" (p. 111).

Bowen and Schuster (1986) also identify stages that faculty move through and suggest that once tenure is achieved--usually at the stage called "mid-careerists" faculty feel secure. The motivation to respond to the calls for change, especially to adopt innovative teaching techniques, may need additional rewards and incentives.

**Conditions within Two-year Colleges**

Faculty at two-year colleges experience organizational and career situations similar to those experienced by four-year faculty, but they have an added pressure. From the beginning, the leaders of the community college movement identified two-year colleges as primarily teaching institutions (Stevens, Goodwin & Goodwin, 1991)
and the community college continues to be urged to be "the nation’s premiere teaching institution" (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988, pp. 25-26).

No formal research is reported that compares teaching effectiveness at community colleges with teaching effectiveness at four-year colleges and universities; it is simply asserted that good teaching "is the hallmark of the community college" (Roueche, Baker & Rose, 1989). The notion of student-centeredness that permeates the literature about the community college provides some evidence that the community college’s emphasize teaching over research:

Its energy derives in part from a stereotypic image of authoritarian university professors interested only in their subject matter and research and caring little for the welfare of their students. In contrast, the community college projects an image of teachers interested in the whole student, teachers who are compassionate toward students’ problems and accessible for help. (Seidman, 1985, p. 86)

Further evidence of the community college’s interest in teaching comes from the faculty themselves. Monney (1989) reports that ninety-seven percent of two-year college faculty compared to seventy-one percent of all professors responding to this nationwide survey, claim that their main interest is teaching. Because of the image portrayed and the claims made that teaching is a primary function of the community college, it would seem logical to assume that a top priority for the administrators of two-year colleges would be to identify policies and practices that support teaching.
The Administrative Role and Need for Support of Quality Teaching Efforts

The organizational structure and a variety of conditions within the professorate constitute significant obstacles to change or innovation related to quality teaching. The literature is clear that administrative policies and actions could play a key role in assisting faculty to center their efforts on teaching. The administrative task is to create the organizational environment that allows teaching to be the central activity of an institution since "the decisions administrators make touch every facet of institutional experience . . . [and] affect in fundamental ways teaching and learning" (Richardson, 1987, p. 2).

O'Hara (1991) gives special emphasis to the role of the administration and claims that "it is not the faculty or even the students who have the greatest influence on the degree of teaching-learning which can occur--it is the administration" (p. 1). Seldin (1990) agrees with O'Hara and urges the administration to embrace superior teachers . . . because the initiative and guidance for such transformation falls to administrative leaders. They must champion the importance of teaching and personally crusade for this idea. In a sense, they must stake their careers on this point and actively seek and find forums from which to broadcast to academia the importance of teaching. To support their verbal endorsement, they must introduce and promote appropriate institutional policies and practices. (p. 9)

The National Institute of Education (1984) specifies how administrators are to lead the initiatives. Twenty items in this report address teaching and learning directly; thirteen of the twenty have primary implications for administrators. Three
of the twenty provide specific administrative actions (items numbered as in the report):

14. In rewarding faculty through retention, promotion, tenure, and compensation, all college officials directly responsible for personnel decisions should both define scholarship broadly and demand that faculty demonstrate that scholarship. (p. 50)

19. College officials directly responsible for faculty personnel decisions should increase the weight given to teaching in the process of hiring, and determining retention, tenure, promotion, and compensation, and should improve the means for assessing teaching effectiveness. (p. 59)

22. Graduate deans and department chairs should develop ways of helping prospective faculty in all disciplines . . . develop their understanding of teaching and learning (p. 65)

Seldin (1990) underscores the need for administrative action by urging administrators to focus on five key actions: (1) work to change the campus environment to make it more responsive to teaching, (2) provide the proper setting and tools to support instruction, (3) assist graduate students to develop teaching skills, (4) use appropriate rewards to improve teaching, and (5) establish an effective faculty development system. These actions are essential if teaching is to be a high priority.

While no empirical studies directly related to the effectiveness of these administrative actions were found, the importance of, and the need for, administrative support consistently emerges from three areas of study: the teacher change and efficacy literature, the faculty development or staff development literature, and the faculty job satisfaction literature.

Evidence from Teacher Change Literature

The teacher change literature—which includes literature related to effective
schools, implementation of innovations, and teacher motivation—generally focuses on changes in elementary and secondary schools, but it can inform those in postsecondary institutions as well. Much of the literature on teacher change relates to the question of why innovations are not implemented when teachers are called upon to do so. The early history of the change literature presented by McLaughlin (1987) identifies teachers as being resistant to change because of personality traits. However, a second wave of explanation for the lack of change was somewhat more sympathetic to teachers. No longer were teachers simply viewed as resistant. Explanations now focused on organizational factors in addition to those that were personal.

Little (1987) leans away from the personal and toward the structure of the organization to account for teachers’ willingness to change and claims that "the structure of an organization and its environment is more important than the nature of the individual working within the organization" (p. 517). Some researchers believe that administrative policies and actions create the organizational structure and environment that support teacher change (Little, 1987; Richardson, 1990). Further research specific to the adoption of innovations which require changes within the classroom reveals that administrators are the primary initiators of innovation (DESSI Study, cited in Fullan, 1982). Administrators have control over the organizational factors that increase or decrease the success of an innovation. Policies and actions that encourage voluntary participation and risk-taking, are key to faculty involvement (Barry, 1986; Fullen, 1982; House, 1985). If these policies do not exist, faculty will
tend to prefer the status quo rather than experience the frustrations brought about by attempts at innovation without administrative commitment and organizational support (Fullan, 1982; House, 1985).

Administrators are responsible for creating the conditions and embracing the reward structures that decrease resistance to change (Barry 1986; Deci & Ryan, 1982; House, 1985; Little, 1987; McDonnell, 1983; Richardson, 1990). Wemlinger (1990) summarizes the research regarding teacher change and innovation and suggests that administrators demonstrate support and commitment by providing critical incentives. These include extrinsic motivators (time, funds) and intrinsic motivators (recognition of efforts and accomplishments, opportunity to be self-determining and involved in decision-making). While intrinsic motivators tend to be more powerful and bring about long-lasting change, extrinsic motivators can be effective in the initial stages of change (Deci, 1980; Deci & Ryan, 1982).

Evidence from Staff Development Literature

The staff development literature for postsecondary faculty reports findings similar to those reported in the teacher change, innovation and motivation literature. Specifically, when incentives such as released time, adequate funding, and greater involvement by faculty in planning the content and structure of staff development programs are present, faculty interest and participation are increased (Cochran, 1987; Cox, 1983; Eble & McKeachie, 1985; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, Richardson, 1987; Seldin, 1990).

Studies specific to faculty development programs at postsecondary institutions
also provide evidence that administrative support is needed and is essential to the success of the programs: "Clearly, the presence of leadership was important to a program's success. Where there was imposition of leadership without involvement, or convictions masquerading as leadership, programs faltered" (Eble and McKeachie, 1985, p. 211). In other words, administrative support of instructional development activities is vital in efforts to shape the instructional character of the institution. (Seldin, 1990).

**Evidence from the Job Satisfaction Literature**

Despite the number of job satisfaction and morale studies that have been conducted by the business and industry, educational researchers had undertaken relatively few empirical studies until recently. The recognition of the importance of such studies has gained momentum as administrators realize that it is to their advantage to promote satisfaction because of its relationship to productivity (Lawler, 1973). By identifying and determining how the faculty perceives various individual and institutional factors, "administrators can then attempt to alter those which are negatively influencing morale and reinforce those that have a positive influence" (Stephens, 1989, p. 9). Other evidence from the literature suggests that administrative policies and actions that promote job satisfaction are important to motivation, retention, and performance in the classroom (Diener, 1985; Gomez, 1982; Stephens, 1989). Furthermore, when administrators focus on faculty satisfaction they not only can lead faculty to accept retraining but the objectives and purposes of the college can be reached (Wood, 1976).
Studies of community college instructors’ job satisfaction and the role of the administration are of two kinds: one looks at satisfaction from the perspective of the effects of personality variables and personal characteristics, while the second investigates working conditions and specific work activities as they may relate to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. It is in this second group of studies that Cohen (1974) found that characteristics of the workplace leading most to dissatisfaction were those related to red tape and the lack of support from administrators; those leading to satisfaction were related to students. In Cochran’s study of three community college settings, the faculty were asked to relate one incident that made them pleased with their work, that made them satisfied with their jobs. Then they were asked to write down one incident that tended to displease them or that caused dissatisfaction or discontent. All participants indicated that satisfaction came from activities related to students. Lack of support from administrators and problems within the organization were the greatest cause for dissatisfaction.

Cohen’s (1974) study was based on an interest in the "two factor theory" postulated by Herzberg (1959). This theory maintains that being content with one’s work is related to personal satisfaction or to factors inherent in the work itself; dissatisfaction, on the other hand, results from the environment surrounding the worker. Wozniak (1973), who also addressed this duality, reported similar results: the determinants of satisfaction were interpersonal relations with students, whereas the determinants of dissatisfaction were institutional policies and administrative demands. More than a decade later, Diener (1985) reviewed the job satisfaction literature and
then surveyed 131 faculty in four community colleges to elicit faculty judgements about work demands, working conditions, and rewards and appreciation. As in Cohen's (1974) study, Diener found that faculty derive high satisfaction from student achievement; red tape and bureaucracy, along with the lack of recognition and a lack of time for personal and professional development, are identified as sources of dissatisfactions. In fact, the category "bureaucracy and administration" outscored "salary," and "heavy work load" as a leading factor causing dissatisfaction. In a later study, Cohen (1988) again reviewed and summarized the literature related to community college job satisfaction and again reached the same conclusion about administrative policies or actions that lead to dissatisfaction. He reports that lack of time to keep up with the field, lack of recognition or support for professional growth or advanced study, and high levels of bureaucracy and red tape were noted often as sources of dissatisfaction. Hutton and Jobe (1985) reached almost the same conclusion from a study of 390 faculty from fourteen Texas community colleges. They asked participants to rank 63 items were in two categories in terms of whether the items contributed to job satisfaction. The items in the categories, "Support for Professional Growth" and "Support for Instruction" received the lowest rankings (p. 320).

Finally, Cohen (1974) urges administrative attention to faculty satisfaction because faculty evaluation, faculty development programs, and "similar administrative attempts to influence instructor behavior are of little effect unless combined with institutional support for that which faculty value" (p. 375).
The Nature of Administrative Actions

The literature on teacher change, staff development, and job satisfaction offer ample evidence to support Cochran's (1987) assertion that the challenge to elevate the status of teaching "cannot be achieved without direct intervention by administrators in the nation's higher education institutions" (p. 33). Practices and processes in collegiate institutions tend to persevere unless certain favorable conditions, tactics, and strategies necessary to encourage innovation are present and specific techniques are used to encourage innovations and change (Chickering, 1981; Deci & Ryan, 1982; Eble & McKeachie, 1985; House, 1985; Little, 1987; Mayhew, 1976; Richardson, 1990; Seldin, 1990).

Cochran (1987) researched administrative strategies and interventions intended to support teaching at postsecondary institutions and then grouped all activities into five categories. The five categories—which are also used as the basis for this study—are institutional climate, instructional development, instructional enhancement activities, employment policies and practices, and strategic administrative actions. Cochran (1987) reported that there were significant differences in the levels of institutional commitment within the five categories when presidents from 3200 four-year institutions were surveyed. A breakdown of the general perceptions of the chief academic officers regarding their own level of administrative commitment to quality teaching is presented in table form. These tables have been adapted from Cochran (1987, p 38). Since the size of the institution affected the results, size is included as part of the data. (The highest possible score for each category was 50.)
The category of employment policies is the area that received the highest level of institutional commitment. The lowest level of institutional support was instructional development activities. Cochran (1987) comments on the results of the survey from presidents and observes that institutional enrollment differences have a significant impact on the perceived level of commitment to instructional effectiveness. Larger institutions, for example, appear to devote far more attention to instructional development activities than do their smaller counterparts. Third, there is a modest increase in the use of instructional enhancement and strategic administrative actions to support teaching as one progresses toward the larger institutions. Fourth, the integral role of teaching in various employment practices tends to increase with institutional size. Fifth, the extent to which the campus environment supports a strong commitment to teaching tends to decline as the campus gets larger. (p. 39)

Institutional Climate

The perspectives of writers regarding campus climate, as opposed to campus culture, vary widely. Peterson, Cameron, Mets, Jones, and Ethington (1986) state
that it is unclear exactly what constitutes "culture," or "climate," or "institutional environment." In a later publication, Peterson, Cameron, Knapp, Spencer, and White (1991) describe both academic culture and organizational climate and distinguish between the two:

Institutional culture can be viewed as the deeply embedded shared values, beliefs, or ideologies that members have about their organization. An organization's culture is both instrumental (affects members' interpretation of events, guides their behavior, and supports change) and interpretive (provides meaning to a member's work). (p. 4, 5)

Organizational climate describes the constituent's shared perceptions of patterns of organizational and administrative behavior ("is" or "should be" views). It focuses on current views of specific organizational and administrative patterns and how they support teaching and learning. Two key dimensions of climate are the degree of consensus within constituent groups and the degree of congruence among various groups of constituents. (p. 5)

The items in Cochran's (1987) study reflect the definition of organizational climate as described by Peterson et al. (1991). Specifically, the items focus on "current views of specific organizational and administrative patterns and how they support teaching and learning" (p. 5). Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) compared a variety of climate instruments and concluded that there were six dimensions common to all of them: autonomy, structure, reward, consideration, warmth, and support. However, Peterson et al. (1986) discuss other studies that attempt to identify unique content dimensions of climate and conclude that such efforts "simply highlight the futility of trying to identify common dimensions" (p. 23).

Despite the difficulty in identifying common dimensions of climate, it has become common for colleges to conduct surveys to assess the climate. For example,
Miami Dade Community College used *The Institutional Climate Survey* by Roueche & Baker (1987). At several four-year institutions, the *National Center for Higher Education Management Systems* survey by Krakower (1987) was used. The outcomes of such studies need careful interpretation because perceptions of climate vary among individuals in different levels of the organization (Schneider, 1975) and the perceived degree of structure or bureaucratization influences an employee’s perception of climate (George & Bishop, 1971). And yet, according to Peterson, et al. (1986), much of the research on organizational climate comes to the conclusion that climate is a "powerful predictor of a variety of organizational and individual behaviors" (p. 25). Nord (1980) reports the same conclusion for his review of the literature: "Organizational climate has a powerful influence on people’s feelings and actions" (p. 52).

The importance of climate, the role of the administration in creating the climate, and the relationship of climate to quality teaching in community colleges is stressed by McCabe and Jenrette (1990):

Now it is time to look at the teaching-learning environment itself. The college can systematically change the way that it does business in order to raise the status of teaching; improve teaching and learning at the college; and change the decision-making process such that the first priority is teaching, learning, and the classroom environment. (p. 183)

Institutional climate at four year-institutions was also the subject of a major report by Rice and Austin (1990). They studied the morale of over 4,000 faculty and concluded that there were several reasons for administrators to be concerned about campus climate. Faculty morale was one of the most important reasons given
"because even the best teachers who are driven by their own curiosity and insatiable love for learning require an organizational environment that affirms the dignity of their work, rewards teaching, and sustains morale over time" (p 23).

While it could be assumed that most administrators would acknowledge the importance of the institutional climate or environment, Seldin (1990) questions how committed administrators are to taking action and implementing the changes that would improve the climate. He poses the question: "Does today’s campus climate support efforts to improve teaching?" and then responds: "The answer is clearly no" (p 7). The results of Cochran’s (1987) study support Seldin: the climate for sustaining the primary function of teaching was found to be only moderately positive. The following factors supportive of teaching were used in Cochran’s (1987) study and are the focus of the discussion which follows: leadership, faculty ownership, morale, a sense of mission, and institutional pride.

Leadership. Of the many factors that create a climate supportive of quality teaching in postsecondary institutions, it is clear that leaders are a critical factor in the effectiveness of any organization (Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989). Grant (1988) describes the relationship between leadership and climate as "two vital factors which interact and help determine the effectiveness of these organizations; leadership and perceptions of leadership influence organizational climate" (Grant 1988, p. 4). While it has been asserted--and generally accepted--that leadership is critical to an effective climate, attempts to provide a definitive description for the leadership style that would be the most effective in an academic setting have had limited success.
Problems result because of the dual control systems operating in a shared governance setting, conflicts between professional and administrative authority, unclear goals, and other special properties of academic, professional organizations (Baldridge, Curtis, Eckridge, & Riley, 1978; Birnbaum, 1988). Furthermore, leadership in academic organizations can be viewed as taking different forms depending upon the organizational system of governance that dominates the organization. If the institution operates as a bureaucracy, the emphasis is on decision-making. When it functions as a collegium, leadership is seen as participative and the leader tries to meet constituents’ needs while attempting to manage processes of consultation and interpersonal skills. When the institution functions as a political system, leaders are seen as influencing through persuasion and diplomacy and through being open and communicative. The leader is a mediator or negotiator between shifting power blocks. And when the institution functions as an organized anarchy, leaders operate through subtle actions and manipulation of symbols (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989).

The organizational structure and the leadership of the community college, primarily because of its early roots, are considered to be more bureaucratic than is true for other postsecondary institutions. However, many community colleges perceive themselves as part of higher education and seek to emulate the traditional values of the four-year institutions. Therefore, attempts to replace the bureaucratic model with the collegial model of governance have been made and the climate and leadership style are likely to reflect those changes. At this point in history, the
dominant community college governance model and presidential leadership style "is not clear, but the role of bureaucratic manager is currently eschewed by most community college presidents" (Rudy, 1991, p. 26).

Research into leadership has produced many theories and every theory holds implications for effective leaders--what ideal leaders should be like, what they should accomplish, or how they should carry out the leadership role. Therefore, it is not possible to identify one best way to measure effective leadership in an academic setting. Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989), however, suggest that since there is

no single acceptable definition of leadership or measure of effectiveness, . . . when academic leaders want to know how well they are doing, it might be more beneficial to ask themselves how they are viewed by their constituents rather than assessing themselves against an arbitrary standard. (p. 70)

An acceptable definition of leadership, then, depends upon the institutional type, the perception of the constituents, and "on how well the leader interprets and communicates institutional values and understands organizational processes" (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988, p. 3). However, as Bensimon (1989) points out, many presidents consider themselves to operate in a collegial mode, but campus constituents do not always see them that way. That means that there must be a match between the leader’s vision and style, the perception of the constituents, and the institution’s climate; if there is a mismatch, conflict generally ensues (Green, 1990).

The Council for Independent Colleges (CIC) initiated a major study of the workplace in liberal arts colleges in which the goal was to gain an understanding of how well the leaders’ vision and style matched the institutions’ climate (Rice &
Austin, 1988). The authors of the CIC national survey of 4000 faculty in 140 colleges analyzed the climate of the colleges with high morale and found that they not only had strong participatory leadership but they also had an organizational structure that minimized hierarchical distinctions. Guidelines have been proposed for administrators who want to implement participatory processes (Mortimer & McConnell, 1978) and the importance of participatory leadership has now been generally accepted (Floyd, 1985).

Faculty ownership and participation. Participatory leadership is directly related to faculty ownership, another element contributing to an effective climate. As Rice and Austin (1990) found, "when there are highly participatory leaders [and when] the distinction between instruction and administration is meant to be only that of function and suggests no hierarchy" (p. 29), a sense of ownership develops among the faculty. This sense of ownership, the feeling that the college is theirs, further strengthens the commitment to teaching, according to the authors. Faculty are not unlike all professionals in that they exhibit strong tendencies to be an integral part of their institutions. "In fact their high levels of preparation and specialized competencies may make this statement truer than for any other group of professionals" (Cochran 1987, p. 52).

Acceptance of the mission. Beyond the leadership and faculty ownership issues that contributed to a positive organizational climate, an understanding and acceptance of the mission of the institution are critical. From the series of in-depth case studies that were conducted by the CIC in a national study (Rice & Austin,
1988), the investigators were able to conclude that the single most important hallmark of these liberal arts colleges was that each had a clearly articulated mission. In a later article, Rice and Austin (1990) summarized other outcomes of the CIC study: "At the heart of the culture is a firm unswerving commitment to teaching; these are unabashedly 'teaching institutions'" (p. 26).

Differences in the visions of individuals about the missions of colleges and universities pose problems for implementing change within institutions. It is difficult to attain consensus about a subgoal, if overall goals are in dispute. It is also hard to work in a collaborative manner in a climate where there is a high level of conflict about broad institutional purposes (Sikes, 1978).

Community colleges, too, are subject to conflicts regarding broad institutional purposes, or the overall mission. From a study of 296 outstanding community college presidents, Roueche, Baker, & Rose (1989) report:

It is apparent that it is critical for an organization to know what business it is in. Such is the case for exemplary community colleges. A clearly articulated mission along with "an unswerving commitment" to teaching contribute to a climate conducive to effective teaching. (p. 115)

The work of providing a consistent message about the institution's mission brings the discussion back to the leadership. Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggest it is a task that does not demand a manager, but a leader. A leader is concerned with goals and philosophy while a manager focuses only on getting things done.

**Institutional pride.** Finally, a climate that is conducive to innovation and supportive of effective teaching will be reflected in the sense of pride that is expressed by the constituents. Clark (1972) spoke of it as the organizational saga
which he defined as "a collective understanding of unique accomplishments offering strong normative bonds" (p. 36). When a sense of pride is present, faculty are likely to feel less isolated and have a greater commitment to broad institutional goals.

**Instructional Development Activities**

The second category of administrative policies and actions includes instructional development activities. According to Gaff (1975), these activities are often referred to as one part of a comprehensive development program that also includes professional development activities (discussed in the next section) and organizational development activities (discussed in the previous section on climate). It is generally assumed that programs or efforts in support of teaching perform a vital role in efforts to shape the instructional character of the campus. Many of the recent prescriptive studies that suggest that higher education is in crisis, propose faculty development efforts as a means to address the problems. (Bowen & Schuster, 1988; Boyer, 1987). Cochran (1987) also identified instructional development activities as vital for shaping the instructional character of the campus because such activities give a clear signal of the administration’s commitment to quality teaching.

And yet, as revealed in Cochran’s nation-wide study of presidents from four-year institutions, instructional development was ranked as the lowest among the five categories studied (i.e., a mean rating of 18.8 was obtained out of a possible score of 50). Less than one-third of the administrators had good/excellent ratings while a large group expressed dissatisfaction with their institution’s attention to the activities in this category which include workshops and seminars for all faculty (new, part-time,
full-time), both on and off campus. Also included in this category are data relating to
the existence of a position or center for instruction on the campus.

Instructional development programs are a rather recent phenomenon. In a
1972 survey of 142 college professors, only ten percent reported receiving from their
institutions specific support for teaching (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). "Support for
teaching" at that time referred primarily to sabbatical leaves, travel monies, released
time from teaching, and financial assistance to complete an advanced degree. In
1973, Freedman and Sanford found a lack of research on the developmental needs of
college faculty, especially as it relates to their main activity, college teaching.
Additionally, they found a pervasive sense of unease, confusion, and lack of
professional identity among college faculty. "Perhaps the clearest evidence that
teaching undergraduates is not a true profession, is the fact that [faculty] . . . almost
never discuss their teaching or philosophy of education" (p. 11). Peter Drucker, the
nationally known managerial consultant, recognized this situation and wrote that
"faculty members need an organized and directed development effort" (cited in
Seldin, 1990).

Things began to change in 1976 and a nationwide survey disclosed 60 percent
of U.S. higher education institutions had programs for faculty which included
activities focusing on learning, teaching, and instruction (Centra, 1987). Ten years
later, the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network reported that
66 percent of the institutions surveyed indicated that their institutions’ investment in
faculty instructional and professional development was as much or somewhat greater
than it had been three years earlier (Erickson, 1986). These same data revealed that the range of resources and services available for the purpose of assessing and strengthening teaching effectiveness is noteworthy: more than 64 percent of the faculty had classroom observation by peers, often as part of a mentoring program; over half had peer review of course materials; almost 50 percent provided consultation on teaching from trained colleagues or videotaping and critiquing of classroom instruction. Finally, over 50 percent provided consultation specifically for use of instructional technology (Erickson, 1986).

Workshops and seminars for faculty. According to Lacey (1988), the most impressive fact about recent faculty development efforts is the focus on strengthening instruction. Lacey reports that workshops or seminars on methods or techniques of instruction are offered by over 60 percent of the institutions surveyed by the POD Network. Over 60 percent also report that they offer programs of grants to develop new or different approaches to teaching; 60 percent provide summer grants for instructional improvement; over 50 percent provide temporary load reductions for faculty to work on new courses or to revise an existing course. Lacey feels that these data speak well for efforts to improve instruction.

Given the strong pressures and incentives to put grant and leave resources into traditional sabbatical support for research and travel funds into attending conferences, this degree of support for teaching and instructional and curricular development speaks to the seriousness with which activities focused on improving teaching and learning are being pursued. (p. 63)

A specific suggestion, focusing on faculty development efforts, is also offered by Seldin (1990) as he describes how administrative support of faculty development
might enhance the climate:

A comprehensive [faculty development] program would assist in the professional and personal development of faculty members. The program would include written materials, colloquia, seminars, videotaping of the professor's class, and a discussion of teaching strengths and weaknesses with the aid of an experienced and supportive instructional improvement specialist. (p. 11)

Centralized faculty development efforts. In some institutions many of the above services are being offered in a centralized office or center that operates with its own budget. The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan preceded most of the other such centers by several years (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). Since then, many private and public institutions, including Colorado State University, Northwestern University (IL), Miami-Dade Community College, Canton Community College (NJ), Johnson County Community College (KS) and The Ohio State University, to name a few, have created centers for teaching and learning (personal correspondence, 1990). The American Association of Higher Education, in a special issue entitled, "Taking Teaching Seriously," (Quinlan, 1991) suggests that a new round of interest in such centers has developed as a result of the recent emphasis on teaching at the postsecondary level. Quinlan reports on a number of efforts on individual campuses such as Syracuse University, Harvard University, University of Washington, that are developing centers for the improvement of college teaching.

Eble and McKeachie (1985) encourage the installation of such centers because "having a centrally identified office with specific responsibilities for teaching and learning can generate and sustain [instructional development] efforts" (p. 151). Bevan
(1985) suggests that the director, working cooperatively and openly, "can create an atmosphere that will develop faculty members in the profession, keep the profession growing, . . . and attract strong persons to the profession" (p. 53). The author concedes that there are outstanding faculty who continually develop professionally, "but seldom do they constitute the critical mass necessary to create a dynamic setting for the productive interaction" (p. 53) that can result when an individual or office is given the responsibility to negotiate and coordinate resources.

Workshops and seminars that support faculty efforts, now the most common offering for full-time, part-time, or new faculty, make a difference when activities go beyond the standard support of travel funding, grants, and sabbaticals (Rice & Austin, 1990). Faculty development activities receive high marks when they are well-planned, when they offer a diversity of opportunities, and when they address practical needs that can result in tangible changes in the classroom (Eble & McKeachie, 1985).

Evaluations of major programs attest to the success of faculty development programs. One example, the Lilly Foundation's national Post-Doctoral Teaching Fellows Program and another, the Faculty Open Fellowships Program for faculty from Indiana, provide analysis and descriptions of successful programs (Lacey, 1988). The Association of American Colleges (AAC) sponsored an evaluation of programs at twenty colleges and universities; an additional twenty-four institutions were part of the evaluation sponsored by the Bush Foundation (Lacey, 1988). The positive results obtained by these evaluations confirm the need for continued administrative support for faculty development offerings.
Faculty involvement and ownership. Inherent in the success of any faculty development effort is the concern for faculty involvement and ownership of that effort. Deci and Ryan (1982) emphasize the need for faculty involvement in designing and choosing programs for improving instruction. Their study provides a summary of the literature on external and internal motivation. Deci and Ryan report that some types of programs (e.g., monetary awards, "good player awards," threats of punishment, and external evaluation of performance) can decrease intrinsic motivation, while the opportunity to choose tasks will increase intrinsic motivation.

When subjects are given a choice about various aspects of the task, they are more intrinsically motivated. We suggest that the choice--the opportunity to be self-determining--produces a shift in perceived locus of causality. If the perceived causality becomes more external, intrinsic motivation will have decreased; if it becomes more internal, intrinsic motivation will have increased. (p. 28)

Zaleznik, Christensen, & Roethlishberger (1958) review several need theories and point out that the nature of the academic environment attracts the kind of people who work to develop their identity through self-initiated behavior. The authors conclude that if faculty members were originally attracted to the type of environment that allows for self-starters, they are more likely to respond to situations in which they continue to have the opportunity to be self-initiating.

Bevan (1985) discusses incentives as they relate to the person given the responsibility for faculty development. He defines the role of the person leading faculty development efforts as "broker, the negotiator of contracts of various types of need, and the identifier and coordinator of resources, both human and material" (p. 52). Bevan also emphasizes the coordinating role of this position and suggests that
full faculty participation is essential if any efforts or programs are to be successful. Finally, the CIC study (Rice & Austin, 1990) looked at organizational structures in forty colleges where morale was high, compared to the forty where morale was low. The requirement for active involvement by faculty when important institutional decisions were made about teaching was judged to be the most important factor contributing to high morale.

Feedback methods. A less visible, but nonetheless important, effort that can be a complement to a faculty development program, is the departmentally-based colleague support mechanisms--peer coaching, mentoring, and videotaping or observations. Wandzilak and Mortensen (1983) report on a number of investigations that were completed using a process-product design with the purpose of establishing a direct relationship between specific teacher behaviors and student achievement. The authors created a model that integrated systematic observation of student and teacher behaviors with an analysis of student achievement. Based on the outcomes, they determined that faculty can observe their colleagues, document student learning, and offer steps to improve what transpires in class. The model--sometimes labeled peer coaching--provides immediate feedback and documents teaching effectiveness in a non-threatening environment.

Results of most research into other types of efforts that include feedback, such as mentoring programs, report the same results: Whether it is in the classroom or in the business world, an individual’s chances of being successful are enhanced when mentoring and similar programs are in place (Hill, Bahniuk, & Dobos, 1989).
Employees with mentors are more promotable (Shelton, 1982) and report that they feel more empowered as a result of the experience (Conrad, 1985). Hall and Sandler (1983) emphasize that academic success depends "not only on hard work but also on encouragement, guidance, support and advocacy from those who are already established in the system" (p. 2). For some faculty, mentoring is even more effective than other, non-individualized efforts (Eison, 1988).

**Instructional Enhancement Efforts**

The specific items and activities in this category--funding for instructional improvement and curriculum development activities, released time, administrative emphasis on scholarship activities related to teaching, and the unique position of librarians--all received low ratings from the administrators in Cochran's (1987) study. Only instructional development activities (described in the previous section) received lower ratings. These lower ratings were of concern to Cochran because he believes this area to be one in need of special attention.

Instructional enhancement efforts require a substantial increase in the amount of time and energy devoted to these activities. Even after the commitment has been made, without continual administrative attention, the perceived level of support can quickly erode. (Cochran, 1987, p. 117)

Research on efforts to enhance instruction suggests that improvement mechanisms outside of the classroom can influence faculty perceptions and behavior in the classroom. In contrast to some other administrative initiatives, instructional enhancement efforts provide a direct and tangible sign that there is a high level of institutional support for teaching (Cochran, 1987).

**Released time and financial rewards.** Support for instructional enhancement
activities has been identified as important to the implementation of innovations leading to quality teaching at the elementary and secondary levels (Deci, 1980; Deci & Ryan, 1982; Fullan, 1982; McDonnell, 1983). Faculty in postsecondary institutions give high marks to efforts such as released time to develop curriculum, sabbatical leaves, travel funds, reimbursement for courses, and other financial awards (Caffey, 1979; Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Friedlander & Gocke, 1985). Other research related to specific administrative actions at community colleges strengthens the argument that incentives in support of teaching are needed. Giordano (1989) surveyed administrators in Illinois community colleges to determine how effective different rewards and incentives are for encouraging faculty to participate in faculty development offerings. According to the author, the following were judged to be effective or very effective: released time (81%), institutionally funded grants (81%), and stipends (75%).

Stephens (1989) also looked at the effect of released time and sabbatical leaves. His survey of Kentucky community college faculty members revealed that released time increased morale but did not increase job satisfaction; sabbatical leaves did not increase morale or job satisfaction ratings. However, attendance at three to four professional meetings a year did increase both morale and job satisfaction.

In spite of the assertion that extrinsic motivators could cause a fall-off in performance if concern is not also given to intrinsic motivation (Bess, 1982; Deci & Ryan, 1982), it would appear that faculty still desire extrinsic motivators. Faculty report that the most preferred form of support is individual grants for study and other
financial reward programs (Lacey, 1988). Other researchers reporting on the effectiveness of financial awards also conclude that financial awards are rated the highest by faculty. Specifically, faculty grants to develop new approaches to teaching and funds for attendance at professional conferences receive high ratings (Centra, 1976; Smith, 1981; Wallin, 1982).

Cochran (1987) questions whether financial awards create a higher quality instructional development program, but does suggest that the use of financial awards clearly indicates that the amount of attention given to instruction is important to the institution. The conclusions of Giordano’s study (1989) support Cochran’s observation: financial awards and released time receive high ratings of effectiveness by the faculty—in fact, higher ratings than did salary increases. Finally, released time and financial awards in support of teaching are important as they lower resistance to change (Wemlinger, 1990).

Enlisting the library staff. Another way administrators can encourage faculty participation in efforts to promote instructional innovation is to enlist the aid of the library staff. Hill (1990) suggests that librarians are the least recognized but the likeliest leaders for some of the most needed educational reform today. When an institution encourages support from this group and recognizes that librarians’ skills are "the essential skills of the liberally educated person" (Hill 1990, p. 7), it signals the faculty that one more group on campus is supportive of teaching.

Not only are librarians seen as agents for change, they are also being asked to change. Ernest Boyer (quoted in Breivik, 1987) outlined the role of the librarian of
the future:

Those in charge of information services on a campus are the renaissance people who are able to guide students through the topology of knowledge and help them discover the relationships that no single department and no single professor can provide.

(p. 46)

Frank Newman, president of the Education Commission of the States in 1987, highlighted the role of librarians as teachers, mentors, and role models rather than technical support personnel and suggested that they teach students to search for ideas, evaluate data, and integrate information and ideas from many sources (Brievik, 1987).

Administrators are encouraged to support changes in librarianship and library use and urge a move away from the "traditional view of libraries to a new model for library-resource sharing and cooperation" (Breivik, 1987, p. 46). In so doing, administrators will in turn be supporting faculty efforts to provide these essential skills to students and will also be demonstrating a commitment to teaching.

**Employment Policies and Practices**

The fourth category of activities that indicate administrative commitment to quality teaching includes issues related to evaluation: student evaluation of teachers, evaluation of teaching for tenure, and evaluation of teaching for promotion. These items received the highest rating by the administrators in Cochran’s (1987) study. The remaining two items--use of teaching criteria in the hiring process, and use of teacher recognition programs--were rated significantly lower (p. 71).

Almost every institution of higher education has a mission statement that
asserts teaching is the primary purpose of the institution. One way to demonstrate the importance of the teaching role is by assessing teaching--either during the hiring process or after employment has commenced.

Hiring practices. Institutions demonstrate a commitment to teaching when they stress that an applicant’s teaching ability is an integral and significant part of the hiring process. Unfortunately, not all institutions consider a potential faculty member’s knowledge of the wealth of research about effective teaching and adult learning, and instead hire teachers based on expertise in a subject field. Little attention is paid to their skills in facilitating the complex activities associated with learning (McCabe & Jenrette, 1990). Cochran (1987) found a mean rating (6.6 out of a possible 10) that suggests a low commitment to the review of teaching credentials. However, Cochran reports that in recent years, it has become more common to require prospective faculty members to conduct a teaching session, present video tapes of past performances, provide student evaluation data, and submit examples of instructional materials and curricular activities. Hiring good teachers to begin with may be the most important approach to quality teaching (Green, 1990). Smith (1981) underscores this attitude with the reminder "... you have an extremely important task in recruiting and selecting faculty. Nothing, absolutely nothing, shapes your institution as does the new faculty member" (p. 31).

Evaluating teaching. The urgency to evaluate teaching was not always present, but the push from higher education’s various publics--students, parents, legislators, and others--is becoming more intense and there is pressure to assess
teaching seriously and substantively (Cashin, 1988). Evaluation of classroom teaching, which continues to be important after faculty members are hired, is done for two reasons: first, formative evaluation is done for purposes of improvement, and second, summative evaluation is done for administrative decision-making, specifically for decisions relating to recruitment, promotion, and tenure. Seldin (1990) indicates that four-year colleges and universities give more consideration to research productivity and scholarly achievements than to teaching performance when it comes to promotion and tenure. The very basis for the institutional reward system is the belief "that working with, contributing to, and pursuing knowledge is superior to teaching" (Seldin, 1990, p. 5). Two-year colleges, according to Arreola (1987), should be better able to focus on the evaluation of teaching and to incorporate it into their overall decision making, in particular, "into their promotion and tenure structures as teaching at community colleges is considered an important mission in and of itself" (p. 66). Arreola (1987) states that if this assertion is true, administrators at community colleges should be able to demonstrate that the evaluation of teaching abilities is an important part of their hiring, promotion, and tenure processes.

One of the main arguments put forth against the evaluation of teaching for the purposes of improvement is that we do not have the final answer to the question as to what constitutes effective teaching. Seldin (1987) disagrees and asserts that the key ingredients of effective teaching are increasingly well known and there is "no reason to ignore hundreds of studies that are in general agreement on these characteristics"
Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness began in the 1920s, and through the 1950s was used less extensively than today because it was done primarily on a voluntary basis. (Centra, 1987). In recent years, the use of student evaluations for administrative decision-making has increased and Erickson (1986) reports that over 96% of institutions surveyed had such procedures in place. The impetus for placing an emphasis upon teaching "surely came from the sheer size as well as the criticism from the undergraduate student body in the 1960s" (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 9).

The use of student evaluations also grew as a result of funding the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of American Colleges (AAC) received from the Carnegie Foundation to conduct a two-year effort, the Project to Improve College Teaching. Two major outcomes of the Project were reported: First, the project helped bring student evaluations into widespread use and, second, the project revealed a need for more systematic career development of college teachers.

Faculty express many concerns about the validity and reliability of student ratings. Aleamoni (1980) summarizes the main areas that faculty most often identify as concerns: students’ level of maturity and ability to make judgments; lack of qualifications and knowledge of good teaching; the possibility of a "popularity contest"; extraneous conditions that can affect ratings--class size, gender, etc.; the relationship of evaluations to expected grades; and general lack of reliability and validity of forms. Aleomoni addresses each of these concerns and presents the
accumulation of evidence that supports the use of student evaluations.

Recent reviews of the validity of student ratings have lent support to their usefulness as a measure of instructional effectiveness (Aleamoni, 1980; Cohen, 1980; Feldman, 1983; McKeachie, 1980). Centra (1987) points to studies done in the last ten years and concludes that "student ratings are reasonably correlated with student learning . . . with about one half using the global rating" (p. 49). According to Cohen (1980), when student evaluations are used for formative, rather than summative, purposes and when they are administered during the first half of the term, they are positively related to the improvement of college teaching.

The data on the improvement of instruction, however, do not provide hard evidence that simply evaluating teaching has an effect on teaching improvement or student achievement. Gil (1987) mentions "facilitating conditions" that must also exist for improvement to occur. For example, Gil suggests that the administration should provide an effective faculty development program to accompany any program of evaluation and adds that the faculty development program must be coordinated with the evaluation program in order to have a positive effect on instruction. McKeachie (1987) also supports the need for coordination and follow-up and points to the evidence that instructional evaluation does not necessarily lead to quick and easy improvement of instruction. His summary of faculty evaluation research suggests that instituting evaluation programs "typically but not invariably produces some improvement in teaching. . . [but] improvement is much more likely when the ratings are discussed with a consultant" (p. 3).
Teaching awards. Another administrative practice that acknowledges the role and importance of teaching is to provide an award for outstanding teaching. This award has become common on many campuses (Seldin, 1984). Seldin warns, however, that a "professor of the year" award, while it can give open acknowledgement to the status of teaching, will only do so if the award is truly meaningful, and not a "perfunctory exercise" (p. 50). A situation reported in The Bulletin (A.A.H.E., 1991) comparing research awards and teaching awards suggests that some teaching rewards (such as those given at some major universities) can be perfunctory. "You see a faculty member in the sciences . . . getting [up to] $400,000 in start-up dollars, and then the administration takes great credit for giving $500 to a great teacher" (p. 6). Schneider and Zalesny (1972) also point out that when outstanding teacher awards are the only means used to highlight good teaching, when only a small number of outstanding teachers receive them, and when the award bestows little money and no prestige, they are likely to be ineffective. And yet, the existence of such an award on a college campus--when handled appropriately and rewarded properly--sends a clear and supportive message from the administration about the importance of teaching (Cochran, 1987; Seldin, 1990).

Strategic Administrative Actions

Strategic actions provide easy ways for administrators to demonstrate commitment to teaching and do not impinge on faculty prerogatives or institutional policies: for example, collecting data to improve instruction; designing research to improve instruction; and giving verbal recognition to teaching in speeches, in campus
meetings, and in news releases. And yet, these items did not receive a high rating by presidents in Cochran's (1987) study. He summarizes the results as representing "a serious indictment of the professorate and suggest an appalling lack of interest in organized efforts to improve instruction" (p.99).

Public support of teaching efforts. Administrators are encouraged to articulate the stated mission, values, and goals of an institution in campus and community speeches and in news releases. Seldin (1987) reminds administrators that even if effective teaching is a written goal of the institution, it will not become a priority unless academic leaders articulate and consistently reinforce it. In institutions where teaching is a priority, thoughtful and consistent attention is directed to "symbolic reminders of the importance of teaching in both formal and informal rewards. . . [with] thorough and frequent campuswide coverage" (Rice & Austin, 1990, p. 36). Making good teaching an institutional priority means that administrators will emphasize its importance at every opportunity and with practices that reinforce its importance.

Institutional research and data gathering. Another practice that reinforces the importance and priority of teaching is to gather data about teaching effectiveness and to appropriately disseminate and use those data. A more recent activity (and one now required by the ICCB) is the program review process, a process which has grown dramatically in postsecondary institutions since the 1970s (Barak & Breier, 1990). An important part of this review process is research on teaching effectiveness. Because graduate schools tend to socialize faculty to focus on research related to their
discipline, new faculty are not likely to automatically place a high priority on teaching (Green, 1990). Comprehensive program review processes that include research on teaching and student outcomes help to counteract the socialization process and demonstrate a high level of commitment to teaching (Barak & Breier, 1990).

Summary

Concern about the quality of teaching in higher education institutions has not subsided since the early 1970s. Colleges and universities are being called upon to be more accountable and to evaluate whether their primary purpose, teaching and learning, is receiving the attention it deserves. Because of the organizational structures and conditions that are typical of postsecondary institutions, change comes slowly and requires intense efforts on the part of both faculty and administrators. However, the reward structure, the lack of attention to teaching on the part of the administration, and the discipline specialization of the faculty, create barriers to change and innovation—barriers that require administrative action and support. The need for administrative involvement and intervention is supported by the literature related to teacher change, staff development, and job satisfaction.

The literature related to the nature of administrative actions and policies in postsecondary institutions is extensive. Cochran (1987), after reviewing the literature, grouped the many administrative policies that indicate a commitment to teaching into five categories: institutional climate, instructional development activities, instructional enhancement activities, employment policies, and strategic administrative actions.
This chapter provides a review of the literature based on these five categories. The review demonstrates a lack of empirical studies, but a plethora of information and arguments in support of administrative involvement and increased commitment to teaching.

Chapter III will discuss the methodology used in this study in order to investigate the level of administrative commitment to the actions and policies identified in the five categories.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the level of administrative commitment to quality teaching reported by the administrators and perceived by faculty in Illinois public community colleges. Further, the purpose was to determine if there is a difference between the level of commitment reported by administrators and perceived by faculty. Data were collected using a two-part questionnaire and the relationship among the level of administrative commitment and demographic factors (institutional size and location), financial factors (amount budgeted for faculty development activities), and contextual/organizational factors (career faculty vs. transfer faculty, teaching vs. non-teaching administrators, existence of a faculty development position) was investigated. This chapter will describe the population and sample, the survey instrument used in the study, the procedures, and the hypotheses generated from the research questions.

Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of all presidents, academic vice-presidents, and full-time faculty in 48 of the 49 community colleges in the Illinois public community college system. In the case of administrators, a census of the population was taken. For the faculty, a sample, yielding 12% of the total number of
faculty, was drawn. (Faculty and administrators from one college, State Community College in East St. Louis, IL, were not included as this college no longer operates in the same manner as other colleges in the Illinois community college system.)

The two groups were selected in the following manner:

(1) Two administrators (the president and the vice-president of academic affairs or similar position) from each of the 48 institutions were identified from those listed in the Directory of Illinois Community College Administrators. (ICCB, 1992). Two presidents and one vice-president of academic affairs asked to be removed from the study as they had been in their respective positions for less than one year.

(2) Five hundred and thirty-seven faculty, representing 12% of the faculty at each of the 48 colleges, were selected from 4478 full-time faculty members. (Budget constraints limited the sample to 12%). In order to ensure that faculty from each of the 48 schools were equally represented, each school was sampled individually. That is, the 4478 faculty were not treated as one group for purposes of sampling; rather, each institution's faculty was assigned a number from 1...x (x = total number of faculty in that institution). Then 12% of that institution’s total faculty were identified using a random table of numbers. The 1991-1992 college catalogs from each of the 48 institutions were used to obtain the names of the faculty in each institution. (Appendix D contains the total number of full-time faculty employed at each institution, number of faculty identified for the study, and number of faculty from that institution responding.)
Instrument

The two-part instrument used in this study was adapted for use in community colleges from a questionnaire developed for a nation-wide study of four-year colleges and universities (Cochran, 1987). The original instrument was created after Cochran conducted a comprehensive review of the literature on the policies and practices that indicate an administrative commitment to teaching. Cochran first constructed a pilot instrument of 40 items, submitted it to a review panel of 12 professionals, then pared it to 25 items. The 25 item instrument was then submitted to 6 of the 12 professionals for final suggestions and changes. Cochran (1987) grouped the final 25 items into five categories and sent the instrument to 3,200 presidents in four-year institutions.

In the present study, Part I of Cochran’s survey instrument was revised by making minor adjustments in wording in order to adapt the instrument to the community college setting (see Appendix A). Five additional items were added to the categories as a result of further review of the literature. The Cochran (1987) instrument was used with permission (see Appendix C).

The first 30 items in Part I of the revised instrument required respondents (both faculty and administrators) to indicate their perceptions of the level of the administrative commitment to teaching on their respective campuses. The response alternatives ranged from one (low level of commitment) to ten (high level of commitment) on a Likert-type scale. A score of zero (or not applicable) was used to indicate that the item described did not exist on the respondent’s particular campus.
There was a possible range of scores from 0 to 300 as each of the 30 items could receive a rating of zero to ten.

Five subscores were obtained by grouping the 30 items related to administrative commitment to teaching into the five categories devised by Cochran (1987):

1. instructional development activities: six items (one item, relating to the role of faculty in development programs, was added to Cochran's (1987) instrument;

2. instructional enhancement efforts: five items;

3. employment policies and practices: seven items (two items, relating to feedback procedures and follow-up to evaluation, were added to Cochran’s (1987) instrument;

4. strategic administrative actions: five items;

5 institutional culture: seven items (two items, one relating to the physical setting and one to the mission of the comprehensive community college, were added).

The lowest score obtainable for each category is zero (indicating non-availability or a total lack of commitment on each of the items in that subscale) and the highest score for a category is 50, 60, or 70 (indicating a rating of ten on each of the five, six, or seven items in the category). There was no weighting of individual questions and each number on the scale had face value.

Two additional questions (items 31 and 32) provided "satisfaction" scores that
required both faculty and administrators to consider the items in the five categories and to rate their levels of satisfaction with (a) the institution’s commitment to these five categories, and (b) the personal attention given by administrators to the items in the five categories.

Part II was added to supplement Cochran’s (1987) original instrument. It consisted of 16 multiple-choice and short-answer questions that were designed to gather demographic, financial, and contextual/organizational data. For example, questions related to (a) the teaching area of faculty--career vs. transfer, (b) the teaching status of administrators, (c) the existence of faculty development position and/or center for teaching and learning, and (d) the total budget for instruction were included.

The reliability of the adapted 32 item instrument used for this study was high (Cronbach’s alpha = .9568). In addition, the reliability of each of the five categories and the two satisfaction items are shown in Table 1:

Table 1
Reliability of Five Subscale Scores and Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale Scores</th>
<th>Chronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional development (items # 1-6)</td>
<td>.8506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional enhancement efforts (items # 7-11)</td>
<td>.8202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment policies and practices (items #12-18)</td>
<td>.8166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic administrative actions (items # 19-23)</td>
<td>.8910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus environment and culture (items # 24-30)</td>
<td>.9157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with institution’s commitment to teaching (item 31):</td>
<td>.9092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with personal commitment (item 32):</td>
<td>.8990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the intercorrelations among each of the Five Subscales and the satisfaction scores were very high (reported in Table 2 and Table 44 in Chapter Four).

**Procedures**

The questionnaire and cover letters (see Appendix A and B) were sent to faculty and administrators in October of 1992. Respondents were asked to rate the level of administrative commitment to teaching on the 30 items which were grouped into five categories. Two additional items required administrators to rate themselves on (a) their overall satisfaction with the level of institutional performance and (b) the amount of personal attention they devote to each of the five categories. The faculty also rated the administration on these two additional items. The subjects also provided responses to the additional items in Part II of the instrument.

Two weeks after the questionnaire was mailed, in order to obtain a high rate of return, a postcard reminder was sent to all faculty nonrespondents and a phone call was made to all administrator nonrespondents. The response from this effort consisted of 48 responses from the 96 administrators (or 50%) and 242 faculty responses from the 537 faculty (or 45%). After a second mailing of the questionnaire to non respondents in November, 1992, the response from the administrators rose to a total of 66 returns (a 69% return rate). Final response for the faculty was 341 returns for a 63.5% rate of response.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses Tested**

The specific hypotheses generated for this study were derived from three general
research questions:

1. What is the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by the administrators and perceived by the faculty in Illinois Community Colleges?

2. Is there a difference in perception of administrative commitment between the administrators and the faculty?

3. Is there a relationship between the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by administrators and faculty and demographic factors, financial factors, and contextual/organizational factors?

To answer these general questions, the following hypotheses were tested.

**Hypothesis 1:** Administrators will rate their level of administrative commitment to teaching higher than the faculty rates the administrator's level of commitment.

It was assumed that the faculty and administrators in this study would differ in their perceptions of the level of administrative commitment to teaching. It was thought that faculty would hold some of the same beliefs and perceptions that Gray, Froh and Diamond (1991) reported in the results of a national survey in which they received over 23,300 responses from faculty. Their results indicated that faculty were generally skeptical of their administrators' commitment to teaching because many of the administrative policies and actions simply did not support teaching. Other higher education researchers (Boyer, 1987; Richardson, 1985; Seldin, 1990) have called for changes in policies and actions that would demonstrate administrative support of teaching. It was assumed that these writers came to this conclusion based on their observations and analyses of the present level of administrative
support in institutions of higher learning. It was further assumed that faculty would perceive this same lack of administrative support.

**Hypothesis 2:** There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in larger institutions (4,000 or over full-time equivalent students) than in smaller institutions (3,900 or fewer FTE).

In Cochran’s (1987) study of four-year institutions, it was reported that size of the institution was the one variable that had a relationship to administrative commitment to teaching. It is frequently held that the innovative institutions are small, private institutions in which people are free to experiment, Hodgkinson (1971) found evidence to support the conclusion of Cochran’s study: The most important element in institutional change is size, with the larger institutions having more of everything--resources, richness of program, and invention of innovations.

The literature does not indicate that there is a direct connection between institutional size and administrative commitment to teaching, but Vaughan (1980) found that size affected the nature of presidential leadership. Clark (1971) maintains that there is a relationship between size and the culture of an institution, the larger colleges generally having a strong group culture.

In addition to the effect on an institution’s culture and the type of leadership found, size is also related to the availability and the effectiveness of faculty development offerings. In Illinois community colleges, for example, Giordano (1989) reported on faculty development efforts and stated that there were differences in success rates of the programs based on the size of the institution and in favor of the larger institutions.
Hypothesis 3: There will be a higher overall level of administrative commitment to teaching in institutions located in suburban areas than in those in other areas.

When Cochran (1987) studied the issue of administrative commitment and location of four-year institutions in the United States according to their accrediting regions, no significant differences were found as a result of location. This study will consider location of community colleges within the state of Illinois where location may be linked to size. For example, it is known that many of the larger, suburban community colleges in Illinois report larger per capita costs than do the majority of the rural colleges, suggesting that more dollars are available for all budget categories. Furthermore, suburban colleges generally have higher unit costs of instruction than do the urban and rural colleges (Data and Characteristics of the Illinois Public Community College System, 1992).

The literature is devoid of information that examines the effect of location on an institution. Fullan and Pomfret (1977), however, reported on two studies where large differences in adoption of innovations between urban centers and rural areas existed— in favor of the urban areas. It is assumed that there may be a similar relationship when location and administrative commitment to teaching is examined.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a higher overall level of administrative commitment to teaching in institutions where there is a designated Center for Teaching and Learning or where a specific position is designated for faculty development than in institutions that have no identified Center or position for faculty development.

When an organizational structure includes an office specifically designed to focus on teaching, there is a strong message that the institution "takes teaching seriously" (A.A.H.E.
Bulletin, 1991, December). It can be assumed that when a center for teaching and learning is created, or, at the very least, a faculty development position is established as part of the institution, a serious commitment has been made to teaching and learning. It is also assumed that the faculty development position is most effective if (a) it is occupied by a faculty member, and (b) it is considered to be more than one-half of the assignee’s responsibilities.

**Hypothesis 5:** There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in institutions that have a unit cost of instruction above the mean than in institutions where the unit cost of instruction is below the mean for all Illinois public community colleges.

It is assumed that there is a correlation between dollars spent and effective instructional programs. It is further assumed that there is a correlation among effective programs, funds available for faculty development programs, funds available for instruction, and the level of administrative commitment to teaching.

There may also be a direct relationship between size of institution, unit cost, and the level of commitment. If, as Hodgkinson (1971) contends, larger institutions tend to have more resources, it is possible that those resources would contribute to a high level of commitment to teaching.

**Hypothesis 6:** There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in institutions where administrators regularly teach classes than in institutions where they do not.

It is assumed that one of the best ways to relate to another’s job is to perform the same job. When administrators teach, they not only will learn first hand the needs of the
faculty, but they will also demonstrate that teaching is a priority (Green, 1990).

**Hypothesis 7:** Faculty who teach more than 50 percent in a career/vocational area are likely to perceive administrative commitment to teaching higher than faculty who teach more than 50 percent of their classes in the transfer area.

Since satisfaction is partially based on the perceived relationship between what one wants and what one receives, it is assumed that those with a higher level of job satisfaction would be receiving more of what they want and, as a result, would perceive a higher level of commitment to teaching from their administrators. The results of several studies provide differing viewpoints. When differences between vocational/occupational faculty and transfer faculty and their level of job satisfaction are examined, transfer faculty tend to be less satisfied (Cohen & Brawer, 1989; Seidman, 1985). For example, when job satisfaction was surveyed in West Virginia and Virginia community colleges, the faculty who taught vocational courses showed significantly lower levels of satisfaction on all variables: self-esteem, accomplishments, expectations, respect and fair treatment, and communication (McKee, 1990). Hill (1983), however, reported the opposite to be true. His survey of over 600 community college faculty members in Pennsylvania indicated that faculty in the social and behavioral sciences, mathematics, and physical sciences are generally less satisfied with their work; those in business and nursing tend to be among the most satisfied. Stephen (1989), on the other hand, reported that the academic disciplines with the highest percentage of respondents who were moderately or very satisfied with their career were not teaching in transfer areas. They were those in vocational or technical areas, specifically, allied health, business, and related technologies.
Hypothesis 8: Administrators "satisfaction scores" (regarding their institution's level of commitment and their personal amount of attention to quality teaching) will be higher than the satisfaction scores obtained from the faculty.

Studies focusing on community college faculty job satisfaction indicate that administrative actions and policies play a key role in how satisfied faculty are with their jobs (Cohen, 1984, 1988; Diener, 1985; Stephens, 1989). When faculty are asked to name the reasons for their dissatisfaction, administrators are often named as part of the problem. Administrators, however, do not identify themselves as contributing to the problem of faculty dissatisfaction.

Method of analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to explore the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by the administrators and perceived by the faculty. A Total Commitment Score mean from the first 30 items, five separate means from the five subscales, and a satisfaction score were computed for both groups. The mean scores from the 30 items, from each of the five subscales, and the satisfaction scores were identified as the 7 dependent variables. Six independent variables included (a) the size of the institution, (b) the location of the institution, (c) the program/teaching area of the faculty—career/vocational vs transfer, (d) the teaching status of administrators, (e) the existence of a faculty development position or center for teaching and learning, and (f) the mean unit cost for instruction. Multivariate analyses of variance (both one-way and two-way ANOVAS and MANOVAs) were run to determine what factors were associated with differences between the two groups and if the differences were significant. Finally, multiple regression analysis
was conducted in order to determine which of the independent variables in the study were associated with each of the dependent variables.

**Summary**

A questionnaire was mailed to senior-level administrators and a sample of full-time faculty in 48 public community colleges in Illinois in order to determine their perceptions of the level of administrative commitment to teaching. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate the level of administrative commitment to teaching on 30 items that reflected policies and actions that indicate support of teaching. Administrators were also asked to rate their satisfaction on the level of commitment of their institution and how committed personally they were to effective teaching. Faculty were asked to rate the administration on both of these items. Additional demographic, financial, and contextual/organizational data were obtained from 16 multiple-choice or open-response items.

Three major research questions were the basis of eight hypotheses:

1. What is the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by the administrators and perceived by the faculty in Illinois Community Colleges?
2. Is there a difference in perception of administrative commitment between the administrators and the faculty?
3. Is there a relationship between the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by administrators and faculty and demographic factors, financial factors, and contextual/organizational factors?

The results of the analyses of the data will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter will report the results from the analysis of the data collected via survey instruments sent to senior administrators and a sample of faculty in Illinois public community colleges. The study was designed to determine the faculty’s and administrators’ level of administrative commitment to quality teaching and to ascertain what factors might account for any differences between the reports of the two groups. Demographic factors (institutional size and location), financial factors (unit cost of instruction), and contextual/organizational factors (career faculty vs. transfer faculty, teaching vs. non-teaching administrators, existence of a faculty development position) were the independent variables in the study. These factors were expected to affect both the faculty’s and the administrators’ perceptions of the administrative level of commitment to teaching.

The results are organized in response to the three research questions that formed the basis for the study:

1. What is the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by the administrators and perceived by the faculty in Illinois Community Colleges?

2. Is there a difference between the administrators and the faculty in their perceptions of administrative commitment to teaching?
3. Is there a relationship between the level of administrative commitment to
teaching reported by administrators and faculty and demographic factors, financial
factors, or contextual/organizational factors?

A related issue examined how satisfied faculty and administrators were with
the reported level of administrative commitment to teaching.

From these three main questions and the related satisfaction issue, hypotheses
were formulated to test the separate and combined effects of the independent
variables. The eight hypotheses were as follows:

H1: Administrators will rate their level of administrative commitment to
teaching higher than the faculty rates the administrator's level of commitment.

H2: There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in
larger institutions (4,000 or over full-time equivalent students) than in smaller
institutions (3,900 or fewer full time equivalent students).

H3: There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in
institutions located in suburban areas than those located in urban or rural areas.

H4: There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in
institutions where a specific position is designated for faculty development than in
institutions that have no identified position for faculty development.

H5: There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in
institutions that have a unit cost of instruction above the mean than in institutions
where the unit cost of instruction is below the mean for Illinois Community Colleges.

H6: There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in
institutions where administrators regularly teach classes than in institutions where they
do not.

H7: Faculty who teach more than 50 percent of their assignment in a
career/vocational area are likely to perceive administrative commitment to teaching
higher than faculty who teach more than 50 percent of their classes in the transfer
area.
H8. Administrators' "satisfaction scores" (regarding their institution's level of commitment and their personal amount of attention to quality teaching) will be higher than the satisfaction scores obtained from the faculty.

In order to test the first seven hypotheses which focused on the level of administrative commitment to teaching, six dependent variables were used in the analysis: five subscale scores and a total commitment score (obtained from items 1-30 on the questionnaire). Hypothesis 8, which focuses on satisfaction, used the satisfaction scores obtained from the ten questions in items 31 and 32.

The results from the first two major research questions (which includes hypothesis 1) will be combined to form the first part of this chapter; results from hypotheses 2-7 will be presented as the next major section. Finally, the results from hypothesis 8 will be presented at the end of the chapter.

A correlation matrix of the six dependent variables used in the discussion of the first seven hypotheses is provided in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1Develop</th>
<th>2Enhance</th>
<th>3Employ</th>
<th>4Strat.Act.</th>
<th>5Climate</th>
<th>Totcom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1DEVELOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7256</td>
<td>.7595</td>
<td>.6837</td>
<td>.8948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ENHANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3EMPLOY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.6378</td>
<td>.8620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4STR.ACT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5CLIMATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.6816</td>
<td>.8800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1Develop</th>
<th>2Enhance</th>
<th>3Employ</th>
<th>4Strat.Act.</th>
<th>5Climate</th>
<th>Totcom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totcom</td>
<td>.7676</td>
<td>.6397</td>
<td>.6954</td>
<td>.6047</td>
<td>.8514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 demonstrates that there is a strong relationship among all of the six dependent variables (r=.6047 to r=.8948). As would be expected, the correlation between the Total Commitment Score (TOT. COM.) and each of the five subscales (1DEVELOP, 2ENHANCE, 3EMPLOY, 4STR.ACT, AND 5CLIM) is consistently high (r=.8481 to r=.8948).

The Sample

The Colleges

Responses were received from administrators and faculty from forty-eight of the forty-nine institutions in the Illinois public community college system. The institutions were grouped by size and location. College size was based upon the full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment of each college as reported by the Illinois Community College Board, Data and Characteristics, 1991. There were twenty-five small institutions (under 4,000 FTE) and twenty-three large institutions (those 4,000 FTE and over).

The definition of location—whether urban, suburban/metropolitan, or rural—was based upon the 1980 data of the United States Bureau of the Census and their determination of metropolitan statistical areas (United States Bureau of the Census, 1987). Eight institutions were classified as urban and all were within the city of Chicago. These eight institutions were treated as separate institutions, even though governed district-wide because each college has its own administrative staff, unique programs, and unique populations. Twenty-four institutions were classified as rural
and sixteen institutions were classified as suburban/metropolitan. The classification of suburban/metropolitan included colleges that were within 50 miles of a major metropolitan area or were institutions in metropolitan areas (other than Chicago) of at least 100,000 population. Table 3 provides the number, size, and location of the institutions in the study and the number of faculty and administrators at each type of institution.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Faculty in 12% Sample</th>
<th>Total Admin. in Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub/met</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to questions related to size and location of institutions, the hypotheses of this study included questions related to the existence of a faculty development position and the unit cost of instruction. Unit cost of instruction is a standard measure of resources available for the instructional efforts at each institution. These data are published by the Illinois Community College Board in Data and Characteristics (April, 1992).
Table 4 expands on Table 3 by identifying the forty-eight community colleges in the study by name and giving their size and location. The existence and type of faculty development position plus the unit cost of instruction for each institution is also provided.

Table 4

Institutional Size, Location, Faculty Development Position/type, Unit Cost of Instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of institution</th>
<th>Size location</th>
<th>fac.dev. position</th>
<th>unit cost of instruction</th>
<th>Above Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>Lg. sub/metro</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>103.48</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackhawk</td>
<td>Lg. sub/metro</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>127.48</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago City Wide</td>
<td>Lg. Chicago</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>96.92</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daley</td>
<td>Lg. Chicago</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>121.05</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy King</td>
<td>Lg. Chicago</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>106.75</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm X</td>
<td>Lg. Chicago</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>98.68</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Harvey</td>
<td>Lg. Chicago</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>107.37</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>Lg. Chicago</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>102.02</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Lg. Chicago</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>144.34</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Lg. Chicago</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>131.27</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupage</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>faculty**</td>
<td>110.63</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>129.03</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>158.78</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill Central</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>faculty*</td>
<td>124.92</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>142.08</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LakeCounty</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>faculty**</td>
<td>152.45</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LincolnLand</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>123.39</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraine Vall</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>faculty**</td>
<td>137.39</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakton</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>faculty*</td>
<td>134.13</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>Lg. Rural</td>
<td>faculty*</td>
<td>137.44</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RockValley</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>133.76</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Suburb</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>faculty*</td>
<td>128.96</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triton</td>
<td>Lg. Sub/metro</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>146.59</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>Sm. Rural</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>135.58</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>Sm. Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>122.28</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier</td>
<td>Sm. Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>67.53</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of institution</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>location</th>
<th>fac.dev. position</th>
<th>unit cost of instruction</th>
<th>Above mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linc. Trail</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>111.75</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney Central</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>111.64</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash Valley</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>66.89</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Val.</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>111.11</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noKankakee</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>95.39</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaskaskia</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>110.66</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishwaukee</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>134.01</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Land</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>99.53</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Clark</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>103.96</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>faculty*</td>
<td>106.18</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>faculty*</td>
<td>151.84</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
<td>faculty*</td>
<td>140.20</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie St.</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>122.83</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RendLake</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>112.98</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>admin.*</td>
<td>132.99</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CarlSandburg</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>122.93</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaukValley</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>127.63</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>111.53</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>108.78</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon River</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>130.04</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waubonsee</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>137.49</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>137.84</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. mean for unit cost of instruction: $121.76
* part-time, less than 1/2 of assigned duties
** part-time, more than 1/2 of assigned duties

The Administrators

The average age of the 63 presidents and vice-presidents who responded was 51 years; seventy-seven percent were male. The number of years they were in their position as a senior administrator ranged from one to twenty-six years; the average number of years was 6. Seventy percent had doctorate degrees and all but one had
held a faculty position. The average number of years of teaching experience was 9 years.

Table 5 provides a composite of the administrator's response by the number and percent responding by size and location of institutions, and the number who teach at least one course per year.

Table 5

**Administrative Response by Institutional Type and Number who Teach Classes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number admin.</th>
<th>Number (%) respond</th>
<th>Number (%) teach one or more courses per yr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31 (62%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32 (70%)</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32 (66%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20 (62%)</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11 (69%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Faculty

The average age of the 341 faculty who responded was 49 years; 59% were male. The number of years the faculty had been in their positions ranged from 3 to 34 years; sixteen years was the average. Of those who identified their area of teaching, more than half (57%) taught courses that were primarily in the transfer curriculum while forty-three percent of those who identified their teaching area taught
primarily vocational/career courses.

Table 6 provides a composite of the faculty in the study by number of full-time faculty at each type of institution, the number identified as part of the sample, the number and percent of the sample responding to the survey, and the number and percent of those responding who teach mainly career/vocational courses or transfer courses.

Table 6

Faculty Response by Size of Institution, Location of Institution, and Teaching Area of Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>number in sample</th>
<th>Number/ (%) responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>120 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>221 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>120 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb/Met</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>173 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc/career</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Level of Administrative Commitment to Teaching

The data gathered from items 1 to 30 on the questionnaire were analyzed to answer the first two research questions, "What is the level of administrative commitment to teaching in Illinois public community colleges?" and "Is there a
difference between the perception of the faculty and the administrators?"

To answer the first question, three scores were produced from the results: a separate mean score for faculty, a separate mean score for administrators, and a combined faculty/administrator mean score. These three scores were computed for each of the 30 items, for each of the five subscales, and for the total commitment score. The item response choices ranged on a scale from 0 (no commitment) to 10 (high commitment). The midpoint of the range is 5.0.

The combined administrator and faculty mean score from all 30 items on the questionnaire (the Total Commitment Score) was 5.1 out of a possible total mean score of 10. When computed separately, the faculty’s mean score was 4.6 and the administrators’ mean score was 7.1. Thus, faculty ratings are below the mid-point of the 10 point scale and administrators are above the mid-point.

To explore the significance of these results, comparisons were drawn between the results from Cochran’s (1987) nation-wide study of presidents of all four-year institutions. Cochran (1987) reported a total mean score of 6.7 from the presidents in four-year institutions he surveyed. However, Cochran’s study did not include faculty; it was sent only to presidents. In order to draw a fair comparison, the administrators’ mean total score of 7.1 is more appropriately used for purposes of comparing Illinois community college administrators with the presidents in four-year institutions. Given the 1 - 10 range of possible scores, the level of administrative commitment is seen as moderately high by administrators as slightly low by faculty.

The means from the five Subscales were computed for purposes of further
As shown in Table 7, the subscale mean scores are generally lower and the standard deviations are generally larger for the faculty than they were for the administrators, which suggests a higher commitment and more agreement among the administrators. Campus climate was rated highest by both groups. Administrators gave lowest ratings to Subscale 1, Instructional Development while the faculty gave their lowest ratings to Subscale 4, Strategic Administrative Actions.

The 30 individual items provide information about the specific administrative
policies and actions that the literature identifies as supportive of teaching. The means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented in Table 8.

Table 8.

Individual Item Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Faculty and Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Combined Fac/Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBSCALE 1: INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. New faculty workshops</td>
<td>3.796</td>
<td>5.635</td>
<td>4.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.296)</td>
<td>(2.847)</td>
<td>(3.295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PT faculty workshops</td>
<td>3.691</td>
<td>5.825</td>
<td>4.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.260)</td>
<td>(2.814)</td>
<td>(3.284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sem., conferences</td>
<td>5.303</td>
<td>6.730</td>
<td>5.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on-campus</td>
<td>(2.943)</td>
<td>(2.431)</td>
<td>(2.912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanisms</td>
<td>(3.002)</td>
<td>(2.287)</td>
<td>(3.046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organized instr.</td>
<td>4.110</td>
<td>5.016</td>
<td>4.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit available</td>
<td>(3.412)</td>
<td>(3.678)</td>
<td>(3.467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty have key role</td>
<td>6.158</td>
<td>8.111</td>
<td>6.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.076)</td>
<td>(2.095)</td>
<td>(3.025)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SUBSCALE 2: INSTRUCTIONAL ENHANCEMENT** |         |       |                    |
| 7. Librarians used           | 4.803   | 5.603 | 4.933              |
|                              | (3.132) | (2.814) | (3.093)           |
| 8. Release time given        | 3.461   | 5.381 | 3.768              |
|                              | (3.037) | (3.299) | (3.156)           |
| 9. Funds available           | 5.442   | 8.111 | 5.870              |
|                              | (2.893) | (2.064) | (2.943)           |
| 10. Curric. develop.         | 4.439   | 6.825 | 4.824              |
| highlighted                  | (2.647) | (1.972) | (2.695)           |
| 11. Admin. emphasize         | 3.760   | 6.841 | 4.255              |
| teaching                     | (2.742) | (2.280) | (2.901)           |
| 12. Teach. important.        | 5.227   | 8.571 | 5.774              |
| to hiring                    | (3.186) | (1.847) | (3.251)           |
### SUBSCALE 3: EMPLOYMENT POLICIES

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Student evaluation results used</td>
<td>6.789</td>
<td>8.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teach. important to tenure</td>
<td>6.692</td>
<td>8.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teach. important to promotion</td>
<td>3.498</td>
<td>5.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teaching awards given</td>
<td>4.474</td>
<td>6.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Follow-up to evaluation provided</td>
<td>4.458</td>
<td>7.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Feedback (mentors available)</td>
<td>4.645</td>
<td>7.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBSCALE 4: STRATEGIC ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Public emphasis on teaching</td>
<td>4.256</td>
<td>7.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Projects related to teaching</td>
<td>3.546</td>
<td>5.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Data on teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>3.171</td>
<td>5.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Admin. emphasizes teaching</td>
<td>3.674</td>
<td>7.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBSCALE 5: CAMPUS CLIMATE

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Faculty ownership of curriculum</td>
<td>6.122</td>
<td>8.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Campus morale</td>
<td>5.330</td>
<td>7.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Admin. stability</td>
<td>4.302</td>
<td>7.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Institutional pride</td>
<td>5.635</td>
<td>7.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Physical setting</td>
<td>5.723</td>
<td>8.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Mission clear and accepted</td>
<td>6.165</td>
<td>8.429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean rating for all items were higher and the standard deviations for most items were lower for administrators than for faculty. In sum, the answer to the first research question is that the level of administrative commitment appears to be slightly low overall (i.e., below the scale mid-point) and it varies notably among the five subscales, the individual items, and the respondents.

The second research question this study addressed was "Is there a difference in perception of administrative commitment to teaching between administrators and faculty?" To provide a partial answer to this question, the Total Commitment Score means were computed and these means, as well as the means of the five subscales, were compared using analysis of variance tests. All testing was run with a minimum significance level of 0.05.

Initially, a one-way analysis of variance test was run to compare mean Total Commitment Scores between faculty and administrators. As expected, the mean total commitment scores among administrators (mean = 7.017) was significantly higher than among faculty (mean = 4.685) (F (1,384) = 88.20, \( p < 0.0001 \)).

The five subscale scores for faculty and administrators obtained from the categories of items from the first 30 items on the questionnaire were also compared statistically to look for differences between the faculty’s perception and administrators’ perception of administrative commitment to teaching. A one-way MANOVA test was run on the subscales and status of the respondents. A Hotelling’s t-value of 0.3123 was computed with an F-value of 22.671. This was highly significant (\( p < 0.0001 \)) indicating that the status of the respondent did affect the
subscale means.

To cite where the specific differences existed, further univariate F-tests with (1,367) df were run on each of the subscales and status of the respondents. Table 9 summarizes the results of each test. The mean scores of both faculty and administrators for each subscale are also listed.

Table 9

Univariate F-tests of Faculty and Administrator by Subscale Score Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
<th>Means faculty</th>
<th>Means admin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>faculty</td>
<td>admin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>160.94</td>
<td>160.94</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>1997.49</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.Enhance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>252.47</td>
<td>252.47</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>1642.57</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl.Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>294.72</td>
<td>294.72</td>
<td>74.79</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>1446.15</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str.Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>417.59</td>
<td>417.59</td>
<td>86.31</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>1775.80</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp.Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td>358.59</td>
<td>358.59</td>
<td>81.03</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td>1624.07</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There is a slight discrepancy in the mean scores in this table from the mean scores in Table 7 due to missing cases.
For each subscale, the administrators' mean scores were significantly higher than those of the faculty with the largest differences being found in the areas of employment policies, strategic actions and campus climate.

Thus, as expected, the study showed that the administrators' perception of total administrative commitment to teaching is significantly greater than that of the faculty's perception. The administrators' mean rating was somewhat higher than the mid-point of rating scale (5.0) while the faculty's mean rating was slightly below it. This was also true for all five subscales.

For purposes of further analysis, these same subscales were ranked (after means were rounded) and the differences between the administrator and faculty means were computed. As Table 10 shows, the average mean score was 7.0 for administrators and 4.7 for faculty with an average difference of 2.3 points.

Table 10

Subscales Ranked by Mean Scores from Highest to Lowest with Differences Identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Faulty (rank)</th>
<th>Admin. (rank)</th>
<th>Differences in means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Campus Environment</td>
<td>5.3 (1)</td>
<td>7.9 (1)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Employment Policies</td>
<td>5.1 (2)</td>
<td>7.5 (2)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Instructional Development Activities</td>
<td>4.6 (3)</td>
<td>6.3 (5)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Instructional Enhancement Activities</td>
<td>4.4 (4)</td>
<td>6.6 (3)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Strategic Administrative Actions</td>
<td>3.7 (5)</td>
<td>6.5 (4)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 4.7 7.0 2.3
The subscale that received the highest rating from both faculty and administrators is Subscale 5, Campus Climate. But the two groups differed on the subscale that would receive the lowest mean score. Faculty rated Subscale 4 (strategic administrative actions) the lowest while administrators rated Subscale 1, instructional development activities, the lowest.

The individual items were also ranked from lowest to highest mean score and the difference between the administrators’ and faculty’s mean scores were computed. The differences between the two groups averaged 2.3 points and ranged from a low of .8 points to a high of 3.3 points as shown in Table 11.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM (SUBSCALE)</th>
<th>Faculty (rank)</th>
<th>Admin (rank)</th>
<th>Difference in means</th>
<th>Difference in rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. (3) Student evaluation results used</td>
<td>6.8 (1)</td>
<td>8.3 (4)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. (3) Teaching important to tenure</td>
<td>6.7 (2)</td>
<td>8.9 (1)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. (5) Mission clear and accepted</td>
<td>6.2 (3)</td>
<td>8.4 (3)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (1) Faculty have key role in instructional dev.</td>
<td>6.1 (4)</td>
<td>8.1 (7)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. (5) Faculty ownership of curriculum projects</td>
<td>6.1 (5)</td>
<td>8.4 (5)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. (5) Physical setting conducive to teaching</td>
<td>5.7 (6)</td>
<td>8.2 (6)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. (5) Institutional pride is high</td>
<td>5.6 (7)</td>
<td>8.0 (9)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (2) Funds available for instructional development</td>
<td>5.4 (8)</td>
<td>8.1 (8)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. (5) Campus morale is high</td>
<td>5.3 (9)</td>
<td>7.8 (10)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (1) Seminars, teaching</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conferences on campus</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. (3) Teaching important</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to hiring</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (2) Librarians used</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. (3) Feedback (mentors)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (1) Colleague support</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanisms available</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. (3) Teaching awards</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. (3) Follow-up eval-</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uation provided</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (2) Curriculum develop</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment highlighted by admin-</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. (5) Administrative sta-</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bility</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. (4) Public emphasis</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on teaching by administra-</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (1) Organized faculty</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development program</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (1) New faculty work-</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shops held</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. (4) News releases used</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. (2) Administration</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasizes scholarly activ-</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. (5) Confidence in ad-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ministration</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (1) PT faculty work-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shops held</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. (4) Admininistration</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasizes teaching</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. (4) Projects related</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. (3) Teaching important</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to promotion</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (2) Release time given</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to teaching</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. (4) Data on teaching</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE: 4.7 7.0 2.3
Comparing the ranks shown in Table 11 revealed a highly significant correlation between administrators and faculty in the relative perceived commitment to those 30 items (\( \rho = .785, \ N = 30, \ p = < .002 \)). Thus, although differing in perceived level of commitment to each, administrators and faculty generally agree on the relative commitment to these items.

Additional comments regarding the differences between the faculty’s and the administrators’ individual item mean scores are organized by the five categories that formed the subscales.

**Instructional Development Activities (Subscale 1)**

The individual items ( # 1-6) in Subscale 1 presented questions about formalized instructional development activities and the mechanisms for delivering these activities. Table 10, which showed the ranked subscale means, revealed that the mean scores for administrators (6.3) in Subscale 1 was the lowest of the five subscales. This was also true for the chief academic officers when this same survey instrument was used by Cochran (1987) in a nation-wide study of four-year colleges and universities. However, when compared to the mean of 5.3 reported by the presidents in Cochran’s (1987) study of four year institutions, the mean for the community college administrators in the present study is a full point higher.

The lowest individual item for administrators was also in this subscale: the existence of an organized program or unit for instructional development. All of the forty-eight community colleges in this study state that a formal unit or program with a full-time director or leader does not exist (see Table 4). One college reports that it is
planning to establish a Center for Teaching and Learning. Although several colleges reported that there is a development committee that makes suggestions and plans activities, no college had a faculty member or administrator with full-time responsibilities for instructional development programming. Twelve of the colleges report that an administrator has a part-time assignment; however, it is considered to be less than half of the administrators' duties. In addition, nine other colleges indicated that a faculty person had responsibility for faculty development but none of the nine had full, reassigned time.

The faculty’s mean score (4.6) for this subscale, unlike the administrators’, was not the lowest mean score of the five subscales; it was third. The analysis of the scores of the individual items that formed the subscale (Tables 8 and 11) suggest that three of the items in this subscale--workshops and seminars for new faculty and for part-time faculty and an organized program for instructional faculty development--were in the bottom third of the 30 items and contributed to a mean score that averaged 1.7 points lower than the administrators’ mean for this subscale.

When examining other individual items in this subscale, one item stands out as particularly positive: the ownership role of faculty in the development of instructional activities. Not only did this item receive the highest mean score from the faculty for this subscale, only three out of the total 30 items received a higher mean score. The administrators’ mean score on this item (8.1) was also high; only four scores out of the 30 were higher. However, on the negative side, the faculty’s mean score was almost two points lower than that of the administrators’ mean score. Also, the
faculty's mean score of 6.2 could be considered low when viewed in light of a potential mean score of 10.

A final comment: The amount of difference between the faculty's and administrators' mean scores on this subscale was 1.7. While this difference is significant ($p < .0001$), the amount was the smallest of the differences on all five subscales.

**Instructional Enhancement Activities (Subscale 2)**

Subscale 2 (items 7 - 12) included questions related to activities and improvement mechanisms that enhance and strengthen instruction.

The faculty's mean (4.4) on this subscale was second lowest of the five subscales, just slightly below the mean for subscale 1, Instructional Development Activities. The administrators' mean score was more than two points higher ($p < .0001$) and suggests that administrators view their efforts on behalf of strengthening instruction to be greater than faculty perceive the efforts to be. However, the administrators' mean score of 6.6 out of a possible 10, is higher than the mean score of 6.0 reported by Cochran (1987) who conducted a nation-wide study of the perceptions of presidents of four-year institutions using the same survey instrument.

Several of the individual items in the subscale, specifically those dealing with the availability of funds and released time confirmed other research that states that faculty rate individual grants for study and released time as the most desirable and most needed forms of support (Caffey, 1979; Fiedlander & Gocke, 1984; Giordano, 1989; Lacey, 1988). The faculty's and administrators' rating of the availability of
funds to support instructional improvement as the highest item of the six in this subscale (5.4 and 8.1 respectively). But, the awarding of released time received the lowest mean score (3.5) by the faculty and by the administrators (5.4) in this subscale. And, when these questions were considered outside of the subscale and ranked with all 30 items (Table 11), the results were similar: the released time response received the faculty’s second lowest and the administrators’ fourth lowest mean score. The use of released time is an approach that both groups agree is used sparingly. (There was a difference of only 1.9 points between the two mean scores.)

Administrators perceive the accessibility of funds in a more positive way than do the faculty: the mean score of 8.1 on the funding item was 2.7 points higher than the faculty’s mean, even though both groups’ scores placed the item in the top eight of the 30 items.

Two other items in this subscale received low mean scores from both faculty and administrators. The first item, giving high visibility to curriculum development activities, and the second, emphasizing the role of scholarly activities to reinforce or support teaching, are both activities that require little effort or expense. And yet, both faculty and administrators gave higher mean scores to more than half of the other 30 items on the survey instrument.

**Employment Policies (Subscale 3)**

Subscale 3 (items 13 - 18) focused on administrative policies surrounding the hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty. For Cochran’s (1987) study of four-year institutions, this subscale received the highest mean score (8.4) from the
presidents surveyed. The administrators in this study, however, rated this subscale lower (7.5) suggesting that teaching is less a part of the reward structure in two-year schools and has less to do with decisions about hiring, promotion, and tenure than it does in four-year schools.

On the other hand, there is some evidence that efforts and initiatives regarding employment policies and practices are receiving a relatively large amount of attention from the administrators in this study. The mean score was second only to the mean score reported for Subscale 5, Campus Environment (7.9). For faculty, the mean score of 5.1 also placed this subscale second to their highest subscale mean. The large difference between their score and the administrators' score ($p < .0001$) on this subscale, however, suggests that faculty view the administrators' employment policies higher than the administrators view some other concerns, but that administrators do not view these concerns as a priority.

The differences in mean scores on individual items between administrators and faculty on this subscale were some of the largest found in the five subscales: administrators report mean scores on several items that are more than 3.3. points higher than the faculty's mean scores. (See Table 11.) But there was also some agreement on the ranking of the individual items. For example, both faculty and administrators gave one of their highest mean scores to "teaching is important to tenure" (6.7 and 8.9 respectively). Faculty gave their highest mean score (6.8) out of all 30 items to the use of student evaluation results. Administrators also rated that item high (8.3) but not as high as the item related to the importance of teaching to
hiring (8.6). These higher scores suggest that both administrators and faculty perceive the evaluation of classroom teaching--including its use for hiring or tenure decisions--to be a significant activity in Illinois public community colleges.

The item in this subscale that received the third lowest score of the 30 from both the administrators and the faculty was the item that questioned how important teaching is to promotion. The fact that few Illinois public community colleges have promotion in rank for faculty would explain this low mean score and the small amount of difference between the two groups.

Strategic Administrative Actions (Subscale 4)

Subscale 4 focused on several items that provide a broad range of opportunities for administrators to demonstrate commitment to teaching. Administrative actions such as making public statements about teaching, sending news releases, and reinforcing the importance of teaching in meetings and campus communications are symbolic reminders that are readily available, take little effort, and cost nothing. And yet, this subscale had the lowest mean of the five subscales for faculty with four of the five items ranked in the lowest ten of all 30 items. In fact, the item receiving the lowest mean score from faculty for all 30 items (and second lowest for administrators) was in this subscale: collecting data on teaching effectiveness. Another item, projects related to teaching, also received one of the lower scores for the 30 items (fourth lowest for faculty and seventh lowest for administrators).

Furthermore, faculty do not perceive the administrators are supportive as
judged by the amount of disagreement on this subscale between the two groups. The faculty's mean subscale score was 2.8 points lower than the administrators' mean subscale score, the largest difference between the two groups for all five subscales. (See Table 10.)

The administrators also ranked this subscale low (fourth out of five subscales) and also appear to agree with the presidents from four-year institutions about the importance of strategic administrative actions. The administrators' mean score (6.5) in this study was only slightly lower than the mean score (6.7) from the chief academic officers in four-year schools (Cochran, 1987).

Campus Climate (Subscale 5)

This subscale's mean score of 7.3 was the highest mean score of all five subscales for administrators and was slightly higher than the 7.1 mean reported by presidents in Cochran's (1987) nation-wide study of four-year institutions. In that study, Cochran judged the presidents mean score to be only moderately positive for sustaining the primary function of teaching.

The faculty in this study also ranked this subscale as the highest. Their mean score was 5.3. Also, five out of seven items in this subscale were ranked in the top eight items when considering all 30 items (see Table 11). Included in these five were items identifying the morale on campus, the sense of institutional pride, the physical setting, and the clarity and acceptance of the mission. The fifth--and perhaps the most important item to receive one of the highest mean scores--was the sense of ownership the faculty have about the curriculum and instructional concerns. This
item ranked fifth highest among the 30 and had an almost identical mean score to an earlier item regarding faculty involvement in instructional development programs. Administrators also sense that the institutional climate is generally positive: the same five out of seven items in this subscale that the faculty ranked in their top eight were ranked among the administrators' top ten items.

A different picture develops, however, when questions about the effectiveness of leadership are posed. Two items related to leadership not only were ranked the lowest in the subscale for faculty (3.7 for confidence in the administration and 4.3 for administrative stability), both items were 3.2 points lower than the administrators' mean scores on these two items. While these scores suggest that the administrators perceive their leadership ability in a far more positive manner than do the faculty, it appears that the administrators also lack confidence in their leadership: The administrators rated item 26, "confidence in the administration" with the lowest mean score in this subscale; the faculty also rated this item the lowest in the subscale and only fourteenth out of 30 items. It was a full two points below the faculty's highest ranking item. (Faculty ranked it seventh.) Also, like the faculty, the administrators perceive a lack of stability in their own administrations. They ranked twelve other items higher than this item. (Faculty rated seventeen items higher.)
The third research question asked was, "Is there a relationship between the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by administrators and faculty and demographic factors, financial factors or contextual/organizational factors?"

Five separate hypotheses were tested to determine if there was a relationship between the levels of commitment reported by the faculty and administrators and these factors. For each of these hypotheses a two-way analysis of variance test was conducted using the faculty and administrator Total Commitment Score means and the faculty and administrator subscale score means as dependent variables.

**Relationship of Size of Institution to Perception of Commitment**

The size of the institutions was expected to have an effect on the perceived level of administrative commitment to teaching. The third hypothesis stated: "There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in larger institutions (4,000 or more full time equivalent [FTE] students) than in smaller institutions (fewer than 4,000 FTE)." Two-way ANOVA and MANOVA tests were run to compare means. The means of the faculty and administrator Total Commitment Scores from large and small institutions are presented in Table 12. (For ease of reading the tables, the standard deviations, which were all in the same range as those listed in Tables 7 and 9, have been omitted.)
Table 12

Means of Separate and Combined Total Commitment Scores of Faculty and Administrators by Size of Institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>faculty</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>4.555</td>
<td>6.749</td>
<td>5.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=113</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td>4.753</td>
<td>7.276</td>
<td>5.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=210</td>
<td>N=32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 presents the results of the two-way ANOVA test run on Total Commitment Scores of faculty and administrators by size of institution. (Missing cases causes a slight variation in the Ns throughout the tables.)

Table 13

Two-way Analysis of Variance of Size of Institution and Separate Faculty and Administrator Total Commitment Scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>1242.09</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>288.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>288.56</td>
<td>88.75</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status by size</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.5120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the mean commitment scores were slightly higher for both faculty and administrators at the larger institutions than at the smaller institutions, the results of the two-way ANOVA in Table 13 indicated that no interaction was present and that size did not have a significant effect on the total commitment scores.
The individual subscale means of faculty and administrators by size of institution were then compared. Table 14 lists the means of the separate and combined faculty and administrator subscale scores by size of institution. In all subscales with the exception of the campus climate area, the mean total commitment scores for the respondents in smaller schools are less than the means of those in larger schools.

Table 14

Means of Separate and Combined Faculty and Administrator Subscale Scores by Size of Institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>faculty</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>3.982</td>
<td>5.548</td>
<td>4.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>4.843</td>
<td>7.011</td>
<td>5.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td>4.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>4.411</td>
<td>6.894</td>
<td>4.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>4.931</td>
<td>7.412</td>
<td>5.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>5.179</td>
<td>7.518</td>
<td>5.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Actions</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>3.677</td>
<td>6.219</td>
<td>4.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large</td>
<td>3.683</td>
<td>6.788</td>
<td>4.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>5.536</td>
<td>7.889</td>
<td>6.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large</td>
<td>5.111</td>
<td>7.875</td>
<td>5.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = Faculty 239 (large), 109 (small); Administrators 32 (large), 31 (small)
The results of a two-way MANOVA test comparing these five subscale means by size of institution and status of respondents appear in Table 15.

Table 15

Two way Multivariate Analysis of Variance on Subscale Scores by Faculty and Administrators by Size of Institution

(s=1, m=1.5, n=179.5 df)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>HOTELLING’S t</th>
<th>Exact F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>.08035</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.29937</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status by size</td>
<td>.00888</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.6680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that both the size of the institution and the status of the respondent are significantly related to the perception of administrative commitment. No interaction was present.

Further tests were necessary to discover the basis of these differences. The results of these univariate F-tests run with (1, 365) df to compare subscale means by size of institution are shown in Table 16.
Table 16

Univariate F-tests of Subscale Means by Size of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>69.47</td>
<td>69.47</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1801.74</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.1480</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1633.17</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.5230</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1461.64</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.3510</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1770.52</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.4530</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1611.39</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the five subscales, only Instructional Development showed a significant main effect due to institutional size; the mean rating was higher for respondents from large schools. It should be noted that the size effect was not significant in the previously reported ANOVA on the Total Commitment Scores, but was significant in the MANOVA because the direction of the effect was not the same for all five subscales. That is, ratings were higher among respondents from large schools on
some subscales but were higher among respondents from small schools on other subscales (e.g., climate). These different patterns were obscured when Total Commitment Scores were used, but were revealed by the multi-variate analysis.

**Relationship of Location of Institutions and Level of Administrative Commitment to Teaching**

The location of the institutions within the state of Illinois was also considered to have a relationship with the level of commitment reported by the faculty and administrators. Hypothesis 3, which states, "There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in institutions located in suburban areas than those located in other areas" was supported by the results. Table 17 lists the means of the faculty and administrator's total commitment scores by location of institution along with the combined means.

Table 17

**Means of Separate and Combined Faculty and Administrator Total Commitment Scores by Location of Institution.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION of Institution</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Combined Fac/Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>3.506</td>
<td>6.691</td>
<td>4.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N= 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
<td>5.013</td>
<td>7.420</td>
<td>5.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4.653</td>
<td>6.841</td>
<td>5.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Variations in the Ns are due to missing cases.
Both the faculty and administrators from the suburban metropolitan area had higher total commitment mean scores than did the faculty and administrators from the urban (Chicago City Colleges) and the rural areas. In addition, the City Colleges had the lowest mean scores of the three locations.

A two-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare the total commitment scores of faculty and administrators by location of their institutions. These test results are summarized in Table 18. Both status and location were found to be significant factors in determining total commitment scores. No interaction was present.

**Table 18**

**Two-way Analysis of Variance of the Location of Institutions and Separate Faculty and Administrator Total Commitment Scores.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>1162.60</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>292.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292.23</td>
<td>95.52</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>31.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.0070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status by Loc.</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.3510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More testing was needed to help identify where specific differences may occur in the five subscale means in relation to status and location of institution. Table 19 shows the means of the subscale scores by location of faculty and administrators.
Table 19

Means of Subscale Scores by Location of Faculty and Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION STATUS</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Combined fac/admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>3.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
<td>5.105</td>
<td>7.562</td>
<td>5.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4.093</td>
<td>5.650</td>
<td>4.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Enhancement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>3.206</td>
<td>6.345</td>
<td>3.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
<td>4.634</td>
<td>7.209</td>
<td>4.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4.399</td>
<td>6.147</td>
<td>4.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>4.201</td>
<td>7.935</td>
<td>4.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
<td>5.378</td>
<td>7.100</td>
<td>5.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5.015</td>
<td>7.562</td>
<td>5.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2.616</td>
<td>5.509</td>
<td>3.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
<td>3.920</td>
<td>7.300</td>
<td>4.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3.753</td>
<td>6.293</td>
<td>4.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>3.874</td>
<td>7.668</td>
<td>4.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
<td>5.396</td>
<td>7.844</td>
<td>5.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5.634</td>
<td>8.029</td>
<td>6.139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For four of the five subscales, the faculty mean scores for the suburban/metropolitan areas were higher than those for the urban and rural areas which supports the hypothesis. The one exception was the campus climate subscale where the faculty mean score for the rural colleges was higher than the means for the Chicago and suburban/metropolitan areas. The administrator’s mean scores for the
suburban/metropolitan colleges also appeared higher than those in the city and rural colleges in the areas of instructional development, instructional enhancement and strategic action, but lower than both the urban and rural areas in regard to employee policies, and lower for the campus climate subscale than for the rural colleges.

A two-way MANOVA test was performed to see if any of these differences were significant. The results of this test are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Two-way MANOVA of Location of Institution and the Separate Faculty and Administrator Subscale means

(s=2,m=1,n=178.5 df)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Status</th>
<th>HOTELLING’S t</th>
<th>EXACT F</th>
<th>SIG OF F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>0.16174</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>0.31101</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status by Location</td>
<td>0.0780</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MANOVA test shows that both status and location had significant effects on the subscale means and that there was also a significant interaction effect. This interaction indicates that the location effect is not the same for administrators and faculty when commitment is considered as a multi-variate factor rather than as a total score.

Further univariate F-tests were run to pinpoint exactly where the mean differences due to location existed among the subscale areas. Table 21 presents the results of this test.
Table 21

Univariate F-tests by Location of Institution and Subscale Scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale Area</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>122.22</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>1712.22</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>35.98</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.0160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1558.25</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1392.69</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>58.29</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1691.02</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>32.07</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1522.27</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences were found in all subscale areas except for employment policies. Referring back to Table 19 it was found that the means of the suburban metropolitan colleges were higher than those for the urban schools in instructional development, instructional enhancement, strategic actions, and campus climate. Even though the mean scores for the employment policies subscale appeared higher in the suburban/metropolitan locations than in the rural and urban areas, the differences were due to chance alone. It was also found that the mean scores of the respondents from rural colleges were higher than those for the urban areas.
In summary, it appears that the suburban location of an institution contributes to the perception of a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching. This was true in all subscale areas except for items related to employment practices. In this one subscale, no significant differences were found among respondents from urban, rural, and suburban/metropolitan locations. Faculty and administrators from rural areas rather than suburban areas had the highest mean scores on items related to campus climate.

Relationship of Position for Faculty Development and the Level of Administrative Commitment to Teaching.

It was assumed that the existence of a position for faculty development, either as part of a Center for Teaching and Learning or as part of the organization of the college, would have a positive effect on the level of perceived administrative commitment to teaching. Therefore it was hypothesized (H5) that "there will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in institutions where a specific position is designated for faculty development than in institutions that have no identified position for faculty development."

When the data were collected and analyzed from the questionnaire (items 5 and 33-37), there were conflicting results. Because of the wide variation in responses, items 33 through 37 were carefully examined to determine if more accurate results could be obtained. The responses to these items were also contradictory. Therefore, in order to obtain the required information, a letter (Appendix D) was sent to the chief academic officer at each of the forty-eight participating campuses
requesting the specific names and the type of position available. Forty-five responses were received by mail or fax; three were obtained from a follow-up telephone call.

As a result of the information obtained from the follow-up letter, no analyses were conducted to determine the relationship of the position to the level of administrative commitment to teaching. No college had a full-time position for faculty development or an organizational unit or program designated as a center for teaching and learning. While twenty-one institutions stated that the activities of faculty development were considered to be part of a job description, only three institutions indicated that it was a position that was considered to be more than one-half of the assigned duties. These three part-time positions were held by faculty members.

**Relationship of Instructional Unit Cost and the Level of Administrative Commitment to Teaching**

The money allocated specifically for instruction was also assumed to have an effect on the level of commitment to teaching. Therefore, it was hypothesized that "there will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in institutions that have a unit cost of instruction above the mean than in institutions where the unit cost of instruction is below the mean for Illinois Community Colleges."

The unit cost of instruction for each of the forty-eight colleges was identified earlier in Table 4. Table 22 lists the separate mean Total Commitment Scores of the faculty and the administrators by unit cost of instruction (whether above or below the mean unit cost for all institutions). As was hypothesized, the mean scores of faculty and administrators where the unit cost of instruction was above the mean were higher
than the scores of the faculty and administrators who came from institutions where the unit cost was below the mean.

Table 22

Means of Total Commitment Scores of Faculty and Administrators by Institutional Unit Cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Mean</td>
<td>4.080</td>
<td>6.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 91</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Mean</td>
<td>4.921</td>
<td>7.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 232</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA tests were run to investigate the effect that the unit cost of instruction had on the level of commitment. Table 23 summarizes the results of a two-way analysis of variance comparing the means of the administrative Total Commitment mean scores by status and unit cost.

Table 23

Two-way Analysis of Variance between Faculty and Administrator's Level of Commitment and Unit Cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>1199.14</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>285.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>285.71</td>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>.0080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status by unit cost</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.5340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both the effect of unit costs and status were found to be significant. The mean scores of both faculty and administrators was significantly lower in institutions where the unit cost of instruction were less than the average than in those schools where the unit cost was above the average. There was no interaction between unit cost and respondent status.

Comparisons of the five subscale means of faculty and administrators by unit cost of instruction were then reviewed. Their means are listed in Table 24.

Table 24

Separate Subscale means of Faculty and Administrators by Unit Cost of Instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>STATUS Admin</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Under Mean</td>
<td>3.527</td>
<td>5.674</td>
<td>4.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Over Mean</td>
<td>4.925</td>
<td>6.647</td>
<td>5.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Under Mean</td>
<td>3.685</td>
<td>6.304</td>
<td>4.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Over Mean</td>
<td>4.611</td>
<td>6.695</td>
<td>4.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Policies</td>
<td>Under Mean</td>
<td>4.423</td>
<td>7.149</td>
<td>5.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over Mean</td>
<td>5.347</td>
<td>7.648</td>
<td>5.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Actions</td>
<td>Under Mean</td>
<td>3.098</td>
<td>5.765</td>
<td>3.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over Mean</td>
<td>3.905</td>
<td>6.935</td>
<td>4.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>Under Mean</td>
<td>4.877</td>
<td>8.019</td>
<td>5.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over Mean</td>
<td>5.410</td>
<td>7.804</td>
<td>5.770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The means of the subscale scores for faculty and administrators appear higher in the institutions where unit cost for instruction is above the mean cost for the state in all subscales except Campus Climate. In this area administrators from campuses where unit cost is below the mean had a slightly higher mean subscale score. To see if any of these differences were significant, a two-way MANOVA with (s=1,m=1.5, n=179.5 df) was conducted to compare the five subscale means by status and unit costs. These results are summarized in Table 25.

Table 25

**Two-Way Manova Tests of Significance of Unit Cost of Instruction and Total Commitment Score Means of Faculty and Administrators.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Cost Status by Unit Cost</th>
<th>Hotelling’s</th>
<th>EXACT F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling’s</td>
<td>0.06117</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXACT F</td>
<td>0.30428</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG</td>
<td>0.01772</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.2720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both status and unit costs were found to be significant factors contributing to differences in subscale means. There was no interactive effect of unit cost by status. Further univariate F-tests with (1,365) df tests were run to pinpoint where these differences might be found with regard to unit cost and the five subscale areas. The combined faculty/administrator mean scores for each subscale were used. The results are summarized in Table 26.

There were significantly higher mean levels of commitment in schools where the unit cost of instruction was above the state average in all subscales with the
exception of campus climate. The most significant differences were in the area of instructional development and strategic actions. All of these results support hypothesis 5 that the unit cost of instruction has a significant effect on perceived administrative levels of commitment to teaching. Moreover, the unit cost effect did not differ significantly as a function of respondent status.

Table 26

**Univariate F-tests of Unit Cost and combined faculty/administrator Subscale mean scores**

(Read with (1, 365) df)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG of F</th>
<th>Means Under Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>66.31</td>
<td>66.31</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>4.06 5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1753.68</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.0310</td>
<td>4.24 4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1578.70</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
<td>5.00 5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1390.04</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>46.08</td>
<td>46.08</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>3.61 4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1715.69</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.6030</td>
<td>5.56 5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1605.98</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship of the Teaching Activity of Administrators and the Level of Administrative Commitment to Teaching

It was assumed that if administrators taught a class at least once a year, they would be delivering a strong message about their commitment to teaching. Therefore, the following hypothesis was tested: "There will be a higher level of administrative commitment to teaching in institutions where administrators regularly teach classes than in institutions where they do not." Table 27 lists the mean total commitment scores of faculty and administrators by whether or not administrators taught at least one course per year.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.744</td>
<td>6.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.658</td>
<td>7.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To see if these differences were significant a two-way ANOVA test was conducted to look for differences between the total commitment by faculty and administrators and the administrator's teaching activity. These results are summarized in Table 28.
Table 28

Two-way ANOVA of Total Commitment Score Means of Faculty and Administrators by Administrator's Teaching Activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>236.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236.95</td>
<td>72.48</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin teach</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.9150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status by Teach</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.8330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>1248.85</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the means were tested for differences between the two groups (those who had administrators who taught regularly and those who did not), the two-way ANOVA test results revealed that only status was significant in determining commitment means. There was no effect of the teaching activity of administrators on mean commitment scores. Any visible differences were due to chance alone.

The subscale score means were also compared between the institutions where administrators teach and where they do not. These mean scores are listed in Table 29.
Table 29

Means of Faculty and Administrator Subscale Scores by Teaching Activity of Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>ADMIN TEACH?</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.991</td>
<td>6.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.344</td>
<td>6.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.213</td>
<td>6.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.414</td>
<td>6.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.086</td>
<td>7.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.092</td>
<td>7.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.590</td>
<td>6.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.719</td>
<td>6.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.130</td>
<td>7.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.318</td>
<td>7.984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both faculty and administrators, there were higher ratings on Instructional Development for schools where administrators teach than where they do not. Conversely, faculty and administrators tended to give slightly lower ratings to Instructional Enhancement, Employment Policies, and Campus climate at schools where administrators do not teach.

A two-way MANOVA was conducted using the subscale score means to determine the effect of administrative teaching activity on the perceived level of administrative commitment to teaching. The results of this analysis (see Table 30)
showed that both the effect of administrative teaching activity as well as status was significant to the level of perception of administrative commitment to teaching. No interaction was present.

Table 30

Two-Way MANOVA on Subscale Scores by Administrators Teaching Activity and Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOTELLING'S t</th>
<th>EXACT F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin teach</td>
<td>.03988</td>
<td>2.87969</td>
<td>.0150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.21114</td>
<td>19.32457</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status by Admin Teach</td>
<td>.01347</td>
<td>0.97247</td>
<td>.4340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that administrators taught was not significant for the two by two ANOVA for Total Commitment Scores but was significant on the MANOVA for the Subscales because the effect of administrators teaching was not the same for all subscales.

Relationship of Faculty Teaching Area and Level of Administrative Commitment to Teaching

It was hypothesized that "Faculty who teach more than 50 percent of their assignment in a career/vocational area are likely to perceive administrative commitment to teaching higher than faculty who teach more than 50 percent of their classes in the transfer area." Each faculty respondent was asked to indicate the area (transfer programs or vocational/career programs) in which they taught more than
fifty percent of their teaching assignment. Thirty-four of the total 341 faculty respondents did not indicate their teaching area; of those who did, fifty-seven percent taught in the transfer area and forty-three percent taught more than 50% of their assignment in career/vocational classrooms. The mean total commitment scores of faculty who taught more than fifty percent in the transfer area was 4.608 with a standard deviation of 1.974. This was a little lower than the mean total commitment score of faculty who taught more than 50% of their assignment in career/vocational classrooms which was 4.806 with a standard deviation of 1.720. However, a one-way analysis of variance test of teaching area of faculty by total commitment score means showed that the mean difference was not significant (p > 0.05). The results of the test are summarized in Table 31.

Table 31

| Analysis of Variance of Teaching Area of Faculty by Total Commitment Score Means |
|---------------------------------|--------|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| Within Cells 1033.52            | 296    | 3.49| F   | SIG   |
| Faculty 2.85                     | 1      | 2.85| .82 | .367  |

Subscale means for faculty by faculty teaching area are stated in Table 32.
Table 32

Mean Subscale Scores of faculty by Faculty Teaching Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>Teaching Area</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Development</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>4.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc/Career</td>
<td>4.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Enhancement</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>4.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc/Career</td>
<td>4.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Policies</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>5.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc/Career</td>
<td>5.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Actions</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>3.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc/Career</td>
<td>3.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>5.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc/Career</td>
<td>5.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means of faculty teaching more than 50% of their assignment in the vocational area appeared to be higher than those whose teaching was predominantly in the transfer area. This was true for the areas of instructional enhancement, employment policies, strategic actions, and campus climate. However, a one-way MANOVA test run on the subscale scores produced a Hotelling’s t-value with a F-value of 1.86 and a p-value = 0.101. This indicated that there were no significant differences in faculty commitment subscale scores due to faculty teaching area.

In conclusion, it must be pointed out that many of the "independent" variables used in this study may be naturally confounded. To determine if confounding did exist, Chi-square tests were run to look for confounding of the size of institution and
location, unit cost and location, and unit cost and size of institution.

The contingency table (Table 33) classifies size of institution by location. A Chi-square value of 37.15 (CV = 5.99) indicated that significant confounding is present between the size and location of the institutions. Almost all large schools are either suburban or urban, and almost all small schools are rural.

Table 33

Contingency Table of Size and Location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sub/metro</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Unit cost and location are classified in Table 34. A Chi-square value of 10.58 (CV = 5.99) indicated that significant confounding also exists between unit costs and location. Almost all suburban/metropolitan schools have unit costs over the mean for the state and most Chicago and rural schools have unit costs below the mean.
Table 34

Contingency Table of Unit Cost and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Unit Cost</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub/metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Mean</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Mean</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the size of the institution and unit costs were not found to be confounded. Table 35 lists the classification of unit cost by size of institution. The Chi-square value of 1.44 (CV = 3.841) was not significant.

Table 35

Contingency Table of Unit Cost and Size of Institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Unit Cost</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under mean</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over mean</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be pointed out that because of the confounding that exists between the variables, their effects on commitment are not independent. This fact presents some problems for the development of a multiple regression model to predict total
commitment scores based on the size of the institution, status of respondent, location of institution, and unit costs. The independence of these variables can now be questioned and subject to some limitations due to the confounding that was found. It should also be noted that because of the categorical nature of the variables, 0 and 1 values and dummy variables were used to handle the three categories of the location variable.

A step-wise regression method was used with the default level for the p-values set at 0.05 for variable entry into the model. The equation to predict total commitment (TCOM) based on the variables of status (STATUS), whether urban, that is located in Chicago or not (CHGO), and whether the size was large or not (BIG) was calculated to be:

\[
TCOM = 4.86 + 2.51 \text{STATUS} - 1.43 \text{CHGO} + 0.59 \text{BIG}
\]

An F-value of 42.05 (p < .001) indicated that these variables were significant predictors of commitment. The R-squared value of 0.2424 indicates that only 24.24% of the variation can be explained using STATUS, CHGO, and BIG to predict total commitment. The standard error associated with the equation is 1.74. Even though the variables included were all significant, the low r-squared is due to multicollinearity between size of institution and Chicago schools. The city has larger schools than the rural areas. It should be pointed out that no interaction terms were included in this model. In general, the regression model indicates that commitment would be highest among administrators outside of Chicago at large schools; and lower for faculty in Chicago and in small schools.
Satisfaction with the Levels of Administrative Commitment to Teaching

In addition to the three main purposes of this study—(a) to determine the level of administrative commitment to teaching, (b) to analyze the differences in the level of commitment between administrators and faculty, and, (c) to determine what factors might contribute to those differences—a related issue, that is, the level of satisfaction with administrative commitment to teaching, was also explored. In order to determine the level of satisfaction of both administrators and faculty, data were collected from item 31 (which had five questions, each corresponding to the five subscales formed from items 1-30) and item 32 (which also had five questions, corresponding to the five subscales) on the questionnaire.

The five satisfaction questions in item 31 focused on satisfaction with the overall institutional performance and support of teaching (labeled Inst.Sat.). The five questions in item 32 focused on satisfaction with personal performance of the administrators and their commitment to teaching (labeled Pers.Sat.). A third satisfaction score (labeled Tot.Sat.) was computed as a mean score from all ten questions in items 31 and 32 on the questionnaire.

The correlation matrix (Table 36) reveals a very high positive correlation ($r = 0.9121$) between the Total Commitment Scores (obtained from the means of items 1-30 on the questionnaire) and the Total Satisfaction Scores (obtained from the 10 questions in items 31 and 32). Therefore, it can be assumed that if policies and practices are in place that improve the perception of administrative commitment to
teaching, satisfaction will also be high. Furthermore, the high correlations among the three separate satisfaction scores \( (r = .8887 \text{ to } .9736) \) demonstrates that if respondents are satisfied with the level of personal commitment of the administration, they will be satisfied with their institution’s level of commitment to teaching as well.

Table 36

**Intercorrelations Among Satisfaction Scores and Total Commitment Scores.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inst. Sat</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8887</td>
<td>0.9697</td>
<td>0.9119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Sat</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9736</td>
<td>0.8656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship of Satisfaction and Level of Administrative Commitment to Teaching**

The data from the ten questions in items 31 and 32 were used to test the hypothesis (H8) "Administrators’ satisfaction scores (regarding their institution’s level of commitment and their personal amount of attention to quality teaching) will be higher than the satisfaction scores obtained from the faculty." The results in Table 37 support the hypothesis: the administrators’ mean scores for all three satisfaction scores are higher than the faculty’s mean scores.
Table 37

Level of Satisfaction with Administrative Commitment to Teaching as Reported by Administrators and faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N= 323</td>
<td>N=63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst.Sat.</td>
<td>4.772</td>
<td>7.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers.Sat.</td>
<td>4.496</td>
<td>6.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot.Sat.</td>
<td>4.645</td>
<td>7.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine if the difference in the satisfaction scores between the faculty and administrators was significant, the total satisfaction scores of the two groups were compared. (A single score was used--Total Satisfaction--because of the high correlation between the two satisfaction subscale means.) A one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the total satisfaction scores of faculty and administrators. An F value of 72.31 was computed indicating that differences are indeed significant (p < 0.0001). Table 38 provides the results of the ANOVA.

Table 38

One-Way Anova on Total Satisfaction Scores of Faculty and Administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>311.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311.62</td>
<td>72.31</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>1654.96</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Earlier, other factors such as size of institution, location of institution, unit cost of instruction, teaching activity of administrators and area of teaching for faculty were considered to determine if they had an effect on the perceived level of administrative commitment by faculty and administrators. The same type of testing was then done with the total satisfaction scores (Total Sat.) to determine if any of these same factors contributed to differences in mean total satisfaction scores. Table 39 summarizes the mean total satisfaction scores by status and these other factors.

Table 39

Mean Total Satisfaction Scores by Status and Selected Independent Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>4.594</td>
<td>6.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td>4.672</td>
<td>6.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>6.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban/Metro</td>
<td>4.969</td>
<td>7.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4.665</td>
<td>7.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Teaching Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admin teach:yes</td>
<td>4.681</td>
<td>7.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admin teach:no</td>
<td>4.630</td>
<td>6.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under state mean</td>
<td>3.694</td>
<td>6.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over state mean</td>
<td>4.904</td>
<td>7.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Teaching Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer</td>
<td>4.608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career/vocational</td>
<td>4.806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two-way ANOVA tests were run on total satisfaction scores by status and other selected factors. These ANOVA results are presented in Table 40.

Table 40

Two-way ANOVA of Status on Mean Total Satisfaction Scores by Selected Independent Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIZE OF INSTITUTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>1653.46</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>309.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>309.20</td>
<td>71.44</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.5610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status by size</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.7560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION OF INSTITUTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>1555.17</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>295.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>295.32</td>
<td>72.16</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>.0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status by Location</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.8230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE TEACHING ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>1653.36</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>273.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>273.51</td>
<td>63.19</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin teach</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.5450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status by Adm.Teach</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.6580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT COST OF INSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>1594.25</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>315.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>315.65</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>.0150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status by unit cost</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.4610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all four two-way ANOVA tests, no interaction was present and, as expected, the status of the respondent contributed to significant differences in total satisfaction score means. The size of the institution and administrative teaching...
activity had no effect on total satisfaction scores. The location of the institution and unit cost of instruction did, on the other hand, contribute significantly to differences in mean total satisfaction score. As shown in Table 40, satisfaction was lowest for the Chicago location and highest for the suburban/metropolitan location. It was higher in schools with greater unit costs than in schools with unit cost of instruction below the mean.

A one-way ANOVA conducted to test for differences in total satisfaction levels between faculty who teach in transfer areas and faculty who teach in vocational/career areas produced an $F(1, 294) = 0.02$. This was not significant.

**Summary**

This chapter reported on the results from the analysis of the data collected from a two-part survey instrument sent to senior administrators and a sample of faculty in Illinois community colleges. The purpose was to investigate the level of administrative commitment to teaching using the Total Commitment Scores and the Subscale Scores obtained from the survey instrument. Analyses were conducted using combined faculty/administrator and separate faculty and administrator Total Commitment Scores means to test eight hypotheses which were designed to answer three research questions that formed the basis for the study.

**Research question one.** What is the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by the administrators and perceived by the faculty in Illinois Community Colleges?
The combined mean Total Commitment Score on all 30 items for faculty and administrators was 5.065 (on a scale of 0 - 10). Separate Total Mean Scores were reported for faculty (4.684) and for administrators (7.017). Subscale Score means for faculty ranged from a low of 3.687 on Subscale 3 (Strategic Administrative Actions) to a high of 5.289 on Subscale 5 (Campus Climate). Subscale Score means were higher for administrators, ranging from a low of 6.292 on Subscale 1 (Instructional Development Activities) to a high of 7.882 on Subscale 5 (Campus Climate). Faculty and administrator means were also presented for each of the 30 items. Faculty reported the highest mean score for item 13 ("Student evaluation results are used") and the lowest mean score for faculty was item 22 ("Data on teaching effectiveness is used to improve instruction.") Administrators reported the highest mean score for item 14 ("Teaching is important in tenure decisions") and the lowest mean score for item 5 ("Teaching is promoted by an organized instructional unit or program").

Research question two. Is there a difference in perception of administrative commitment between the administrators and the faculty?

ANOVA tests revealed significant differences between the faculty' and administrators' Total Commitment Scores and all five Subscale Scores.

Research question three. Is there a relationship between the level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by administrators and faculty and demographic factors, financial factors, or contextual/organizational factors?

The size and location of institutions, the unit cost of instruction, the teaching activity of administrators, and the teaching area of faculty (transfer or
vocational/career) were analyzed to determine if there was a relationship to the level of commitment.

Institutional size, the teaching activity of administrators and the teaching area of faculty were not significant factors in perceived levels of total commitment, but effects of location and unit cost of instruction were significant. The total commitment levels of the Chicago colleges were found to be significantly lower than those for the suburban/metropolitan area colleges. The total commitment scores were significantly higher for faculty and administrators where the unit cost was above average.

When commitment was analyzed according to the five subscales, institutional size, location, and unit cost of instruction, and teaching activity of the administrators were found to have significant effects on some, but not all, subscales. That is, although subscale scores were highly correlated with each other, they were not always influenced in the same way by the other factors. The mean of the smaller institutions was significantly less than that for larger institutions on Instructional Development but not on the other subscales. The means of the suburban/metropolitan colleges were significantly higher than those for the urban schools in the areas of instructional development, instructional enhancements, strategic actions and campus climate but not employment practices. In all subscales except for campus climate, significantly higher mean levels of commitment were found in schools where the unit-cost of instruction was above the state average. Teaching by administrators was associated with differences in instructional development but not in other subscales. These differences attest to the value of considering commitment as a multi-faceted concept.
Size, location and unit costs were shown to be non-independent factors and unit costs were shown to be non-independent factors, thus clouding the interpretation of which variable is actually responsible for the level of commitment. Even so, a regression analysis indicated that location and size may constitute unique sources of variance in commitment scores.

Finally, a hypothesis was tested to determine if the administrators were more satisfied than faculty with the institution's performance and the administration's personal attention to the items identified in each of the five subscales. The size of the institution, the teaching activity of administrators, and the teaching area of faculty were not found to have a significant effect on satisfaction. However, location of the institution and unit cost were found to have a significant main effect on satisfaction such that suburban/metropolitan and unit costs above the mean respondents were more satisfied.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Excellence in the classroom is a responsibility as well as a primary interest of most college faculty members (Monney, 1989). While the importance of quality teaching is indisputable, substantive questions regarding the commitment to teaching, especially since the 1970s, have been raised from various sectors within and without the academic community (Finn, 1990). In response to the concerns, administrative policies and actions that create the organizational structure and environment that support quality teaching have been discussed (Grant, 1988; Green, 1990; Little, 1987, 1991; Richardson, 1989; Seldin, 1990). The specific policies and actions that have been identified to encourage faculty to strive for quality in the classroom have been reviewed and categorized by Cochran (1987). This chapter will provide a summary of findings and the conclusions from the findings. The limitations of the study and recommendations for practice and further research will also be discussed.

The Study

The present study explored the level of administrative commitment to quality teaching in Illinois public community colleges via a questionnaire that was adapted from Cochran's (1987) nation-wide study of presidents in four-year colleges and universities.
Unlike Cochran's study, which surveyed only presidents, the present study also surveyed faculty. Since the two vital factors which interact and help determine the effectiveness of organization are "leadership and the perceptions of leadership" (Grant, 1988), it was essential that faculty also be questioned regarding their perceptions of their leaders' commitment to quality instruction.

The following three questions were the basis of the study:

1. What is the level of administrative commitment to teaching as reported by administrators and as perceived by faculty in Illinois community colleges?

2. How does the level of administrative commitment to teaching, as reported by the administrators, compare to the faculty's perception of administrative commitment?

3. What is the impact of financial, demographic, and contextual/organizational factors on the reported level of commitment?

Administrative commitment to quality instruction was measured by the administrators' and faculty's answers to 30 questions organized around five sub-scales: (1) instructional development activities; (2) instructional enhancement efforts; (3) employment practices; (4) strategic administrative actions; (5) and campus climate. In addition, the impact of financial, demographic, and contextual/organizational factors on the level of commitment was investigated.

Faculty and administrative responses were analyzed to determine if the level of administrative commitment to teaching as reported by the administrators differed from that of the faculty's perception of the administrators' commitment. A summary of the
findings follows.

Summary of Findings

Research Questions One and Two

Data from the 341 faculty (a response rate of 64%) and 63 administrators (a response rate of 69%) were analyzed to first answer research questions 1 and 2: "What is the level of administrative commitment to teaching in Illinois community colleges?" and "Is there a difference between the level of administrative commitment to teaching as perceived by the faculty and reported by the administrators?"

A summary of the 10 major findings is presented first. Details about these 10 major findings and additional findings follow.

1. The level of administrative commitment to teaching in Illinois public community colleges, as determined by the combined administrator and faculty mean scores, is a mean score of 5.06 out of possible total score of 10.

2. When the administrators' scores are computed separately, their mean score is only slightly higher than the mean score obtained from the administrators in four-year institutions (Cochran, 1987).

3. Administrators report a significantly higher level of administrative commitment to teaching than faculty perceive them to have on all items and on all subscales. The difference in perception is greatest for subscale 4, strategic administrative actions.

4. Administrators report their lowest level of administrative commitment to instructional development activities (subscale 1); faculty perceive the lowest level of administrative commitment to be to strategic administrative actions (subscale 4).

5. Although the items in subscale 4 focused on inexpensive and easy-to-accomplish administrative actions, none of the items in this subscale were rated in the top ten by either administrators or faculty.
6. The lowest score by administrators for all 30 items was in the instructional development subscale in response to the item that read, "there is an organized faculty development program."

7. Administrators and faculty agree that released time does not receive a high level of commitment from administrators.

8. Administrators and faculty report a relatively high level of commitment regarding the funding of instructional development activities.

9. Administrators and faculty rated policies and actions related to the campus climate to have a higher level of administrative commitment than most other policies and actions.

10. The administrators and faculty both report a relatively low level of faculty confidence in the leadership and in the stability of the administration; these items were not ranked in the top ten by the administrators.

There was a significant difference ($p < .0001$) between the faculty's mean Total Commitment Score of 4.6 and the administrators' mean Total Commitment Score of 7.1. There was also a significant difference ($p < .001$) found between the means of each of the faculty's and administrators' five subscale scores. The range of score for faculty on the five subscales was from 3.7 to 5.3 (mean = 4.7) while the administrators' mean subscale scores ranged from 6.3 to 7.9 (mean = 7.0). The range on the individual items for faculty was from 3.2 to 6.8. For administrators the range on the individual items was from 5.3 to 8.9. Furthermore, the administrators' commitment score exceeds by less than half a point the scores reported by Cochran (1987) in his nation-wide study of presidents; Cochran reported a total mean score of 6.7 from the four-year institutions he surveyed.

Subscale 1, Instructional Development Activities, had the lowest level of commitment to quality teaching reported by administrators (mean = 6.3) for the five
subscales. An even lower level of commitment was perceived by the faculty (4.6) for Subscale 1, although it was not the lowest subscale mean reported by faculty. This subscale focused on workshops and seminars on campus for full-time faculty, for part-time faculty, and for new faculty; the remaining items focused on the establishment of a formal instructional development program or unit, such as a Center for Teaching and Learning and the role of the faculty in such programs. Additional data revealed that there are no formal organizational programs or units with a full-time director or manager in Illinois public community colleges. This fact may explain why the item in the questionnaire referring to such programs received from administrators the lowest mean score for all 30 items on the questionnaire. The faculty’s mean score on this item ranked 20.

The administrators’ scores for items related to instructional enhancement efforts (Subscale 2), placed this subscale third out of the five subscales (mean = 6.6). An even lower level of commitment was perceived by the faculty (mean = 4.4) and their score placed this subscale fourth lowest out of five subscales.

The items identified in this subscale (support for released time, curriculum development and innovation, scholarly activities other than publishing, and adequate funding for instructional development) had mixed responses. For both faculty and administrators, some of the items were ranked in the lowest ten of the 30 items and some were ranked in the highest ten. For example, items relating to support for curriculum innovation and support for broadening the definition of scholarship received low mean scores. In addition, released time received the lowest mean score
in this subscale and was ranked 29th and 27th by administrators and faculty, respectively, out of the total 30 items. Availability of funding, on the other hand, received relatively high scores from both faculty and administrators. It was ranked 8th for both groups.

Employment Policies (Subscale 3), which included items that focused on policies related to the evaluation of teaching and retention, promotion, tenure, and hiring of new faculty, generally ranked higher than the previously discussed subscales. It was ranked second out of five by both groups. However, the administrators' mean score of 7.5 on this subscale was lower than the presidents' mean score of 8.2 in Cochran's (1987) study of four-year institutions. Furthermore, the faculty's mean score was a full three points lower.

The one subscale (Subscale 4, Strategic Administrative Actions) that focused on items that provide a broad range of opportunities for administrators to inexpensively demonstrate commitment to teaching received the lowest mean score of the five subscales from the faculty. The administrators' mean score on this subscale was also low and was ranked fourth lowest of the five subscales. Individual items in the subscale, such as making public statements about teaching, sending news releases, and reinforcing the importance of teaching in meetings and campus communication, were ranked low. And other items in this subscale (specifically those related to support for teaching projects or to institutional data collection on teaching effectiveness) received some of the lowest mean scores of any of the 30 items. Faculty ranked these items 27th and 30th out of 30 respectively. Also, when the 30
items were ranked for administrators, four of the five items were ranked in the lowest nine.

Finally, when a comparison is made with the administrators' mean score on this subscale with the mean score from the presidents who participated in Cochran's (1987) study of four-year institutions, the administrators in this study had slightly lower scores.

Subscale 5, Campus Climate, was ranked the highest of all five subscales for both faculty and administrators. The items that focused on the level of morale on campus, the sense of institutional pride, the physical setting, clarity and acceptance of the mission, and the sense of ownership faculty have about the curriculum and instructional concerns received relatively higher scores. However, the administrators' mean score of 7.9 was almost identical to the mean score of the presidents in Cochran's (1987) nation-wide study of four-year institutions. Cochran judged the presidents' mean score to be "only moderately positive" for sustaining the primary function of teaching.

When specific questions were posed about administrative leadership, both the faculty and administrators had lower scores than for the other items in this subscale. Faculty ranked the items on confidence in the administration and administrative stability lowest in the subscale and also 3.2 points lower than the administrators' mean scores on these two items. The administrators also ranked this "confidence" item only 17th out of 30 items and a full two points below the highest ranked item in the subscale. The faculty's ranking for "confidence" was even lower--24th out of 30.
Research Question Three

Administrative commitment to teaching vis-a-vis such factors as size of institution, location of institution, unit cost of instruction, whether administrators teach at least one course per year, and whether the teaching area of the faculty is vocational/career or transfer was also questioned. The findings related to this question follow:

1. The size of the institutions did not have a significant effect on the total level of administrative commitment to teaching as reported by the administrators and perceived by the faculty.

2. The teaching activity of the administrators (i.e., whether they teach at least once course per year) did not have a significant effect on the level of administrative commitment to teaching as reported by the administrators and perceived by the faculty.

3. The teaching area of the faculty (i.e., whether they teach primarily in transfer areas or primarily in vocational/career areas) did not have a significant effect on the faculty’s perceived level of administrative commitment to teaching.

4. There is a relationship between location and the perceived level of administrative commitment to teaching, generally in favor of colleges located in a suburban/metropolitan area.

5. There is a relationship between unit cost of instruction and the perceived level of administrative commitment to teaching.

As indicated above, the size of an institution was not a factor in this study. It did not contribute to the differences found between the faculty’s and administrators’ reported level of administrative commitment to teaching. However, when the subscales from the questionnaire were analyzed separately, Subscale 1, Instructional Development, was significant in favor of larger institutions and climate tended to be rated higher in smaller institutions.
The location of the college, that is, whether it was located in a rural, urban (Chicago) or suburban/metropolitan area, did contribute to the differences between the faculty’s and administrators’ perceptions of the level of administrative commitment to teaching. Specifically, the suburban/metropolitan location of an institution contributes to the perception of a higher level of commitment in all cases except one: in rural schools, the subscale items relating to campus climate have significantly higher mean scores.

When unit cost of instruction was investigated, it was found that money spent on education made a difference in the total level of administrative commitment to teaching and for all subscales except teaching. The larger schools generally were the schools that had unit costs of instruction over the state’s mean but consideration must be given to the confounding effect of size and location when these factors are interpreted.

Related Question: Satisfaction with Level of Administrative Commitment

An analysis of the data from the ten questions focusing on satisfaction with the level of administrative commitment to teaching revealed that the results of the satisfaction data and the results from the level of administrative commitment to teaching data were almost identical: the faculty’s level of satisfaction with the administrators’ personal level of commitment to teaching was significantly lower than the administrators’ level of satisfaction. It was also the case that the Total Satisfaction Scores and the Total Commitment Scores were highly correlated. The results from analyses related to the size of the institution, the teaching activity of
administrators, and the teaching area of faculty did not reveal a significant effect of these variables on the satisfaction levels. However, location of the institution and unit cost were found to have a significant main effect on satisfaction. The highest Total Satisfaction Score means were found at institutions where unit cost was above the mean and at the institutions categorized as suburban/metropolitan.

Conclusions

Conclusions in response to the findings from the three research questions are listed below followed by a brief discussion of the related research.

Research Questions One and Two

The following conclusions relate to research questions one and two.

Discussion follows.

1. Faculty and administrators vary, sometimes sharply, in their perception of the extent of administrative support for effective teaching.

2. The level of administrative commitment to teaching in Illinois public community colleges, as reported by the administrators and perceived by the faculty, does not give strong support to the claim that quality teaching is emphasized more at two-year institutions than at the four-year institutions--where it is often suggested that the research and service aspect of the faculty role is emphasized over teaching.

3. The level of administrative commitment to teaching reported by the administrators is such that changes in administrative policies and actions are
warranted.

4. The faculty's perception of the level of the administrative commitment to teaching as revealed through the total commitment scores and the subscale scores could serve as a disincentive for faculty to participate in efforts aimed at instructional innovation or improvement.

The faculty in this study perceive significantly less support or commitment from the administrators than that reported by the administrators. Given the two-year colleges' emphasis on teaching, the differences in perception are even more striking. The administrators' mean score of 7.1 exceeds by less than half a point the mean score reported by Cochran in his study of presidents at four-year institutions. Community college administrators would be expected to have higher scores since their institutions have been designated the nation's premiere teaching institutions (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988) where good teaching is considered to be the hallmark (Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989).

One possible explanation for the disparity between the faculty's and administrators' scores is that it is common, or even typical, for faculty to perceive administrators in a "we-they" mode and therefore, not view them as supportive. Perhaps faculty are quantifying the less-than-positive remarks often made about administrators in general. Responses from the open-ended question suggest that an adversarial relationship does exist between faculty and administrators and that a "we-they" mode is evident among the faculty who responded. (See Appendix E.)

A second explanation is that the administrators are more supportive of quality
teaching than the faculty perceive them to be, but, for a variety of reasons, the administrators have not attended enough to the actions that would communicate their commitment. Administrators (especially vice-presidents) may be required to attend more to the operational demands of the institution (budget, policy formulation, personnel issues) than even they would like. Presidents may also be perceived more negatively than their actual commitment warrents. In recent years they have been required to pay more attention to the demands of their communities, the state legislatures, and the boards of trustees. They have also become more involved in fund-raising activities. As a result, the faculty's perception is not as positive as it would be if the presidents were able to be more visible on campus.

A third explanation relates to the separation of job functions that exists between these two groups. Faculty are sometimes viewed as "independent contractors" and professionals in their own right. The classroom is seen as the faculty's domain and administrators may have chosen (or found it to be more politic) to concentrate their attention elsewhere. As a result, the perception exists that they are not supportive of teaching when, in fact, they may be simply honoring a long tradition of "division of labor." Also, if administrators believe that the activities of the classroom are not in their domain, they may purposefully direct their energies elsewhere. It is possible that they simply do not know what kind of actions would most appropriately demonstrate their commitment to quality teaching.

A final explanation for the disparity that exists in the scores of the administrators and the faculty is that there is, in fact, a less-than-adequate amount of
support and commitment available from the administration. Their mean Total Commitment Score of 7.1 lends support to the assertion that changes in administrative behavior and action are warranted. Administrators should identify and adopt new policies and actions that demonstrate a commitment to quality instruction. There is also a need to more effectively communicate their support of teaching where it does exist so that the perceptions of the faculty about administrative commitment are accurate.

Related research reveals that a high level of administrative commitment to teaching is essential to affect instructional innovation and improvement (O’Hara, 1991; Richardson, 1987; Seldin, 1990). The job satisfaction literature also underscores the importance of the role administrators play by concluding that productivity (Lawler, 1973), morale (Rice & Austin, 1990; Stephens, 1989) and retention and performance are affected by administrative policies and practices. Furthermore, the teacher-change literature suggests that administrators are the primary initiators of change (Fullen, 1982) and that administrators have control over the organizational factors that increase or decrease the success of an innovation (Barry, 1986; Deci & Ryan, 1982; Wemlinger, 1990). Grant (1988) suggests that the perception of leadership is as important as the leadership itself; when the faculty perceive strong support from the administration, morale is high and change and innovation are possible (Richardson, 1985; Seldin, 1990; Stephens, 1989). This study identified the areas in which change in administrative policies and actions can occur.

Instructional development activities have been identified as at least a partial
solution to the crisis in higher education (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Boyer, 1987; NIE, 1984) and support for instructional development activities has been described as an important, even essential, way for administrators to demonstrate commitment to quality teaching (Cochran, 1987). For administrators to report a low level of commitment to such activities and for faculty to perceive an even lower level of commitment supports the conclusion that changes from the administrators are warranted, especially changes that would support instructional innovation and improvement efforts. Furthermore, the faculty’s score on items in this subscale support the conclusion that faculty may be disinclined to engage in instructional innovation or improvement activities because a low level of administrative commitment to such activities could serve as a barrier to change.

The establishment of a formal instructional development program, such as a Center for Teaching and Learning, is a clear statement of administrative commitment to quality teaching (Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Gray, Froh, & Diamond, 1988; Lacey, 1988). The absence of such programs in Illinois community colleges calls into question the level of administrative commitment to quality teaching. A national group of professional and organizational development specialists (POD) recommends that, at a minimum, a full-time position be established, with faculty leadership, and a budget equal to 2% of the institution’s educational budget.

Another area that warrants more attention and action from the administrators was identified as Instructional Enhancement Efforts (Subscale 2). The activities identified provide tangible and direct signs of institutional support (Cochran, 1987;
Rice & Austin, 1990). Support for released time, curriculum development and innovation, scholarly activities other than publishing, and adequate funding for instructional development is needed. Taking a leadership role in redefining scholarship, for example, to include the application of knowledge and curriculum innovations is an administrative action that would indicate support of the teaching function.

The respondents in the present study, however, indicated that there is a low level of commitment to instructional enhancement efforts. Released time, a form of support faculty rate as the most desirable (Caffey, 1979; Friedlander & Gocke, 1984; Giordano, 1989; Lacey, 1988), received one of the lowest mean scores from both faculty and administrators and was ranked 29th and 27th respectively (out of 30).

Funding, on the other hand, received scores from both faculty and administrators that indicated higher levels of commitment relative to other items in this subscale. That faculty and administrators indicate higher levels of commitment vis-a-vis funding might begin to temper the conclusion that changes are warranted in administrative actions and policies if it were not for the research that reports what the faculty desire regarding instructional enhancement efforts. Faculty in other studies (Caffey, 1979; Friedlander & Gocke, 1985; Giordano, 1989) did not give high ratings to workshops and seminars when asked what they desired or needed in terms of instructional enhancement efforts; instead, they ask for released time. If funding is available, but only for activities that are not desired by faculty (e.g., workshops and seminars), and is not available for that which is desired, that is, released time, then
the conclusion that administrative change is warranted is supported.

Policies that relate to retention, promotion, and tenure focus on the rewards commonly used by the institution. The scores on the items in this subscale (Subscale 3) that questioned these policies, suggest that the faculty do not perceive that the employment policies that support quality teaching are a priority for the administration. These particular policies may need special attention as they shape the faculty’s perceptions of how administrators value teaching (Cochran, 1987; Seldin, 1990) and can influence much of what is said and done about teaching and learning on campus (Eble & McKeachie, 1985; NIE, 1984; O’Hara, 1991; Richardson, 1987). If new faculty are hired, for example, because of their teaching ability as well as for their subject-area knowledge, or, if faculty members are retained and promoted on the basis of their teaching expertise, the nature of a department and the focus of an institution can change (Green, 1990; Smith, 1981). Changing the reward systems is an essential first-step in changing the nature and focus of the institution (Seldin, 1990; Richardson, 1987).

As reported earlier, the administrators in this study had a mean score of 7.5 on this subscale. The presidents in Cochran’s (1987) study of four-year institutions, however, had a mean score of 8.2 on this subscale. The lower administrator scores, compared to the presidents’ score, supports the conclusion that community colleges cannot claim with certainty that they are distinct from four-year institutions or that they are unique in their support of quality teaching.

Faculty reported their lowest subscale score on Subscale 4 (Strategic
Administrative Actions), which focused on items that provide a broad range of opportunities for administrators to inexpensively demonstrate commitment to teaching (Cochran, 1987; Rice & Austin, 1990). Individual items in the subscale, such as making public statements about teaching, sending news releases, and reinforcing the importance of teaching in meetings and campus communication, were also ranked low by the administrators. Furthermore, the administrators' mean score is slightly lower than the mean score of the presidents in Cochran's (1987) study, thus offering additional support to the conclusion that community college administrators cannot make unqualified claims that they are unlike their four-year counterparts in the level of support they give to quality teaching.

The perception by the faculty that administrators are not committed to the kinds of activities identified in this subscale should be cause for administrative concern since public recognition is an extrinsic motivator that can be used to promote change (Deci, 1980; Deci & Ryan, 1982). Furthermore, actions such as those identified in Subscale 4 are symbolic reminders of administrative commitment to teaching and provide administrators with the latitude to be creative and to use personal initiatives and innovations (Cochran, 1987). One way administrators could support quality teaching would be to promote and support research efforts related to instructional effectiveness. An example of such research was designed by Patricia Cross (Angelo, 1991). She suggests that faculty engage in classroom research by creating assessment tools and then using those assessment tools to study the effectiveness of the teaching and learning in their own classrooms. In addition to
research that faculty can conduct on their own teaching effectiveness, the institution can collect data campus-wide on effective teaching. Collecting institutional data on effective teaching, if part of a formal program review processes (Barak & Breier, 1990), can be nonthreatening and can suggest administrative commitment to teaching. Items in this subscale that related to support for teaching projects or to institutional data collection on teaching effectiveness, however, received some of the lowest mean scores of any of the 30 items. Faculty ranked these items 27th and 30th out of 30; administrators ranked them 24th and 29th. The faculty's perception that administrators do not demonstrate commitment to quality teaching, even when it would be relatively inexpensive to do so, could serve as a disincentive to change as well as have a negative affect on faculty morale and job satisfaction.

Finally, an institutions's climate is an important area for administrative concern because the climate has a strong influence on the actions and feelings of those working in the institution (McCabe & Jenrette, 1990; Nord, 1980; Peterson, et al. 1986). The items in this subscale focused on the level of morale on campus, the sense of institutional pride, the physical setting, clarity and acceptance of the mission, and the sense of ownership faculty have about the curriculum and instructional concerns.

This subscale was ranked the highest of all five subscales for faculty and for administrators. But to put this "high" ranking into perspective, when the presidents in Cochran's (1987) nation-wide study of four-year institutions had an almost identical mean score on this subscale, Cochran judged the presidents mean score to be "only moderately positive" for sustaining the primary function of teaching. And even
though the faculty ranked this subscale highest of the five subscales, their mean score was only 5.3. This score suggests that, in general, faculty perceive a climate in their institutions that is only marginally supportive of quality teaching.

When questions on this subscale focused on administrative leadership, however, the scores do not allow for a claim of "moderately positive level of commitment." Leadership is a critical factor in the effectiveness of any institution and the perception of positive leaders is essential to a positive climate supportive of quality teaching (Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989; Grant, 1988). In the present study, however, the two items related to leadership were not only ranked low by the faculty, but their score differences were some of the largest for all items. Also, the administrators reported a surprising lack of confidence and lack of stability in their own administrations. Clearly, if administrators question their own leadership ability, as is suggested by low scores on confidence in administration and a sense of stability about the administration, it is not surprising that faculty experience the same lack of confidence in their leadership. As a result, faculty are not likely to respond positively to the administration’s efforts to encourage or plan activities supportive of quality teaching. That the campus climate on the four-year campuses was described as only "moderately positive" (Cochran, 1987), the lower-yet score given by the two-year respondents in this study gives further support to the conclusion that further actions are needed by the administrators to improve the perception of the faculty.

Research Question Three

The analysis of the data regarding demographic, financial, and contextual,
organizational concerns suggests several areas that are of interest to administrators.

**Size.** The size of the institutions was not generally found to be a factor, but one of the subscales (Instructional Development) was significant in favor of larger institutions. Of interest is the fact that slightly more than half of the large institutions reported that there was an individual at their college with some responsibility for faculty development while only about one-third of the small schools identified such an individual. Having an individual on campus who is responsible for faculty development activities may have affected in a positive way the perception of the level of commitment to teaching at the large institutions.

**Administrative teaching activity.** No empirical research was found regarding the teaching activity of administrators. Nevertheless, some authors claim, that if administrators teach, they will experience first-hand faculty needs; at the same time, they will demonstrate that teaching is a priority (Cochran, 1987; Green, 1990). This study does not support the conclusion that if administrators teach, teaching will be viewed as a priority, as determined by the reported levels of commitment from both faculty and administrators.

**Faculty teaching area.** The research related to the faculty’s teaching area, that is, whether a faculty member teaches primarily transfer courses or vocational/career courses, is mixed. When job satisfaction was considered, several researchers (Cohen & Brawer, 1989; McKee, 1990; Seidman, 1985) found that faculty who taught primarily in transfer areas were slightly more satisfied with their jobs. Other researchers (Hill, 1983; Stephen, 1989) found that those in vocational or technical
areas were slightly more satisfied. The results of this study do not contribute any new information to the literature about differences that might exist between transfer faculty and vocational/career faculty and the level of administrative commitment to teaching.

**Location.** The location of the college, that is, whether it was located in a rural, urban (Chicago) or suburban/metropolitan area, did contribute to the differences between the faculty's and administrators' perceptions of the level of administrative commitment to teaching. However, it was also noted that significant confounding took place between location and size. The suburban/metropolitan location of an institution contributes to the perception of a higher level of commitment in all cases except one: in rural schools, the subscale items relating to campus climate have significantly higher mean scores. Also, as was expected, the mean levels of commitment of the faculty and administrators at the eight Chicago colleges were found to be significantly lower than those for the suburban/metropolitan area colleges. This was true in all subscales except Subscale 3, Employment Policies.

The fact that climate was significant for rural colleges suggests that "big is not always better;" all rural schools were small schools. Furthermore, the fact that the Chicago schools were significantly lower on four of the five subscales suggests that these eight schools may have conditions that are unique to their location. Understanding this uniqueness would require information that is beyond the scope of this investigation.

**Unit cost.** When unit cost of instruction was investigated, it was hypothesized
that money spent on education would make a difference in the level of administrative
commitment to teaching. Hodgkinson (1971) contends that larger institutions have
more resources; in this study, it was the larger schools that had unit costs of
instruction over the state's mean. The results suggest that the dollars available did
have an impact on the level of administrative commitment to teaching. It should be
noted that unit costs and location had a significant confounding. The subscale means
for climate, however, were an exception to that finding. The subscale means for
climate were significantly higher where the unit cost was below the mean. (Again, the
unit cost was below the mean for small, rural schools more often than for large
schools.) It would appear that the small, rural schools with unit costs below the
mean, are able to maintain a different perspective on the level of administrative
commitment to teaching. Respondents from those schools had higher mean scores on
items that related to campus climate: faculty morale, campus pride, a clear sense of
the mission, and a sense of ownership of the curriculum on the part of the faculty.

A final conclusion can be drawn from the findings from research question 3:
Other than for the location of the institution, Illinois public community colleges can
be viewed as one group. This conclusion has implications for the ICCB as it sets
policies related to instructional improvement. In general, when commitment to
teaching is the issue, recommendations for increasing commitment transcend the
issues of size, teaching activity of administrators, or faculty teaching area. Large
institutions and small institutions can follow the same recommendations or the same
guidelines for increasing commitment. No special consideration need be given to
teaching area, that is, whether faculty teach in the vocational/career or transfer programs. Location was a factor contributing to perceived lower levels of commitment in Chicago schools. But, as stated earlier, the explanation for such differences is beyond the scope of this investigation.

Of particular concern for ICCB policies should be the finding that unit cost of instruction may be related to the level of administrative commitment to quality teaching. Even though regression analysis did not identify unit cost as a predictor of commitment, unit cost was found to have a statistically significant effect on the level of administrative commitment to instruction. Schools with unit costs of instruction above the average for the state reported higher levels of commitment. The amount of money spent and how it is spent could be seen as an indication to both administrators and faculty of a commitment to quality instruction.

Related Question: Satisfaction with Level of Administrative Commitment

Cochran (1987) suggested that one of the most important factors in any reform initiative is to determine the level of satisfaction that exists among those involved in the initiative. Ten questions were repeated from Cochran's instrument and the data were used to test hypothesis eight, "Administrators' satisfaction scores (regarding their institution's level of commitment and their personal amount of attention to quality teaching) will be higher than the satisfaction scores obtained from the faculty."

The results indicated that the faculty's level of satisfaction with the administrators' personal level of commitment to teaching was significantly lower than the administrators' level of satisfaction. Further investigation using the size of the
institution, the teaching activity of administrators, and the teaching area of faculty did not have a significant effect on the satisfaction levels. However, location of the institution and unit cost were found to have a significant main effect on satisfaction. The institutions where unit cost was above the mean and the suburban/metropolitan institutions had the highest Total Satisfaction Score means. The results of the satisfaction data and the level of commitment data were almost identical. This can be explained by the fact that the Total Satisfaction Score and the Total Commitment Score were highly correlated; therefore, the comments and conclusions that were appropriate to the findings for Total Commitment Scores are appropriate to the findings from the satisfaction data as well.

**Limitations**

The findings and conclusions must be interpreted in light of the study’s limitations. Some limitations adhere in the survey instrument. First, it is assumed that the 30 items serve as measures of how commitment to teaching is manifested; however, there may be additional items that would provide an enhanced or more comprehensive measure. It is further assumed that faculty and administrators share a common notion about the meaning and significance of the different items; that may or may not be the case. Finally, each item in the questionnaire is given equal value and weight when scores are determined. In fact, individual respondents may think that some items are much more important than others. The present instrument limits the opportunity for respondents to reflect the notion that some items have more weight
Another limitation comes from the subjects selected for the study. The administrators (presidents and vice-presidents of academic affairs) as a group may not be able to provide the most accurate report of the institutions' level of commitment to quality instruction. Presidents especially, may have their attention and their priorities with funding, community relations, legislative concerns, and work with the boards of trustees. Deans may be closer to the decision-making process when administrative actions regarding teaching are implemented and they, therefore, may be better able to represent the level of administrative commitment to teaching that reflects a more accurate campus picture. Finally, the results must be interpreted with caution as all variables were not independent of one another. Significant confounding was found between size and location, and unit cost and location, indicating a certain amount of interdependency between these variables. If the study were broadened beyond one state, it is possible that the effect of the variables would be less confounded.

**Policy and Practice Recommendations**

The conclusions drawn from this study lead to some recommendations for policy and practice. The results from research question 3 related to size, location, unit cost, etc., suggest that the recommendations are generally appropriate to all Illinois community colleges. However, there may be some need to adapt specific recommendations at individual colleges as their cultures and idiosyncracies will determine the manner in which the recommendations are implemented.
There are two related policy recommendations applicable to all Illinois community colleges. First, the administration, specifically the academic vice president for instruction, should analyze the existing policies and activities related to instruction using the 30 items in this study's questionnaire as a framework for the analysis. The purpose would be to isolate the existing policies and administrative actions that administrators and faculty identify as demonstrating a low level of administrative commitment to teaching. Following such an analysis, the vice-president of instruction, as the instructional leader on campus, should, in cooperation with the faculty, propose new policies and activities or modifications for those that already exist that would address the problems identified in the analysis.

These new or modified policies and activities would relate to the selected items from the questionnaire and would be divided into three categories: (a) those that require little investment of money, can be implemented quickly, and do not directly involve the faculty; (b) those that require more time, a formalized plan, and directly involve the faculty; and (c) those that are long-term and are more costly, but would ultimately have a significant effect on instruction.

The second recommendation for administrative action would be to take steps to assure that faculty and administrators share a common perception of the level of administrative commitment to teaching. The present perceptions of both groups must be examined in an attempt to learn the source of the difference in perceptions. Appropriate actions must then be taken to try to ameliorate those differences.

In addition to the broad, general recommendations listed above, more specific
recommendations follow. The applicability of these recommendations will vary from college to college.

1. Create a center for teaching or an organizational unit that has the administrative responsibility for instructional development activities. The head of the unit should have faculty status and be directly responsible to the vice-president of academic affairs. A budget, equal to approximately two percent of the instructional budget (per the POD Network's recommendations) should be established. An advisory committee, made up of faculty and the vice-president, should determine the goals and the plan for all instructional development activities on campus.

2. Review and, perhaps, reconsider how funds are being designated for faculty development efforts. Since released time has been identified as one of the most desirable incentives by faculty but is perceived as having a very low level of commitment from the administration, an opportunity for negotiation and dialogue is present. Released time offered specifically to bring about changes and innovations in the curriculum would not only provide the faculty the time required for such activities, but it would also demonstrate that the institution places a high priority on change and innovation. It is possible that no other action would speak so persuasively to faculty as would awarding released time for such activities.

3. Continue to support the role of faculty in curriculum and faculty development issues. Since faculty perceived a higher level of administrative commitment on items that suggest faculty have a sense of ownership than they perceived to be true on most other items, those activities that contribute to the
faculty's sense of ownership must receive continued support. The administration, specifically the vice-president of academic affairs and the Deans, can foster faculty ownership of curriculum and instructional development issues by lending institutional support and resources to activities such as classroom research activities and other teaching projects that are initiated and implemented by the faculty.

4. Establish employment policies that place instruction at the center of employment decisions. Specifically, identify the procedures and criteria that will be used for hiring new faculty members. New faculty should be asked to demonstrate knowledge of and expertise in classroom instructional techniques in addition to the knowledge they are asked to demonstrate of their discipline. That teaching is an important consideration in the hiring process should be highlighted in job advertisements.

5. Review policies and procedures relating to faculty evaluation. Tenure in Illinois public community colleges is granted automatically after three years of employment; therefore, efforts must be made during the first two years of employment to assure that teaching excellence is the determining factor for continued employment. If the evaluation process does not already include it, expand the process to include peer mentoring. Peers could observe each other in the classroom, examine instructional materials, and provide feedback during post-observation consultations. Curriculum development activities could be incorporated into the assessment process.

6. Establish and formalize a plan of action that promotes excellent teaching.
For example, administrators should seize every opportunity to support quality teaching both on and off campus. News releases and speeches to civic groups should focus on instruction as often, or perhaps more often, than they focus on building plans or campus activities other than instruction. Innovative curricular efforts and cross-discipline approaches to teaching, for example, should be highlighted in both on-campus and public communications.

7. Initiate a program review process that includes the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data for the purpose of evaluating learning outcomes.

Recommendations for Further Study

The present investigation raises a number of questions. The fact that it was conducted in the community colleges of one state only (albeit in a state that has one of the largest community college systems in the nation) requires cautious generalizations. In addition, modifications to the instrument might provide additional insight into the level of administrative commitment to teaching beyond the level provided by the 30 items that were in this instrument. Also, redefining the population of administrators to include other administrators than those defined for the present study may provide additional insights. Therefore, the following recommendations for further research are presented.

1. Replicate the study:

   (a) Explore the level of administrative commitment in community colleges nation-wide. Involve both administrators and faculty so that
further comparisons can be made between the results of Cochran's (1987) study and the additional data that would be obtained.

(b) Include vice-presidents and deans. They may provide a more nearly accurate perspective of administrative commitment than can be obtained from presidents.

(c) Explore the perceptions of faculty in four-year institutions in Illinois. Examine the differences between the faculty in these two sectors for the entire state.

2. Modify the instrument and mode of investigation:

(a) Conduct a qualitative study by asking appropriate academic administrators and faculty directly, in an open-ended interview format, to identify the policies and actions they believe show support of teaching. Analyze the data and use results to modify the instrument.

(b) Select a sample of administrators and faculty from this study and conduct follow-up, semi-structured interviews to probe the meaning of their responses to the questionnaire items. Modify the questions and directions on the basis of information gathered. Or, use the same 30 items on the questionnaire, but substitute a ranking procedure in place of the rating scale. Compare the rankings of the administrators with the rankings of the faculty for additional insight as to the priority of administrative actions and policies.
Appendix A

Survey Forms: Administrator and Faculty
A Survey of the Administrators and Faculty of Illinois Community Colleges on the Level of Commitment to Instructional Effectiveness

Purpose: This study is designed to assess the perceptions and attitudes of Illinois community college administrators and faculty regarding the level of administrative commitment to teaching on their campuses.

Audience: The questionnaire is being sent to a random sample of faculty from forty-eight Illinois community college campuses and to all presidents and academic vice-presidents of these institutions.

Focus: The primary goal of the study is to collect information on administrative commitment to specific and general areas affecting instruction on Illinois community college campuses. The focus is on specific factors external to the classroom that impact and shape instructional experiences.

COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: This survey instrument is divided into two parts. In Part I, please respond to each item by circling the number from 1 (low) to 10 (high) that best represents what you perceive to be your institution's commitment to an area. If a specific activity does not occur on your campus, please circle 0. Leave blank any item you feel unable to evaluate. Part II includes a combination of multiple choice and short answer questions. Write in your responses to the short answer questions on the blanks provided. For multiple choice questions, place an X in the blank to the left of your selection.

Definition of Commitment: The focus of this study is on commitment. Commitment should be judged in terms of the amount of time, energy, and resources your institution devotes to the particular function. A high level of commitment indicates that there are visible examples of substantial investment by the administration in the specific area. A low level of commitment implies that little effort has been made in the area (very little discussion, no policies, no expenditures of time or resources).
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

1. Workshops, seminars on effective instruction are conducted for new full time faculty. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. Seminars/workshops on teaching are held for part-time faculty. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. Faculty seminars, workshops and conferences on teaching and learning are conducted on campus. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. The campus promotes various colleague support mechanisms (mentors, chairperson monitoring, etc.) to promote and support effective instruction. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. Effective instruction is promoted by an organized unit or program (e.g. center for teaching and learning, an office for faculty development--not Learning Resource Center.) 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. Faculty play a key role in the design and development of program offerings for instructional development. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

INSTRUCTIONAL ENHANCEMENT EFFORTS

7. Librarians are used to promote effective instruction on campus. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. Released time is used to promote teaching improvement. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. Funds and financial awards are available to support instructional improvement (e.g., conferences on teaching effectiveness, faculty development activities, and other instructional improvement items.) 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

10. Curriculum development activities are given high visibility to illustrate their importance. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

11. Administrators regularly emphasize the importance of keeping current with the research about teaching and learning. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
EMPLOYMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES.

12. A faculty member's teaching effectiveness is evaluated as a significant/integral aspect of the initial hiring process.

13. Classroom instruction is regularly evaluated by students and results are used to improve instruction.

14. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated as a significant/integral aspect of the tenure process.

15. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated as a significant/integral aspect of the promotion process.

16. Teaching recognition programs (grants, awards, etc.) that promote effective teaching are available.

17. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated for the purpose of improvement and follow-up measures are included as part of the process.

18. Feedback programs (mentoring, classroom observations, video taping) are available for individual faculty.

STRATEGIC ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

19. The importance of teaching is emphasized by upper level administrators in public presentations.

20. News releases and articles are regularly used to focus attention on exciting classroom activities.

21. Projects related to effective teaching are regularly conducted on campus.

22. Institutional data on teaching effectiveness are collected and used as a means to improve instruction on campus.

23. Academic administrators across campus regularly reinforce the importance of effective teaching in meetings and communications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT AND CULTURE</th>
<th>Level of commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A low (circle one) high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Faculty have a clear sense of ownership of the curriculum and other instructional concerns.  
25. The level of intellectual vitality and morale on campus is conducive to effective instruction.  
26. The faculty have a clear sense of confidence in the upper administrative leadership that fosters effective instruction.  
27. There is a clear sense of administrative stability that allows faculty to focus their energies on the instructional process.  
28. There is a shared feeling of institutional pride that stimulates effective classroom performance.  
29. The physical setting of the campus (classrooms and faculty offices) suggest that teaching is a priority.  
30. The mission of the comprehensive community college is clear and accepted by all areas of the campus.  

31. Using the previous statements as operational definitions of the category listed below, rate the level of institutional performance in each area.  

| a. Instructional Development Activities | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| b. Instructional Enhancement Efforts    | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| c. Employment Policies and Practices    | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| d. Strategic Administrative Actions     | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| e. Campus Environment and Culture      | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |

32. Please rate your satisfaction with the amount of personal attention your administration devotes to each area:  

| a. Instructional Development Activities | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| b. Instructional Enhancement Efforts    | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| c. Employment Policies and Practices    | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| d. Strategic Administrative Actions     | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| e. Campus Environment and Culture      | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
33. Is an individual responsible for faculty development on your campus?  __yes__no

34. If so what is the individual's title: ____________________________________________

Is that individual:
  ___ a. a faculty member, full time in the position
  ___ b. a faculty member, part time in the position, part time teaching
  ___ c. an administrator, full time in the position
  ___ d. an administrator, part time in the position, part time other duties
  ___ e. a part time administrator or faculty member

35. Is there a center for teaching and learning on your campus?  ____yes__no

36. If so, what is the title of the director: ________________________________

37. Is the Center Director also considered the "faculty development director?"  __yes__no

38. Describe the sense of ownership faculty have regarding programs or efforts related to teaching effectiveness:
   ___ a. The faculty are responsible for the design and implementation of any programs or efforts
   ___ b. The faculty works with the administration in the design and implementation of any programs or efforts.
   ___ c. The administration initiates programs and efforts and asks for faculty input and support
   ___ d. Neither faculty nor administration promote programs or efforts related specifically to teaching effectiveness.

39. During your formal education, what training, if any, did you receive in instructional methodologies? ____________________________________________________________

How would you rate the training you received?
  a. very poor  b. fair  c. good  d. very good

40. How important is it for administrators to periodically teach?
   ___ a. very important
   ___ b. of some importance
   ___ c. not very important
   ___ d. of no importance

41. Since you have been employed as a faculty member (at any institution) how many courses related to effective instruction (not for the purpose of acquiring additional discipline-based knowledge) have you attended either on or off-campus:
   ___ a. none; I am not aware that any are offered.
   ___ b. none
   ___ c. 1-2
   ___ d. 3-5
   ___ e. more than 5
Part II

Please fill in the required information or mark (x) the appropriate box.

42. Your age____ male____ female ____ Years in position____

43. Highest degree earned
   ___ Ph.D. or Ed.D.
   ___ Masters in __________________
   ___ Professional (medicine, art)
   ___ Bachelor's in __________________
   Other ____________________________

44. ___ Years in Illinois Community College system as faculty
   ___ Years in Illinois Community College system as administrator
   ___ Years in other postsecondary institution(s) as faculty
   ___ Years in other Postsecondary institution(s) as administrator
   ___ Years at elementary or secondary level as teacher or administrator
   ___ Years employed full time in business or industry

45. In the last five years have you presented at a conference or written for publication? _____
   yes____ no____

46. Identify the department/division in which you teach
   ___ Humanities/English  ___ Social Sciences
   ___ Business  ___ Science/math
   ___ Career/vocational __________________________

47. Identify the area you consider to be your primary area of teaching:
   ___ transfer courses  ___ vocational/career

48. Indicate the level of commitment to teaching you expect your administrators to report:
   ___ a high level of commitment
   ___ a moderate/medium level of commitment
   ___ a low level of commitment

What suggestions/comments do you have regarding the level of administrative commitment to teaching. (Use extra paper if necessary.)

___ Check here if you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study.
A Survey of the Administrators and Faculty of Illinois Community Colleges on the Level of Commitment to Instructional Effectiveness

Purpose: This study is designed to assess the perceptions and attitudes of Illinois community college administrators and faculty regarding the level of administrative commitment to teaching on their campuses.

Audience: The questionnaire is being sent to a random sample of faculty from forty-eight Illinois community college campuses and to all presidents and academic vice-presidents of these institutions.

Focus: The primary goal of the study is to collect information on administrative commitment to specific and general areas affecting instruction on Illinois community college campuses. The focus is on specific factors external to the classroom that impact and shape instructional experiences.

COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: This survey instrument is divided into two parts. In Part I, please respond to each item by circling the number from 1 (low) to 10 (high) that best represents what you perceive to be your institution’s commitment to an area. If a specific activity does not occur on your campus, please circle 0. Leave blank any item you feel unable to evaluate. Part II includes a combination of multiple choice and short answer questions. Write in your responses to the short answer questions on the blanks provided. For multiple choice questions, place an X in the blank to the left of your selection.

Definition of Commitment: The focus of this study is on commitment. Commitment should be judged in terms of the amount of time, energy, and resources your institution devotes to the particular function. A high level of commitment indicates that there are visible examples of substantial investment by the administration in the specific area. A low level of commitment implies that little effort has been made in the area (very little discussion, no policies, no expenditures of time or resources).
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

1. Workshops, seminars on effective instruction are conducted for new full time faculty.

2. Seminars/workshops on teaching are held for part-time faculty.

3. Faculty seminars, workshops and conferences on teaching and learning are conducted on campus.

4. The campus promotes various colleague support mechanisms (mentors, chairperson monitoring, etc.) to promote and support effective instruction.

5. Effective instruction is promoted by an organized unit or program (e.g. center for teaching and learning, an office for faculty development—not Learning Resource Center.)

6. Faculty play a key role in the design and development of program offerings for instructional development.

INSTRUCTIONAL ENHANCEMENT EFFORTS

7. Librarians are used to promote effective instruction on campus.

8. Released time is used to promote teaching improvement.

9. Funds and financial awards are available to support instructional improvement (e.g., conferences on teaching effectiveness, faculty development activities, and other instructional improvement items.)

10. Curriculum development activities are given high visibility to illustrate their importance.

11. Administrators regularly emphasize the importance of keeping current with the research about teaching and learning.
EMPLOYMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES.

12. A faculty member's teaching effectiveness is evaluated as a significant/integral aspect of the initial hiring process.

13. Classroom instruction is regularly evaluated by students and results are used to improve instruction.

14. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated as a significant/integral aspect of the tenure process.

15. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated as a significant/integral aspect of the promotion process.

16. Teaching recognition programs (grants, awards, etc.) that promote effective teaching are available.

17. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated for the purpose of improvement and follow-up measures are included as part of the process.

18. Feedback programs (mentoring, classroom observations, video taping) are available for individual faculty.

STRATEGIC ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

19. The importance of teaching is emphasized by upper level administrators in public presentations.

20. News releases and articles are regularly used to focus attention on exciting classroom activities.

21. Projects related to effective teaching are regularly conducted on campus.

22. Institutional data on teaching effectiveness are collected and used as a means to improve instruction on campus.

23. Academic administrators across campus regularly reinforce the importance of effective teaching in meetings and communications.
CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT AND CULTURE

24. Faculty have a clear sense of ownership of the curriculum and other instructional concerns. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

25. The level of intellectual vitality and morale on campus is conducive to effective instruction. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

26. The faculty have a clear sense of confidence in the upper administrative leadership that fosters effective instruction. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

27. There is a clear sense of administrative stability that allows faculty to focus their energies on the instructional process. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

28. There is a shared feeling of institutional pride that stimulates effective classroom performance. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

29. The physical setting of the campus (classrooms and faculty offices) suggest that teaching is a priority. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

30. The mission of the comprehensive community college is clear and accepted by all areas of the campus. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

31. Using the previous statements as operational definitions of the category listed below, rate the level of institutional performance in each area.

a. Instructional Development Activities 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
b. Instructional Enhancement Efforts 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
c. Employment Policies and Practices 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
d. Strategic Administrative Actions 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
e. Campus Environment and Culture 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

32. Please rate your satisfaction with the amount of personal attention your administration devotes to each area:

a. Instructional Development Activities 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
b. Instructional Enhancement Efforts 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
c. Employment Policies and Practices 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
d. Strategic Administrative Actions 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
e. Campus Environment and Culture 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
33. Is an individual responsible for faculty development on your campus? ___yes ___no

34. If so what is the individual's title: 

Is that individual:
   ___ a. a faculty member, full time in the position
   ___ b. a faculty member, part time in the position, part time teaching
   ___ c. an administrator, full time in the position
   ___ d. an administrator, part time in the position, part time other duties
   ___ e. a part time administrator or faculty member

35. Is there a center for teaching and learning on your campus? If yes, what is the name: ____________________________________________
What is the total budget: ________________________________________

36. Is there a separate budget specified for faculty development--in addition to contractual, individual expense dollars for faculty? ___no ___yes If yes, what is the amount? ________

37. What is the college's total operating budget for 1992-93? __________________________

38. Describe the sense of ownership faculty have regarding programs or efforts related to teaching effectiveness:
   ___ a. The faculty are responsible for the design and implementation of any programs or efforts
   ___ b. The faculty works with the administration in the design and implementation of any programs or efforts.
   ___ c. The administration initiates programs and efforts and asks for faculty input and support
   ___ d. Neither faculty nor administration promote programs or efforts related specifically teaching effectiveness.

39. During your formal education or while serving as an administrator, what training, if any, did you receive as an instructional leader?
   __________________________
   How would you rate the training you received?
   a. very poor   b. fair   c. good   d. very good

40. In preparation for your role as an administrator or since you became an administrator, how many courses/seminars related to effective instructional leadership have you attended:
   ___ a. none; I am not aware that any are offered or needed
   ___ b. none; my time does not allow me to pursue that area
   ___ c. 1-2
   ___ d. 3-5
   ___ e. more than 5

41. How important is it for administrators to periodically teach?
   ___ a. very important
   ___ b. of some importance
   ___ c. not very important
   ___ d. of no importance
Part II

Please fill in the required information or mark (x) the appropriate box.

42. Your age _____ male _____ female _____ Years in position _____

43. Highest degree earned: _____Ph.D., or Ed.D.
   _____Masters in ____________________________
   _____Professional (medicine, art)
   _____Bachelor's in ____________________________
   Other ____________________________

44. _____ Years in Illinois Community College system as faculty
   _____ Years in Illinois Community College system as administrator
   _____ Years in other postsecondary institution(s) as faculty
   _____ Years in other Postsecondary institution(s) as administrator
   _____ Years at elementary or secondary level as teacher or administrator
   _____ Years employed full time in business or industry

45. In the last five years have you presented at a conference or written for publication? yes ___ no ___

46. While serving as an administrator, what is the average number of courses you have taught:
   a. _____ more than one course per term
   b. _____ one course per term
   c. _____ less than one course per term
   d. _____ less than one course per year
   e. _____ none

47. Indicate the level of administrative support to teaching you expect the faculty to report:
   a. _____ a high level of commitment from the administration
   b. _____ a moderate/medium level of commitment from the administration
   c. _____ a low level of commitment from the administration

What suggestions/comments do you have regarding the level of administrative commitment to teaching. (Use extra paper if necessary.)

____ Check here if you would like to receive a summary of the results of this study.
Appendix B

Letters of Request to Administrators and Faculty
Dear Faculty Member:

As you know, the topic of postsecondary teaching and instructional effectiveness is a major item in higher education. Because of your role as a faculty member in a community college, you are in a special position to evaluate administrative commitment to teaching.

I am inviting you to be a part of a sample selected from the full-time faculty at your college to participate in a state wide-study of two-year college administrators and faculty. The purpose is to gather data that will contribute to a discussion about administrative commitment to instructional effectiveness in Illinois community colleges.

As with any questionnaire, the validity and usefulness of the findings rest upon your candor when responding. Strict confidentiality will be maintained and only aggregated data will be reported.

The fifteen minutes it will take you to respond to the enclosed questionnaire will be deeply appreciated. An executive summary will be sent to you if you mark the appropriate box at the end of the questionnaire form.

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed addressed, postage-paid envelope by October 15, 1992.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Lee Vogel, Dean
Learning Resource Center
William Rainey Harper College
Palatine, IL
Dear Faculty member:

I would appreciate your help with a project that is directly related to your professional life.

I am counting on you to provide some needed information about how committed your administrators are to teaching effectiveness. You will be providing information for a presentation to all Illinois Community College administrators at their annual conference.

I have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire I mailed to you in early October. Please take 15 minutes and fill it out. I’ll give you the results (aggregated, not individual) if you indicate you’d like them; mark the box on the bottom of page 5.

Thanks again for your time; I KNOW this is a busy time for faculty.

Sincerely,

Lee Vogel, Dean
Learning Resource Center
Harper College
Palatine, IL
October 1, 1992

Dear Academic Officer:

As you well know, the topic of postsecondary teaching and instructional effectiveness is a major item in higher education. Community colleges, because they are often referred to as "teaching institutions," have a special interest in this subject.

To provide a research base that might contribute to the discussion of administrative commitment to instructional effectiveness in Illinois community colleges, I am inviting you to represent your college in a state-wide survey of two-year college administrators and faculty. I will also be sending surveys to randomly selected members of your faculty in order to have the faculty’s perspective on this topic.

This state-wide survey replicates two, nation-wide surveys of administrators and their commitment to teaching. It expands on those previous studies by (1) combining Illinois community college CEOs and academic vice-presidents into one administrative group, and, (2) by including Illinois community college full-time faculty in the study. The comparison between these two groups--administrators and faculty--provides an important dimension to the discussion about administrative commitment to teaching effectiveness. If you already filled out a similar form, please complete this survey as the focus is now on Illinois community colleges.

Please complete the survey yourself rather than delegate it to a staff member. As with any survey, the validity and usefulness of the findings rest upon your candor when responding. The fifteen minutes you take to respond to this survey is deeply appreciated. Strict confidentiality will be maintained and only aggregated data will be reported. An executive summary will automatically be sent to you for participating in this project.

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed addressed, postage-paid envelope by October 15.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Lee Vogel, Dean
Learning Resource Center
William Rainey Harper College
Palatine, IL
Appendix C

Letters of Request for Permission to Use Survey Instrument
Dear Dr. Cochran:

It has been over a year since I spoke with you regarding your work with administrative commitment to teaching. Since we spoke, I modified the questionnaire you sent to four-year college presidents and included it as part of my proposal for my dissertation at Loyola University in Chicago.

Earlier, you gave me your permission to use the questionnaire in community colleges. At this time I think it would be appropriate if you would give me your written permission to allow me to send it to presidents, vice-presidents, and a selected group (12% random sample) of faculty in Illinois Community Colleges. As I said in our earlier conversations, I would be delighted to share my results with you.

I have enclosed a copy of the form I sent to administrators (white) and the form I sent to faculty (salmon-colored). I would like your permission to include a copy of each of these questionnaires in the appendix of my dissertation. Appropriate credit will be given.

The requested permission extends to any future revisions and editions of my dissertation, including non-exclusive world rights in all languages, and to the prospective publication of my dissertation by University Microfilms, Inc. These rights will in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you. Your signing of this letter will also confirm that you own the copyright to the above-described material.

If these arrangements meet with your approval, please sign this letter where indicated and return it to me in the enclosed return envelope.

Sincerely,

Lee Vogel

PERMISSION GRANTED FOR THE USE REQUESTED ABOVE:

Dr. L. Cochran (Date)
Appendix D

Letter of Request Regarding Faculty Development Position
Dear Vice-President of Academic Affairs:

Selected administrators and faculty from your institution recently answered a survey about administrative commitment to teaching. Since I received conflicting information regarding the existence of a faculty development position at your institution, I would appreciate it if you or someone from your office would verify the following information regarding a faculty development position on your campus.

___ No one individual has responsibility for faculty development and there are no funds for a person to fill that position.

___ Yes, we have a position for faculty development.____________________

(name of person in position)

___ the position is full-time and no other duties, other than faculty development, are associated with this position.

___ the position is considered to be at least half-time

___ the position is less than half-time; it is only a percentage of the duties assigned to the individual.

The person holding the position is ___ an administrator ___ faculty

___ No, there is no full-time or half-time position for faculty development.

If possible, please fax your response to me as I am in the middle of analyzing all the data. If you cannot fax your response, then please return it in the enclosed envelope.

Fax Number: 708 397 0433

Sincerely,

Lee Vogel, Dean
Learning Resource Center
Harper College
Palatine, IL
Appendix E

Additional Comments from Open-Ended Question: Faculty and Administrators
Faculty Comments: Negative to Administration

I suggest the administration/faculty relationships be less adversarial. The adversary is "built in" in our school because of our long history of collective bargaining. Nevertheless, our administrations' commitment is more than adequate—our last president is quite good.

Chancellors and college board members should have some educational background to understand mission of a college education. Presently, they are dedicated to the needs of business not the needs of a student's future in life, work and citizenship.

They are too money conscious. But that is not entirely their fault. The governor and other opinion leaders should be doing more to educate the public on the importance and necessity of finding higher education adequately.

Take a hard look at how the formal organization of the college impedes teaching growth i.e. As it affects assignment of loads, schedules etc.

Commitments are not to take away from administrative commitment to student services. It is just as important but not addressed.

Administrators who have their highest degrees in education rather than in some discipline in the sciences, arts, or humanities inevitably fail to comprehend academic teaching as well as they do budgets.

Administrators should have background in education.

The administration is helpful in answering faculty. Requests, and support (maps, computers, xerox, etc.) is excellent. But the administration really doesn’t know what school is about. It's up to faculty individuals, pretty much, and some departments.

We (in the U.S.A.) Are slipping badly. Science and math teaching and learning in the U.S.A. Have deteriorated badly since 1967. I see this personally where I work. Today's students are frequently being cheated out of a good education.

As Shakespeare said, "kill all the administrators!!" Get the oppression of administrators off the faculties backs, save the taxpayers money, and allow faculty to teach! Let's stop the administrators' "paper chase" and make work!

Such amelioration as may occur will be through insisting that all college teachers/administrators be grounded in liberal arts and sciences and that all administrators hired have several years teaching experience (promotion from teaching is best).

The Chicago city colleges are currently in a large central administrative mess. After a
10 year freeze on hiring, a new board chairman decided to eliminate all overtime. Since all expansion for the past 10 years was fueled by o.t. Instead of hiring new faculty, we drastically cut high demand courses in basic mathematics, basic english, and data processing. The new board chairman has implied that vocational offerings should be expanded but instead of seeking cooperation of college transfer faculty, he should set up a false conflict implying that Voc. Ed could only be expanded by reducing college credit offerings. The damage to the college program will take years to fix.

1) Academic administrators should come from and return to faculty on contractual-ongoing-basis. 2) Academic administrators should teach at least one course per year.

The commitment to our students by our administration is poor at best. The goal seems to be that of status and maintaining their positions. Student interaction for the most part is done with "problems" are presented. Our adm. Lacks new ideas to lead the faculty or students. All of our administrators are not qualified to lead this institution. The same applies to control as well as local administration. Politics prevail in this system, racism, sexism are also highly visible in this system (city colleges of Chicago).

Administrators are politically orientated business people. Administrators are not interested in the educational juror. They are concerned about their own job - hence in pleasing teen political mentor.

I would like to see the entire board of trustees of the city colleges replaced by people committed to education and to the support of faculty.

Our local administration rates from good to fair. However, all important decisions are made by a central administration. The primary goal of the central administrator is a relentless, ruthless down sizing of the college for political (and perhaps economic and racial) reasons. Everything else is subordinate to that goal. Just read the papers on the Chicago city college and try to follow the attending law suits.

In the city colleges, most administrators have not taught in the system, especially those in the central office - therefore, there is very little commitment to teaching. This is a major problem, and I cannot see any foreseeable improvement in the future, especially as Mayor Daley is out to destroy the city colleges. I am delighted that I can retire very soon!!!

Comment: reliance on a business model for education/teaching is bankrupt! Such a model, in general, to problem-solving. The teaching-learning paradigm, broadly speaking lends itself the learner and the teacher, between learner and environment.

The current order within institutions should be reversed instead of administrator, faculty, staff, student, it should be student, faculty, staff, administration. Then proper priorities can be assigned that will re-allocate budget and activities to support needed areas. At
present the first organization is unable to deal with too many problems.

Faculty: Positive Comments

The administration seems very committed to teaching and faculty development. However, it is unfortunate that faculty and administration conflicts and differences have undermined that commitment.

Administrators here are so respectful toward faculty posturing that they are in the direction of not mitigating conversation on the subject except at evaluation sessions.

Many of our administrators seems to be too tied up with clerical/physical responsibilities to have the time to devote to teaching improvement/enhancement.

Administrators are working hard to improve staff development programs and policies. They seem obvious to low morale of faculty brought about by poor management strategies of middle-management - department chairs in particular.

All administrators should teach both a day and evening classes at least one semester every other year to keep in touch with the "customer" - our students. Regular communication - memos, newsletters, etc. There needs to be an administrative priority. Expecting verbal information to channel down the chain of command accurately and to all concerned only creates problems. When explicit procedures are expected to be followed, meet with all to explain them as well as provide the procedures in writing.

Lack of awareness of potential hurts efforts. Instruction as such not a primary concern at the college overall.

The administration seems most committed to retention and building enrollment. They also support the latest vogue in education.

95% of our faculty voted no confidence in this administration! No central evaluation was very critical of this administration! This president and 2 chief u.P.S are committed and to lip service to excellence. I want to share this (if there is a comparison of xxxx. To other colleges) with our board of trustees.

Our administrators are on a different wave length than the faculty. They do not support excellent teaching nor do they support a pathway to excellent teaching. Our problem is that the board of trustees hire these types of top-level administrators.

They should teach periodically/on-campus opportunities (workshops, etc.) Should be made available/at least they should recognize that teaching is the core of the institution/they
should strive for more participatory management in academics.

The administrators at this college tend to expend their energies on political maneuvering, reorganization, administrative/union bickering, and in fighting. If half their effort were spent on facilitating and encouraging excellence in instruction, what a wonderful world it would be.

We are in the process of administrative change - new president (1 yr) - new vp of student development. And new dean of enrollment. I believe we will see a new initiative toward excellence in teaching and serving our community. This is a change for the better, in my opinion.

Good teaching is not a priority for administrators. They want no problems from dissatisfied students or their parents. Just maintain the status quo. Do not want to spend money to provide equipment to further education. More concerned with negative publicity than with other problems.

I’m impressed with the level of administrative commitment to teaching excellence.

Administrators need to put high priority on classroom teaching and presently do not do this.

I think it is easy to lose focus on what’s important when dealing with very pressing matters like budgets, grants, creating new programs using government funds, and when existing curricula and people continue to do their jobs without causing problems. Unfortunately those existing curricula and people can get stale or burn out while no one is paying attention.

At our school, good teaching is assumed. We have sought to hire full-time faculty, despite budget pressures, and new hires are certainly highly competent in fields of study; but little real accountability for effective teaching exists, in my view.

To make a long story short, they are "administrators" (though some formerly taught) - I think they view "administration" in life generally and hence, "image" is life itself - then they are not at heart remotely committed to teaching - or even have an thinking of what it is and involves.

After serving as an administrator for 19 years, I feel the present day administration feels a commitment to physical stamina to fulfill that commitment. I went back into teaching to become stimulated intellectually instead of vegetating as an administrator.

I don’t feel that the information generated by this survey will be worth much.
More funding for students not administration.

At our campus, we get a lot of lip service as to how important education is, but that is all it is. We do not get the support to back up their talk.

The administration would probably have and interest in pedagogical matters, were it not for the constant distraction if political upheaval that threatens their job security at this institution. Personal professional pride drives most faculty to do the best they can. Nearly all are highly experienced in the classroom.

8-10 years ago the administration would have rated very high marks in commitment to teaching.

Administrators are attempting to survive in a tough political environment.

New administration making major, good changes - what used to be negative or non-existent is changing - many needs shown on your 1st page will be addressed.

It is satisfactory.

Our previous dean of inst. Was from industry. He treated the job as keeping the troops in line -- teaching was clearly secondary. That president agreed. Our current dean is much more committed but has a very limited background. Our new president encourages her -- but it is a lot to ask of someone with a phd in german lit.

Administration's commitment is to the dollar. Their commitment to quality education is lip service to say "the right thing." Our chancellor doesn’t give 2 hoots about the teaching as long as someone fills the chair.

Don’t really understand the question, if it means what I think it means - no comment.

Good old boys club!

The administration verbalizes a high commitment to teaching. However, it seems that more time is spent meeting for issues other than teaching than our classroom activities (marketing, economic development, campus beautification and safety, social, etc.). I know these areas have their place, but it feels as if we are always in meetings. Our requests for space, improved facilities, equipment is often ignored. The perception is that the instructor’s needs become secondary to presenting a good picture ("selling") the college to the public.

In fairness our administrators appear to be so busy that there is not much time to "push" excellent teaching. At the end of the last year three retired and were not replaced largely due to state "non-support."
As a faculty member and division coordinator at two community colleges, I have seen little emphasis on teaching excellence from administrators. The present, upper-level administrators (six, in number) include three who have never taught, two who have not taught a class in the past five years, and one who teaches one class per year. I hear cliches ("in the best interest of the students") in meetings and media statements; however, I see no policies or practices that promote teachers' improvement or excellence. Unfortunately, I see some truth in the administrators' beliefs that collective bargaining and tenure hinder positive demands that teachers improve personal teaching skills. However, I also see no attempts to creatively motivate teachers to improved performance.

The level of administration commitment will be reflected in the instructional staff. The board sets the tone for the whole institution in its employment policies and in the policies regarding instruction.

The level of administrative commitment to teaching needs to be a "10." This is so desperately needed and so neglected.

Our administration views Madaline hunter as a god and they beat the new faculty over the head with her teaching model. Kishwaukee college administration needs to realize that a variety of teaching models exist. And the model used can only be measured against the objective of the instructor.

Administration should have an acute sense of the teaching responsibility. As far as I can tell, they have only a passing interest. Matters affecting teaching should be decided by the faculty and administration. Administrators should come from the faculty ranks and should possess terminal degrees in an academic field. I am very suspicious of the higher ed. Degrees. I don't know what characteristics these people exhibit.

Administrative commitment to good teaching at any institution is poor. The administration in institutions are weak. They leave me alone, don't interfere with my effort to teach: make funds available for conferences, etc. But don't encourage you in any other way.

The president has a high level of commitment to teaching but the academics dean does not.

Of our top administrators have never been in a classroom in their life.

The level - or existence - is very difficult to determine. Outwardly, administrators talk about teaching effectiveness as a top priority, but policies, actions, decisions seem to contradict this.
Most administrators seem to lose sight of the goal of the school - to provide instructional services - they need to be brought closer to areas where the action takes place - in the classrooms and labs.

Support is spoken of, but never implemented.

Ineffective and impaired teachers are virtually ignored by administration. There is no real evaluation process after tenure is achieved; the union has blocked efforts to establish a meaningful enhancement program. Courses to improve instructional effectiveness are offered through the central office, but taking the courses is voluntary and those who could most benefit seldom enroll.

Administrators should be there for support rather than evaluation. They should make information and resources available to faculty but not be "gatekeepers" of faculty development.

Our recent commitment to a teaching/learning center within the part year should improve our situation considerably.

Our teaching/learning center is just being formed, so it needs time to be tested and evaluated. Referring to question number 16 -our faculty senate does not agree with the philosophy of recognizing "special teachers" since all are special.

Support and developing of faculty development programs and teaching/learning center. Become more vocal in praising good teaching; recognizing good teaching, encouraging good teaching. Support for work shops and inservices for all faculty.

Teaching abilities should be of major importance in: hiring, promoting, and granting tonneau. Workshops and seminars should be available on campus. New faculty orientation should include training.

I do think administrators who have a record of strong teaching should teach a class each year so they don’t forget the level of commitment and energy the profession demands. In fairness, I think the biggest obstacle to faculty development is faculty resistance. The longer we teach, it seems, the less receptive we are to change all close recruiting. But in our defense, teaching 5 classes a semester doesn’t leave much time for development.

Need leadership - need recognition/rewards/pat on the back - need release time for curriculum revision/updating - many curriculum areas are changing constantly; how do we keep up to date? - Provide us with computers, software, and time to update curriculum.

Should be the number 1 concern - far more emphasis is needed on effective teaching/more programs and on campus seminars are needed - distribute research and
latest findings on effective teaching. Our campus focuses heavily on what is taught, new programs, etc. Rather than how it is taught or effectiveness.

Would like an office or center and a director for faculty development. Also a one-year "internship" program for new full-time faculty with release time provided them for that years activities.

We are being asphyxiated by committees. Lets cut the b.S., And get to the core - do the job or relax and retire.

The commitment must be obvious and promoted at all levels of administration. This includes the dean level. They all (administrators) seem buried and preoccupied with meetings and budgets but not with the promotion of effective teaching. They should take a leadership role in this area since they are the closest to the faculty. This is not to say that they don’t support our efforts, but that they need to get involved and act as coaches. I am sure there are a few deans who do not even understand what critical literacy means. They are really in charge of full-time faculty and should be able to mentor, encourage, and challenge us all to be better.

Know what we do. - Schedule meetings et al, with recognition of academic year (busy at midterm-finals). - Too many administrators; need more full-time faculty.

The best thing that has happened to us is "great teachers seminars" inspired and designed by xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx. We have had five! And energy continues!

Hire full-time teaching staff rather than "directors" of whatever. Part-time teaching staff may be five teachers, but full-time people must replace retiring full-time faculty to keep individual disciplines visible.

Teach classes. -Provide opportunities for improvement. -Demand high standards. -Reward excellent teaching.

First, xxxx should have a center for teaching and teaching improvement. Instead, we have a staff development committee, composed primarily of secretaries and paraprofessionals. As a result, the faculty, as a group and as individuals, appear as problems in the shuffle for survival and growth.

On our campus there is little chance of improvement since there is nothing but contempt for faculty from upper level administration. Given the local climate, I am relieved there is no more commitment to "teaching effectiveness" on the part of administration. If there were more commitments, it would be to what they perceive effectiveness and be (whatever latest educational fad) and such perception would be crammed down our throats. They would never realize that there are a myriad of teaching styles and methodologies that are "effective" and that much of the richness of an institution is the
variety of such styles and methodologies.

Know your faculty by name or face. -Make some personal contact with same. -Teach at least one course per year. -Acknowledge faculty as the day to day front-line warriors - > the glue that makes any college excellent or poor quality.

The support of the division associate dead is excellent. The institution; however, would be better served if someone were responsible for promoting or at least informing faculty about off campus workshops on teaching. As it stands, now, faculty must find out about these workshops on their own.

Believe administrators should be much more flexible in granting release time for course development or learning new materials (self taught) for implementation in class. It is difficult to teach 3 to 4 challenging preparations, (different courses) 5 classes with 30 students and still find time to develop new courses/materials, or learn and implement new software packages. I can’t appreciate a mentality that is willing to spend money for me to take graduate courses but not be willing to spend an equal amount to free me from classes for 3-6 hours a semester.

More research possibilities offered/more grants or sabbaticals or awards offered for faculty projects/active encouragement to attend subject related conferences/scholar-in-residence program/symposiums (in-house) or day long convocations on a combination of current issue(s)-local and regional connection.

It would be nice to have seminars on campus on the latest techniques in effective instruction.

The administration needs to encourage effective teaching techniques as well as just learning new technology. Just because a person knows how to run computers, doesn’t mean they can teach them effectively.

We have instructional development activities yearly, but they are very poor at best.

The major focus on critical thinking has benefitted our institution - many opportunities for full and part time faculty have been made available - classes, meetings, and conferences.

Merit/performances evaluations of faculty is possible and can be the basis for monetary incentives.-Administrators increase their visibilities in classroom areas.-Formal indoctrination and follow up for part-time faculty.-I don’t want an additional administrator responsible for faculty development.

Too many faculty do not invest time or effort into anything beyond the classroom.
Deans need to inspire faculty by having required attendance at seminars/teas several times a semester (once a week would be ideal). I believe that the discussion generated would raise faculty morale and increase their interest and participation in creative changes in curriculum and relationships between faculty and administration. Our administration has felt the antipathy of our faculty for so long, they tend to "do it themselves" rather than expect (or wait for) us to do it.

To lobby for more funds for faculty development from district budget.

I would like to see instructors rewarded for excellence in teaching rather than according to all the extra activities that a person can participate in. I would like to see the administration support quality teaching theories i.e., Limit class size to 30, separate class rooms for each teacher (instead of having 2 teachers sharing a room at the same time), etc.

From my answers, it appears that the administration should take charge and implement basic programs that encourage teaching effectiveness. They seem to have a long way to go.

Instead of dumb staff development days, give a day off to boost morale or an office day. Also help fund extra education!

Student evaluations - mandatory reward system for successful program management and teaching gouged by employment vote of graduates and 5 yr. After graduation vote.

Other than faculty staff workshops, there is not a lot of formal instructional development activities by administration - thank goodness - I prefer to update my own methodologies as they pertain to my area.

An easing of narrow restrictions on graduate credit and activities for advanced placement. Clear, written information on credit equations for workshops and seminars, not just graduate classes. An easier pre-approval process for both. More on-campus pre-approved grad. Credit workshops and seminars.

More publicity for those who make presentations at conferences get published, create new courses, etc. - Perhaps this should be a regular agenda item for board of trustees meetings.

There should be a very "high" level of administrative support. This is what we do presumably at the community college level. Our focus should be on the improvement of teaching and intellectual involvement of faculty and administration. We should always strive for the "best." The student deserves nothing less than the best!
While we have periodic "professional" or "in-service" training days, the faculty generally view them as a waste of time. Many faculty would like to see inter or intra departmental "training," by the form of intellectual inter-activity such as reading; discussing important articles on books, etc. Most faculty outside of "education" view such topics as "how to write a syllabus" or "dealing with handicapped students" as a waste of time, since such problems are handled well anyway.

I feel there is an attitude that if you are not in class, you have nothing to do. Lab time and lab prep time is considered insignificant and certainly less important than class (lecture) time. I am currently frustrated and in need of a mentor. I'm afraid if I go on, it will simply be complaints rather than constructive material.

We, as new faculty, have not been offered any opportunities to increase the effectiveness of our instruction. I did not observe anyone else teaching nor was I offered the opportunity to discuss methodologies of effective teaching. I believe this has proven to be detrimental to our department.

A greater willingness to encourage and provide professional development days on campus during the semester which would inform the entire college staff on issues related to teaching and education. (Entire staff required to attend)

The college has a definite need for one individual to investigate, recoup and promote instructional help to those faculty that have a poor teaching/retention reputation. The committee for faculty development fund 2 to 3 faculty per/yr to attend master teacher seminar. Although the one seminar I attended was good - the social basic information and experience sharing comprised 98% of the activities/training - true instructional help or education was minimal.

Released time.

Know that effective teaching is very hard to measure: therefore, poor teaching is also hard to measure. Effective teaching is something you either know instinctively is happening or not happening. It is hard to build a reward system for something so elusive. However, offering teaching effectiveness training would be helpful and perhaps teachers should be monetarily rewarded for attending.

Administrator Comments

Teaching is the essence of community colleges. There are many facets of support which are a part of that. In the smaller colleges where administrators perform multiple roles it is difficult, if not impossible to accomplish all of the tasks on hand. This includes program development program review curriculum work, supervision, budget management and a host of other administrative tasks which may be spread around in large institutions.
In other words, there is often no one to whom certain assignments can be delegated. This is a preface to saying that it is important to be as supporting and helpful as possible to faculty, to ask for their assistance when possible and to give, in return, what you are capable of giving.

Teachers many time see instruction as the only area to support but do expect the support of the other areas of the college. If they keep the total college in perspective they are happier.

The informal commitments throughout the college are more important here than are the formal commitments.

It needs to be very high. A supervisory evaluation system of faculty, both F.T. and P.T. is a major key.

Colleges are going to have to reorganize how and what they collect for information and data on instruction and other institutional information. The electronic technology has to be installed to provide administrators a way to sort data etc. for all the reports (both internal and external) demanded of them. Such support should allow them more time to provide instructional leadership.

Sorry, I don’t have time to write - but consider this an important area, given the demand for quality, life-long learning skills, etc. and the increasing diversity of our students which requires new approaches to teaching and learning.

There is a shared responsibility between and among faculty and administrators in committing time and resources to instruction/teaching/learning. Administrators aught to respond to needs expressed by faculty, encourage them and find ways to make instructional engagement occur with the faculty being the prime initiators.

We are in the process of negotiating another contract. Faculty morale is low. Unfortunately, most administrators do not have faculty rank and are not qualified to teach at the 1st and 2nd year curriculum. They can however, teach at the graduate level.

President, VP, and Deans all need to demonstrate this commitment.

Colleges need to be made up of good dedicated faculty - this faculty needs to present themselves in a professional dedicated manner to allow community perception and support of college to be maintained effective instruction is the key to institutional effectiveness.

Administrators are responsible for providing faculty with the necessary resources to do their job, this includes opportunityes for professional growth (sabbaticals, $ for travel to
workshops and seminars that promote teaching and learning and showcase exemplary teaching practices), appropriate environments (space, technologies, etc.), and coursework for discussing and acting upon curriculum reform.

This is an interesting survey. Some of the questions may want a certain answer, but the results should at least make it clear that faculty will question the level of administrative commitment to teaching - that's my prediction.

There is a higher level of commitment to teaching at most administrative levels than at the faculty level, but the focus is difficult and faculty generally do not perceive it as so.

Administration is usually committed to instruction, however because of time and funding constraints this commitment is not always expressed in the form of well developed faculty development programs. This situation is often exaggerated in union environment. In the union environment these issues often end up as bargaining chips as opposed to problem solving strategies to address much needed programs to address the needs of education.

President's role is not same as that of chief academic officer. Not all administrators should teach - some are lousy. Unlike a university, an administrator does not return to the classroom; there is no chair on the faculty set up for administrators (presidents) who want to teach.
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