1

OVERVIEW OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

HISTORY AND CHOICES

Mathew L. Ouellett

MY PURPOSE IN THIS CHAPTER is to set the stage broadly for the chapters that follow; to call readers' attention to some of the literature, both body of practice and research based, upon which much of this book is built; and to suggest key questions that await further pursuit as we continue to expand and refine the work of faculty development. For both seasoned and beginning practitioners, the good news is that during the past several decades our colleagues have steadily contributed to a rich body of knowledge that serves to illuminate why we pursue our work in the ways we do, how we do what we do, and what the principles and values are that undergird what we do.

A Note on Language and Scope

In the Preface of this volume, the volume editors address common confusion that stems from our currently fuzzy and interchangeable use of terms, including *educational development, faculty development,* and *professional development.* As the editors point out, our community is in the process of building consensus on what words best describe our work, but we are not there yet. Therefore, readers of this volume will see the field named by a number of terms. I invite readers to join this ongoing conversation.

In order to provide a broad foundation for the topics covered in depth by specific chapters, my goal here is twofold: to summarize the historical context and to introduce topics and questions addressed in later chapters of this volume. The test is to achieve these two goals succinctly and without "stealing the thunder" or unnecessarily repeating the efforts of my colleagues. Their chapters provide the best in research, practice, and innovative approaches and offer an in-depth exploration of the implications of these issues from the perspective of educational developers.

A Brief History of Faculty Development

Colleges and universities in the United States have a long history of commitment to the development and success of faculty members related to their disciplinary expertise and research. Lewis (1996) pointed out that the sabbatical leave instituted at Harvard University in 1810 is probably the oldest form of faculty development. The primary goal of this early program was to support faculty members' further development as scholars within their fields. Well into the 1960s, this focus on increasing research expertise was the standard of support in colleges and universities.

Faculty development, as we understand it today, began to emerge in U.S. higher education in the social and economic turbulence of the late 1950s and 1960s (Bergquist, 1992; Rice, 2007; Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). With the advent of the student rights movement across higher education in the United States, students began to demand more control over what they studied (for example, the emergence of ethnic studies programs) and to assert the right to give teachers feedback on what they found to be boring and irrelevant courses (Gaff & Simpson, 1994). Additionally, students began to demand a role in the determination of the content of the curriculum, expecting that courses would be, in their perceptions, more relevant to their experiences, concerns, and aspirations.

The reimagination of faculty life in the 1960s and 1970s encompassed the broadening of what should constitute the central work of faculty. This was the recognition that success for faculty members had been defined almost exclusively by research and publication success. The expansion to include a more holistic focus on, and concomitant rewards for, excellence in teaching and service was a dramatic departure from what had been a generally accepted standard. Faculty members increasingly advocated that institutional and career rewards, particularly tenure and promotion standards, should reflect a broad understanding

of the nature of their work. These shifting perspectives on the roles and rewards for faculty members in higher education intertwined with two concurrent important social movements: the human potential and the student rights movements (Bergquist, 1992; Gaff & Simpson, 1994; Lewis, 1996, Rice, 2007). This era launched a reevaluation of the traditional focus on the role of researcher and introduced a reappraisal of the value of and rewards for faculty members who focused on excellence in teaching. This dialogue continues on college and university campuses and within professional associations as well.

Stages of Faculty Development Work

A number of authors have suggested models for understanding the stages in the evolution of the research and practices in faculty development during the past several decades (Rice, 2007; Sorcinelli et al., 2006; Tiberius, 2001). In *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present,* Sorcinelli et al. (2006) categorized the evolution of faculty development into four past ages (scholar, teacher, developer, and learner) and one new one (the age of the networker).

In their conceptualization, Sorcinelli et al. described the first stage (roughly the mid-1950s into the early 1960s) as the Age of the Scholar, indicating that during this time faculty development efforts intended to improve scholarly competence. In the 1950s and early 1960s, few institutions had formal programs addressing teaching improvement. The focus of support was on the development of scholarly expertise as indicated by research success and publication rates. Heiss (1970) noted that the pervasive norms of the time honored the development of research skills through "rigorous exposure to theory and practice" (p. 229) but held that teaching skills came "naturally" or automatically as one's scholarship increased. Not surprisingly, researchers at the time noted that few doctoral programs included any formal pedagogical training (Nowlis, Clark, & Rock, 1968). In practical terms, faculty members understood that the pathway to success was based upon research and publication records.

The second stage, the Age of the Teacher, spanned the mid-1960s through the 1970s and witnessed an extension to include faculty, instructional, and organizational components of the improvement of teaching effectiveness. This period saw increased numbers of faculty members becoming dissatisfied with the narrowing of resources and sole focus on research as the definitive benchmark of faculty accomplishment. Recognizing the changing landscape, individuals and foundations

began to argue for a broadening of the definition of scholarship and an exploration of other venues for faculty fulfillment and vitality (Astin, Comstock, Epperson, Greeley, Katz, & Kaufman, 1974; Rice, 2007). At this same time, research institutions began to respond to these changing demands by establishing faculty development opportunities (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). Melnik and Sheehan (1976) described three key forms of "teaching improvement programs" that began to emerge at this time as "one-shot" programs, expert centers, and financial incentive programs. The one-time programs included workshops, colloquia, and other opportunities of relatively brief duration. Examples of the "expert center" include the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching established at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, in 1962 and the Clinic to Improve Teaching at the University of Massachusetts Amherst established in 1972 (Melnik & Sheehan, 1976; Tiberius, 2001). Such centers offered sustained teaching improvement services and advice often delivered by faculty colleagues who had been granted release time. The financial incentive programs were small grants for individual faculty members to develop and implement teaching improvement projects. During this period, a group of faculty members and higher education scholars founded the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) in 1974, which was a pivotal event in the evolution of what we now call faculty or educational development.

Sorcinelli et al. (2006) then defined the 1980s as the Age of the Developer. This period saw a number of faculty development units emerge formally on campuses and a greater institutionalization of the role of faculty developers (Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Erickson, 1986; Sorcinelli et al., 2006). Initiatives on changing the state of undergraduate education from private foundations (for example, the Bush, Ford, and Lilly Foundations) helped provide the resources and motivation for innovation and experimentation with new approaches to teaching and faculty development (Sorcinelli et al., 2006).

The 1990s was the Age of the Learner. In a dramatic paradigm shift, the focus of teaching and instructional development moved from what had been a singular focus on the development of the pedagogical expertise and platform skills of teachers (the "sage on the stage") to include a focus on student learning (teachers as the "guide on the side"). This shift caused a surge of interest in student-centered pedagogical methods such as active and collaborative approaches and problem and inquiry-based learning strategies that brought students directly into the teaching and learning equation (Barr & Tagg, 1995; Sorcinelli et al., 2006). This decade also saw a profusion of new, more complex options and resources

for initiatives in faculty, instructional, and organizational development. The relatively fast evolution of faculty support programs—from periodic sabbatical leaves to extend one's disciplinary expertise to comprehensive institution-wide programs that address faculty needs for growth and development across career stages and roles—is perhaps the greatest testament to the resonance and value of a more systemic approach to educational development.

Finally, Sorcinelli et al. (2006) proposed that we have now entered a new stage, the Age of the Networker. In this age, faculty developers will be called upon to "preserve, clarify, and enhance the purposes of faculty development, and to network with faculty and institutional leaders to respond to institutional problems and propose constructive solutions as we meet the challenges of the new century . . ." (p. 28).

Data gathered by Sorcinelli et al. (2006) indicate a rapidly growing constellation of individuals responsible for education development activities on campuses. The majority of survey respondents identified their primary roles as administrative, and they were relatively new to the field (that is, ten or fewer years); but more than three-fifths of respondents indicated they held faculty appointments. Additionally, some centers may now have staff positions, especially in centers located within larger institutional settings. Thus, we now have a pipeline of practitioners who may not have followed traditional faculty career pathways but bring specific expertise, such as instructional technology, to educational development. "As a group they [faculty developers] tend to be relatively new to the field with only one-quarter reporting that they have been in faculty development for a decade or more" (p. 36). This surge has created great interest in strengthening the dialogue between seasoned faculty development practitioners and relative newcomers, with the idea that there is much to be learned from each other. Not surprisingly, our articulation of what we do has evolved, too.

Building a Common Lexicon

Early on, Francis (1975) defined *faculty development* as a primarily classroom-based, individualized endeavor: a "process which seeks to modify the attitudes, skills, and behavior of faculty members toward greater competence and effectiveness in meeting student needs, their own needs, and the needs of the institution" (p. 720). Nearly twenty years later, Lewis (1996) noted that the term *faculty development* had evolved, as had the field, into a more expansive term meant to encompass three key areas of effort: personal development (self-reflection, vitality, and growth),

instructional development (course and student-based initiatives), and organizational development (program, departmental, and institution-wide efforts). Diamond (2002) pointed out that these approaches are not mutually exclusive, but that, in combination, they allow for a tailoring of programs and resources best suited to the questions and goals at hand.

Diamond (2002) offered a further analysis of roles by presenting them as interdependent domains of faculty, instructional, organizational, and professional development. In his perspective, these roles parse out as follows. Faculty development focuses on the improvement of the individual instructor's teaching skills; instructional development on students' learning by improving the course and curriculum experience; and organizational development on the interrelationship and effectiveness of units within the institution; finally, educational development refers to the overall interaction resulting from the prior three efforts (Diamond, 1988, 2002).

Faculty development, professional development, organizational development, and the *scholarship of teaching and learning* interchangeably refer to aspects of the wide array of duties taken on by faculty developers. In international contexts, the more encompassing term *educational development* is used to cover the related initiatives for academic development, staff development, and quality enhancement. Recently, Felten, Kalish, Pingree, and Plank (2007) have argued for the adoption of the term *educational development* as the most inclusive term to describe "a profession dedicated to helping colleges and universities function effectively as teaching and learning communities" (p. 93). These several terms, and the accompanying confusion about when and how to use them accurately, are indicative of the fast-paced, international growth of the field and the complexity of competing demands arising from these often overlapping functions (Gosling, Sorcinelli, & Chism, 2008).

Today, the demands placed upon faculty members and the complexity of their roles and responsibilities continue to evolve at an astonishing pace. Consequently, our understanding of what constitutes "faculty development" and our language to articulate these changes in perspective will continue to evolve to reflect new conceptualizations.

Expanding the Horizon of Faculty Development

Changes in higher education and in the expectations of faculty members, including paradigm shifts in our approaches to teaching and learning and emergent research on the stages of faculty life, contribute significantly to the scope and breadth of faculty development. In their comprehensive research study, Sorcinelli et al. (2006) polled faculty developers to discern

the three top challenges they saw facing the faculty and higher education institutions. As one would expect, respondents reported a range of priorities, but five emerged across institution type and size as central. These five concerns were

1. Balancing increasingly complex and demanding faculty roles
2. Assessment of teaching and student learning (especially in the context of increasingly diverse students)
3. The impact of technology
4. Addressing the needs of part-time faculty
5. The demands of interdisciplinary leadership development for chairs and institutions (pp. 104–105)

Response to the study to date indicates that these challenges resonate internationally as well (Gosling, Sorcinelli, & Chism, 2008).

Chism (2006) indicated that there is utility in approaching the work of educational development from multiple perspectives. She explained that one benefit of such an approach is that it prompts us to identify the strategies, theoretical perspectives, and consultation practices best suited for the challenge at hand. Inarguably, there is reason to respond to the priorities and unique needs of one's institution. However, as faculty developers, we often have an institution-wide platform from which to work; and this perspective offers an opportunity to introduce new ideas, models, and practices that influence the development and progress of the institution.

In the chapters that follow, our colleagues address the specific content knowledge, skills, and values needed for success in promoting effective educational development. Some of these chapters dovetail neatly with the historical development of the field of faculty or educational development, and others point to emergent priorities. Collectively, they contribute to helping both new and experienced educational developers think more creatively, act more holistically, and meet the complex needs of diverse constituents more successfully in the future. Next, I briefly highlight four key topics that are of universal concern for educational developers: (1) the increasingly complex roles of faculty members, (2) the focus assessment of student learning and curricular innovations, (3) technology, and (4) diversity.

Complex Roles of Faculty Members

The definition of the scope of faculty work traditionally involved research, teaching, and service. The common wisdom used to be that the more expert you were within your disciplinary concentration (in other words,

the better your research), the better your teaching. While it is true that great teachers can be great researchers and great researchers can be great teachers, it is not necessarily so for all. Consequently, efforts to apply adult development, educational psychology, and learning theories to the faculty development context have helped practitioners to determine when to use different strategies to bring about professional growth and development (Herbert & Loy, 2001; McKeachie, 1991; Menges & Rando, 1989). Faculty developers have long been familiar with the usefulness of theories of learning (Kolb, 1984), reflective practice (Brookfield, 1995; Schön, 1983), adult education (Saroyan, Amundsen, & Li, 1997), and adult learning theories (King & Lawler, 2003).

However, as research documents, the needs and values of the faculty are changing at every stage of the career path; our guiding theories and practices must do so, too. We will benefit from approaching these needs with creativity and generosity (Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000; Sorcinelli & Austin, 2006; Trower, 2000). Chapter Twenty-Two, entitled "Supporting Faculty Members Across Their Careers," directly addresses these issues.

For example, with new and junior faculty members we now see an increased demand for better balance between work and life, support for the challenges of dual-career couples, and an acknowledgment of the demands of parenting as well as taking care of aging parents. We already see innovative efforts to rethink traditional support mechanisms. Gonzales and Baran (2005) have written eloquently about how their sustained multicultural dialogue between senior and junior faculty members in the same department became a mutually rewarding exchange of expertise and skills and how their relationship became a model of interracial dialogue for students. Another example is the complete reenvisioning of mentoring moving from top-down, individualized models to mutual mentoring (peer-to-peer) communities to meet the socialization needs of new and junior faculty and faculty of color (Yun & Sorcinelli, 2007, 2008).

Additionally, there is growing interest in addressing the pre-professional needs of senior graduate students, especially those who expect to pursue careers in academia. The Council of Graduate Schools in partnership with the Association of American Colleges formed the Preparing Future Faculty initiative in 1993 as an early effort to develop resources and programmatic models to prepare students for faculty careers within a wide array of institutional settings (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008). However, we know that much remains to be done to establish healthier and more transparent models of graduate education and preparation for

the professoriate (Gaff, Pruitt-Logan, Sims, & Denecke, 2003; Golde & Dore, 2001; Lovitts, 2001). While this topic has been of particular interest to developers located in research universities (Nyquist, Austin, Sprague, & Wulff, 2001; Nyquist & Sprague, 1998; Wulff & Austin, 2004), in truth many graduate students will become junior colleagues at institutions of varying types and sizes. Border and von Hoene provide guidance on these issues in their chapter entitled "Graduate and Professional Student Development Programs" (Chapter Twenty).

Finally, the exponential growth in the numbers of both part-time faculty appointments and adjunct faculty members, specifically addressed in Tarr's chapter on "Working with Adjunct Faculty Members" (Chapter Twenty-One), presents educational developers with the challenge of addressing the needs of these often under-acknowledged members of the academic community.

Assessment of Student Learning and Curricular Innovations

Faculty development emerged partially out of a need to alleviate concerns of parents and legislators and to assure them that students could experience an optimal teaching and learning environment (Lewis, 1996). Today, due to a range of pressures, including budgetary concerns, legislative activism, and changing accreditation standards, the assessment and accountability movements have sharpened the interests of the faculty and academic administrators in finding methods for informing parents, legislators, citizens, prospective students, and alumni how well students are doing in achieving course-based, program, and institutional learning goals (Wehlburg, 2006). Such efforts apply to a wide array of academic development initiatives beyond the classroom.

Faculty developers can make important contributions in this area by facilitating key discussions, providing empirical evidence based on evaluation and assessment data of current curricula, and assisting in the review of existing programs (Diamond, 2005). Developers have the skills, neutrality, and understanding of technology needed to help organize and facilitate meetings before faculty members and key administrators finalize major decisions. They also can provide expertise and resources to help design and pilot course innovations and assess program enhancements. Additionally, developers continually acquire data useful in the assessment and evaluation of new curricula. For example, Cook (2001) offered a useful description of instructional consultants' involvement in a recent curriculum reform effort on the campus of the University of

Michigan, and Smith (2000) described a program sponsored by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to promote faculty use of inquiry-based learning methods. Chapters in this book address these matters in detail.

Technology

Instructional technology is now ubiquitous in most colleges and universities. For many faculty members the central issues related to technology have moved from questions about whether or not to use the technologies to questions of when, to what degree, and to what ends to use them. As we know, when implemented appropriately, the emerged and emerging technologies can act as a great accelerator to the teaching and learning process. For example, on my campus, students often cite course Web sites as one of the most useful instructional resources for them, enabling them to keep up with course announcements, check due dates for assignments, and retrieve course presentations or notes.

The good news is that faculty members are often willing to admit they need assistance when implementing instructional technologies. The rewards can be immediate when students demonstrate that such uses can make a positive difference in their classroom experiences. The bad news is that linking good teaching practices with effective use of instructional technology can be frustratingly labor intensive, unpredictable, and expensive. Issues commonly cited are the cost of hardware and software, lack of clarity about copyright and fair use practices, and the social implications of the role of technology in the teaching and learning relationship (Shih & Sorcinelli, 2000). What is clear is that it takes a steady hand to guide instructors in using technology to enhance instead of to replace existing pedagogies. It is especially effective when the choices of applications clearly suit a professor's teaching style or can be seen to accommodate a student's learning style needs (Gibbs, Major, & Wright, 2003; Shih & Sorcinelli, 2000).

A knotty but pervasive issue on campuses today is the role of hybrid and distance education courses. For some, such courses are an expedient cost-cutting or revenue-producing measure or a strategy to maximize usage of limited classroom space rather than a conscious pedagogical preference. However, as any faculty member who has taught online will attest, it is rarely true that online or hybrid courses are less effort for the instructor than ones taught face to face. It will continue to be important for faculty developers to help facilitate the dialogue between instructors and administrators as they explore the underlying assumptions, values, and beliefs about teaching embedded in such online initiatives (Chickering

& Ehrmann, 1996). On the plus side, conversations about technology initiatives create opportunities for networking across campus. The chapter "Issues in Technology and Faculty Development" by Sally Kuhlenschmidt (Chapter Sixteen) provides more discussion of these issues.

Diversity of Faculty and Students

Since the 1970s, faculty developers have paid close attention to the importance of reviews of organizational structures (Diamond, 1988; Graf, Albright, & Wheeler, 1992; Lindquist, 1978). Such efforts have generally focused on the effectiveness of programmatic efforts and innovations along the three common dimensions described earlier: individual consultation and support services, instructional development initiatives at program and department levels, and organizational development. More recently, however, practitioners and scholars have called for more sustained analysis at the organizational level (Baron, 2006; Chism, 1998). What has been neglected is how deeply diversity and multicultural dynamics embed these issues at every level of our practice (Jacobson, Borgford-Parnell, Frank, Peck, & Reddick, 2001; Lieberman, 2007).

However, as complex new issues confront us, new research and practice models for understanding organizations can be essential (Jackson, 2005; Lockhart & Borland, 2001). Marchesani and Jackson (2005) have applied the theory and practice of multicultural organization development (MCOD) to educational institutions. This data-driven model is a tool for supporting social justice and diversity goals in the context of a systemic change initiative. Unlike other organizational change systems, in the MCOD model a level of social justice must be present in order to pursue social diversity. Our field would benefit from an expansion of research paradigms to include data-driven multicultural organization development models in order to expand our understanding of the unique contributions and challenges in different institutional settings, such as community colleges, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), predominately Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), and Tribal Colleges.

Faculty development within community colleges is of concern because faculty members at such institutions are increasingly held accountable for student learning outcomes, adjusting to a learner-centered focus, and learning to incorporate technology in the classroom; they are being asked to teach effectively in far more diverse classroom environments than had been the case (Eddy, 2005). Quick growth in student populations, competition for resources, heavy teaching loads, and a lack of resources are often cited challenges. However, there is an increasingly strong

effort to address these needs via organizations like the North American Council for Staff, Program and Organization Development (NCSPOD). Because community colleges are often feeder schools for nearby four-year colleges and universities, our workplaces, student populations, and the health and well-being of our institutions are increasingly tied together. (See Chapter Nineteen, "Faculty Development in the Context of the Community College," by Burnstad and Hoss).

Clearly, different types of institutions have their own faculty development needs (Sorcinelli et al., 2006). Historically Black Colleges and Universities have a unique historical tradition, culture, and mission in the context of higher education; and, just like other higher education institutions, they are responding to changing demands from faculty, students, and staff. The HBCU Faculty Development Network, founded in 1994, has been instrumental in facilitating the institutionalization of faculty development at these institutions as well as in highlighting their innovations in teaching and learning (Dawkins, Beach, & Rozman, 2006).

As with the relationships between community colleges and neighboring four-year institutions, faculty developers may overlook the benefits that may come from closer alignment with the work of colleagues across institutional type and mission. When feasible, we ought to look for ways to sustain dialogues that encourage and extend each other's work. A recent example of this became evident when members of the HBCU Faculty Development Network surveyed their members to determine what faculty development opportunities were offered on their campuses and what members saw as important future priorities. They were able to collaborate with a research team that had administered a similar survey to members of the predominately white organization, the POD Network (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). Ultimately, this allowed both research teams to compare data sets and to extend their projects' resources in important new directions (Dawkins, Beach, & Rozman, 2006).

Conclusion

This chapter ends as it began, with an understanding that not all issues carry the same salience for every faculty developer or in every institutional context. The task for practitioners, new or experienced, is to find the right balance and most useful array of programmatic offerings based on institutional needs, level of support, and faculty expectations. In fact, such diversity of perspectives, expectations, and effort contributes to the richness of the field of faculty development. Our charge is to identify and address those issues most central to the faculty and

institutions we call home. Additionally, as the number of educational development practitioners continues to grow and as the field becomes increasingly professionalized, we need to give special attention to how we welcome a diverse group of practitioners to the field and support their preparation and training.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W., Comstock, C., Epperson, D., Greeley, A., Katz, J., & Kaufman, R. (1974). *Faculty development in a time of retrenchment.* Washington, DC: Group for Human Development in Higher Education and Change.

Baron, L. (2006). The advantages of a reciprocal relationship between faculty development and organizational development in higher education. In S. Chadwick-Blossey & D. R. Robertson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 24. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 29–43). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 27*(6), 13–25.

Bergquist, W. H. (1992). *The four cultures of the academy: Insights and strategies for improving leadership in collegiate organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A., & Ehrmann, S. (1996, October). Implementing the seven principles: Technology as lever. *AAHE Bulletin,* 3–6.

Chism, N.V.N. (1998). The role of educational developers in institutional change: From the basement office to the front office. In M. Kaplan & D. Lieberman (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 17. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 141–153). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Chism, N.V.N. (2006). POD connections: Faculty development theories. *NEFDC Exchange, 17*(1), 8.

Cook, C. E. (2001). The role of a teaching center in curriculum reform. In D. Lieberman & C. Wehlburg (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 19. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 217–231). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Council of Graduate Schools. (2008). *The preparing future faculty program.* Retrieved November 5, 2008, from http://www.cgsnet.org

Dawkins, P. W., Beach, A. L., & Rozman, S. L. (2006). Perceptions of faculty developers about the present and future of faculty development at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. In S. Chadwick-Blossey

& D. R. Robertson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 24. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 104–120). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Diamond, R. M. (1988). Faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development: Options and choices. In E. C. Wadsworth (Ed.), *A handbook for new practitioners* (pp. 9–11). Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

Diamond, R. M. (2002). Faculty, instructional, and organizational development: Options and choices. In K. Gillespie, L. Hilsen, & E. Wadsworth (Eds.), *A guide to faculty development: Practical advice, examples, and resources* (pp. 2–8). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Diamond, R. M. (2005). The institutional change agency: The expanding role of academic support centers. In S. Chadwick-Blossey & D. R. Robertson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 23. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 24–37). Bolton, MA: Anker.

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

Eddy, P. L. (2005). Faculty development in community colleges: Surveying the present, preparing for the future. *Journal of Faculty Development 20*(3), 143–152.

Erickson, G. (1986). A survey of faculty development practices. In M. Svinicki, J. Kurfiss, & J. Stone (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 5. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 182–196). Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

Felten, P., Kalish, A., Pingree, A., & Plank, K. (2007). Toward a scholarship of teaching and learning in educational development. In D. R. Robertson & L. B. Nilson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 25. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 93–108). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Francis, J. B. (1975). How do we get there from here? Program design for faculty development. *Journal of Higher Education, 46*(6), 719–732.

Gaff, J. G., Pruitt-Logan, A. S., Sims, L. B., & Denecke, D. (2003). *Preparing future faculty in the humanities and social sciences: A guide for change.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities, Council of Graduate Schools.

Gaff, J. G., & Simpson, R. D. (1994). Faculty development in the United States. *Innovative Higher Education, 18*(3), 167–176.

Gibbs, J. E., Major, C. H., & Wright, V. H. (2003). Faculty perception of the costs and benefits of instructional technology: Implications for faculty work. *Journal of Faculty Development, 19*(2), 77–88.

Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education.* A report prepared for The Pew Charitable Trusts. Retrieved December 8, 2008, from http://www.phd-survey.org

Gonzales, D., & Baran, J. (2005). Breaking the silence: Innovative approaches for promoting dialogue about diversity issues within a communication disorders department. In M. L. Ouellett (Ed.), *Teaching inclusively: Resources for course, department & institutional change in higher education* (pp. 225–240). Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

Gosling, D., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Chism, N.V.N. (2008, June). *The future of faculty/educational development: An international perspective.* Presentation at the biennial meeting of the International Consortium for Educational Development, Salt Lake City, UT.

Graf, D. L., Albright, M. J., & Wheeler, D. W. (1992). Faculty development's role in improving undergraduate education. In M. J. Albright & D. L. Graf (Eds.), *New directions for teaching and learning, no. 51. Teaching in the information age: The role of educational technology* (pp. 101–109). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heiss, A. M. (1970). *Challenges to graduate schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Herbert, F., & Loy, M. (2001). The evolution of a teacher professor: Applying behavior change theory to faculty development. In D. Lieberman & C. Wehlburg (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 20. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 197–207). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Jackson, B. (2005). The theory and practice of multicultural organization development in education. In M. L. Ouellett (Ed.), *Teaching inclusively: Resources for course, department and institutional change in higher education* (pp. 3–20). Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

Jacobson, W., Borgford-Parnell, J., Frank, K., Peck, M., & Reddick, L. (2001). Operational diversity: Saying what we mean, doing what we say. In D. Lieberman & C. Wehlburg (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 20. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 128–149). Bolton, MA: Anker.

King, K. P., & Lawler, P. A. (Eds.). (2003). *New directions for adult and continuing education, no. 98. New perspectives on designing and implementing professional development of teachers of adults.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lewis, K. G. (1996). A brief history and overview of faculty development in the United States. *International Journal for Academic Development, 1*(2), 26–33.

Lieberman, D. (2007). Diversity initiatives, institutional change, and curricular reform in higher education. In D. A. Brunson, B. Jarmon, & L. L. Lampl (Eds.), *Letters from the future: Linking students and teaching with the diversity of everyday life* (pp. 3–25). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Lindquist, J. (1978). Approaches to collegiate teaching improvement. In J. Lindquist (Ed.), *Designing teaching improvement programs* (pp. 3–22). Berkeley, CA: Pacific Soundings.

Lockhart, M., & Borland Jr., K. (2001). Incorporating diversity in all faculty/staff development programs . . . Regardless of the content. *Journal of Faculty Development*, *18*(2), 57–64.

Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Marchesani, L. M., & Jackson, B. W. (2005). Transforming higher education institutions using multicultural organizational development: A case study of a large northeastern university. In M. L. Oullett (Ed.), *Teaching inclusively: Resources for course, department, and institutional change in higher education* (pp. 214–251). Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

McKeachie, W. J. (1991). What theories underlie the practice of faculty development? In K. Zahorski (Ed.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 10. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 3–8). Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

Melnik, M. A., & Sheehan, D. S. (1976). Clinical supervision elements: The clinic to improve university teaching. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 9*(2), 67–76.

Menges, R., & Rando, W. (1989). What are your assumptions? Improving instruction by examining theories. *College Teaching, 37*(2), 54–60.

Nowlis, V., Clark, K. E., & Rock, M. (1968). *The graduate student as teacher.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Nyquist, J. D., Austin, A. E., Sprague, J., & Wulff, D. H. (2001). *The development of graduate students as teaching scholars: A four-year longitudinal study, final report.* Seattle: University of Washington, Center for Instructional Development and Research.

Nyquist, J. D., & Sprague, J. (1998). Thinking developmentally about TAs. In M. Marincovich, J. Prostko, & F. Stout (Eds.), *The professional development of graduate teaching assistants* (pp. 61–88). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Polich, S. (2008). Assessment of a faculty learning community program: Do faculty members really change? In L. B. Nilson & J. E. Miller (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 26. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 106–118). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rice, R. E. (2007). It all started in the sixties: Movements for change across the decades—a personal journey. In D. R. Robertson & L. B. Nilson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 25. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 3–17). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation.* New Pathways Working Paper Series, no. 7. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Saroyan, A., Amundsen, C., & Li, C. (1997). Incorporating theories of teacher growth and adult education in a faculty development program. In D. DeZure (Ed.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 16. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 93–116). Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Shih, M., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2000). TEACHnology: Linking teaching and technology in faculty development. In M. Kaplan & D. Lieberman (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 18. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 151–163). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Smith, K. S. (2000). Faculty development that transforms the undergraduate experience at a research university. In D. Lieberman & C. Wehlburg (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 19. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 193–204). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2006). Developing faculty for new roles and changing expectations. *Effective Practices for Academic Leaders*, *1*(11), 1–16.

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Tiberius, R. G. (2001). A brief history of educational development: Implications for teachers and developers. In D. Lieberman & C. Wehlburg (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 20. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 20–37). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Trower, C. A. (Ed.). (2000). *Policies on faculty appointment: Standard practices and unusual arrangements.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Wehlburg, C. (2006). *Meaningful course revision: Enhancing academic engagement using student learning data.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Wulff, D., & Austin, A. E. (Eds.). (2004). *Pathways to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yun, J., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2007). From mentors to mentoring networks: Mentoring in the new academy. *Change, 39*(6), 58–61.

Yun, J., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2008). When mentoring is the medium: Lessons learned from a faculty development initiative. In L. B. Nilson & J. E. Miller (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 27. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 365–384). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.