



Innovative Models for Organizing Faculty Development Programs

Pedagogical Reflexivity, Student Learning Empathy, and Faculty Agency

Jay R. Dee and Cheryl J. Daly

University of Massachusetts Boston • Western Carolina University

jay.dee@umb.edu • cdaly@wcu.edu

Abstract: This study reports on the impact of faculty development seminars convened at seven colleges and universities by the New England Center for Inclusive Teaching (NECIT). In these semester-long seminars, faculty participants reflected on their professional lives, identified strengths and competencies that they could share with others, and assumed the posture of being learners themselves, as they encountered new ideas and innovations that could enhance their work as scholars and teachers. The seminar process was more organic and free-form than the structured workshops and training sessions that are often offered to faculty through more conventional, functionally-oriented faculty development programs. This more organic, grassroots approach allowed faculty members' own needs to be foremost in the development of related initiatives and programs. The study concludes with a set of principles that other colleges and universities can use to implement similar faculty development initiatives.

I. INTRODUCTION

Faculty members have been described as purveyors of culture, engines of economic development, and generators of scientific, medical, and technological discoveries that transform human society (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). They have been characterized as institutional agents

who can foster the development of social and cultural capital, particularly within and among historically disadvantaged communities (Stanton-Salazar, 1997). Faculty have been at the forefront of social change movements, and have been viewed as teachers and mentors who can empower students to achieve their highest potential (Kingston-Mann & Sieber, 2001).

But faculty have also been described,

Jay R. Dee is associate professor in the Higher Education Doctoral Program at the University of Massachusetts Boston. His scholarly interests include organizational theory, higher education leadership, governance, and faculty development. He is the co-author of *Understanding College and University Organization: Theories for Effective Policy and Practice* (Stylus Publishing, 2008). He also serves as the director of the New England Center for Inclusive Teaching. **Cheryl J. Daly** is assistant professor at Western Carolina University, where she directs the master's program in College Student Personnel. Her research interests include organizational leadership, college teaching and learning environments, and career issues for faculty of color. The project described in this article was supported by grant number 1040-0275 from the Ford Foundation. The contents of this article are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Ford Foundation.

by critics, as scam artists who focus on self-interested agendas at the expense of the education of tuition-paying students (Sykes, 1988). Collectively, faculties and their academic disciplines have been defined by some postmodernists as closed communities that endorse only certain forms of knowledge generation, primarily those forms that reinforce the power positions of well-established interests within those disciplines (Foucault, 1986). Recently, faculty have been characterized as managed professionals, whose autonomy has been eroded by extensive accountability-oriented measurement systems (Rhoades, 1998) and by a rising managerialism among college and university administrators, who now are more likely to make major decisions without faculty input (Bess, 2006).

These various images and metaphors suggest that expectations for the academic profession have become highly differentiated and fragmented. No longer does a quick reference to teaching, research, and service suffice to explain the work of the faculty member. Faculty roles have become increasingly complex and challenging, both for individuals to carry out and for institutions to support.

Despite the multitude of images and descriptors associated with academic work, one commonality is that faculty members are people who have human needs for growth, achievement, satisfaction, and connection with others (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Faculty development programs can play an important role on college and university campuses by acknowledging the human needs of faculty members, and by providing the resources, social networks, and innovative ideas that can foster the fulfillment of those needs. This paper reports on an innovative faculty development program that focused its energies on the idea that fulfilling the human needs of faculty members is an essential prerequisite for ongoing growth and success within the academic profession.

Many faculty development programs are organized around meeting functional needs, rather than human needs. These programs, many based in centers for teaching and learning, focus on the functional roles that faculty perform, and attempt to identify key areas within those functions that present unique challenges for faculty (e.g., teaching with technology or assessing students' writing). These functional needs are sometimes identified systematically through a survey of faculty members, but more often the needs are identified by a faculty committee, or by an academic administrator charged with responsibilities for faculty development (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). Once the functional needs have been identified, programs and services are designed to identify and convey a set of skills that can be used to improve performance within a given function (Akerlind, 2005). The programs may be tailored to fit the needs of particular faculty groups, such as junior faculty or discipline-specific issues (e.g., teaching large lecture courses in the sciences). Although these programs may acknowledge different needs by career stage and by academic discipline, they typically are not organized around foundational human needs. The goal of many of these faculty development programs is to teach faculty, for example, how to use technology or how to assess students' writing, rather than to fulfill faculty members' needs for growth, achievement, and collegial connection.

The New England Center for Inclusive Teaching (NECIT) was organized around a different set of assumptions. Rather than conform to a rational, linear model of identifying functional needs and then offering services to address those needs, NECIT faculty development seminars allowed developmental needs to emerge through processes of faculty interaction over time. Through semester-long seminars, faculty participants reflected on their own professional lives, identified strengths and com-

petencies that they could share with others, and assumed the posture of being learners themselves, as they encountered new ideas and innovations that they realized could enhance their own work as scholars and teachers. The process was much more organic and free-form than the structured workshops and “packaged” training sessions that are often offered to faculty through more conventional, functionally-oriented faculty development programs. This more organic, grassroots approach allowed faculty members’ own needs to be foremost in the development of related initiatives and programs.

This study reports on the impact of NECIT faculty development seminars on the initial set of faculty participants at seven colleges and universities. First, we examine the historical and contemporary context of faculty roles and faculty development. Next, we provide an overview of the structures and processes associated with the NECIT faculty development seminars. After describing our research methods, we present findings related to the impact of the seminar in three areas: 1) how participants engaged in pedagogical change, 2) how participants’ knowledge of students and student learning was enhanced, and 3) how participants developed as faculty leaders and change agents on their own campuses. We conclude with some recommendations for how faculty development programs can become more focused on the human needs of faculty members themselves.

II. FACULTY ROLES: HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVES

In this section, we outline some of the broad historical and contemporary contours that shape the landscape of faculty development programs in the United States. The goal, here, is not to provide a comprehensive treatment of the historical

evolution of the academic profession. Instead, we begin by noting that several distinctive features of the contemporary model of academic work began to emerge in the latter decades of the nineteenth century. In particular, the structure of academic work shifted from a model of generalist faculty who taught a broad range of subjects, to a highly specialized faculty who were trained in specific disciplinary traditions (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Distinct academic disciplines with their own learned societies began to emerge in the 1880s and 1890s. Moreover, during this time, increasing numbers of U.S. faculty received advanced graduate training in German universities. Some academics attempted to replicate the German model by founding new institutions in the U.S. that focused solely on research and graduate education, to the exclusion of undergraduate instruction. Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore and Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, were founded along those lines, but the German model was not widely adopted in the U.S. Instead, research and graduate education functions were grafted on to existing institutions. Faculty at these institutions became responsible not only for undergraduate education, but also for graduate programs and research productivity within their academic disciplines.

The growing level of specialization and professional expertise associated with academic work generated calls for academic freedom and for more extensive involvement in institutional decisions regarding curriculum and faculty appointments. In the early decades of the twentieth century, tenure systems became more prevalent as a means to ensure and protect academic freedom. The linkage between tenure and academic freedom was formalized in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure published by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

The post-World War II era represents another key turning point in the development of the academic profession. Financial assistance through the GI Bill and other forms of access resulted in significant enrollment growth following the war. The number of faculty members also grew significantly in this era. Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) note that this expansion “nearly doubled the ranks of college faculty between 1940 and 1960, from about 120,000 to 236,000 and almost doubled again in a single decade, 1960-70, from 236,000 to 450,000” (p. 33).

Concurrently, the U.S. government became much more directly involved in funding academic research, given its potential for military and economic applications. The growth of large-scale, government-funded science enabled faculty members to control revenue streams that were separate from institutional budgets, thus giving them some degree of autonomy from the administrators who controlled those budgets, which in turn reinforced notions of academic freedom. But the proliferation of research products from these endeavors also solidified within the academic profession a positivist, scientific-methods model of knowledge generation, which affected publication priorities not only within the natural sciences, but also in the social sciences, arts and humanities, and professional fields. Put simply, empirical research became the coin of the realm.

Enrollment growth and increasing levels of role specialization within the profession led to attempts within the various states to rationalize the system of higher education. The California master plan of 1960, for example, is viewed as a seminal effort to differentiate the missions of public higher education institutions. The University of California system was assigned a prominent role in graduate education and research, the California State University system was to focus on undergraduate and professional education in fields such as ed-

ucation and nursing, and the community college system was to provide both practical training for direct employment as well as opportunities for students to engage in coursework that would prepare them for transfer into the four-year system. Many other states engaged in similar attempts at mission differentiation, yet the prevailing model of the “ideal” institution was that of the research university.

College leaders, often with strong endorsements from their faculties, engaged in efforts to appropriate many of the features of the leading research universities. These normative pressures led to extensive institutional isomorphism in which many previously teaching-oriented institutions became more research focused (Morphew, 2002). These efforts were frequently formulated by college leaders and trustees as strategic plans for institutions to rise to higher levels within the Carnegie classification system where the research university was viewed as the pinnacle of success.

Conversely, few efforts were made to prepare future faculty for the types of institutions in which they would more likely find employment. As Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) note, by 1969, fewer than half (48.3%) of all full-time faculty were employed by research and doctoral universities. The majority were employed in other institutional types that did not emphasize empirical research, such as teaching-oriented public universities and community colleges. Yet graduate programs continued to focus on preparing future faculty as researchers, largely to the exclusion of their future roles as teachers.

The effects of this dramatic restructuring of faculty work were not realized fully for several decades. As Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) note, “During the first several decades following World War II, faculty members spent a majority of their work time, as much as two-thirds, directly engaged in instructional duties.” By 1987, however, “the portion of their effort de-

voted to teaching declined to about half of their overall effort" (p. 89). The effects of this transformation were also directly observable through the increasing number of graduate teaching assistants, part-time faculty, and adjunct faculty who were teaching undergraduate courses, especially to first-year students.

During the 1980s, public stakeholders began to express significant concerns about faculty accountability to the teaching missions of their institutions. Some critics used Alvin Gouldner's (1957) distinction between cosmopolitan and local orientations to characterize faculty in terms of divided loyalties between their employing institutions and their academic disciplines. Cosmopolitan workers are "those low on loyalty to the employing organization, high on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an outer reference group" (Hoy & Miskel, 1991, p. 147) such as a learned society associated with one's academic field. These faculty would tend to concentrate their efforts on producing high quality research that is valued by relevant external referents. In contrast, workers with local orientations are "high on loyalty to the employing organization, low on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an inner reference group" (p. 147) such as colleagues within one's own academic department. The argument in the 1980s was that faculty values and preferences had become much more heavily weighted toward the cosmopolitan orientation, at the expense of local institutional initiatives related to teaching and learning.

The prevailing counterargument was that high quality research actually enhanced and strengthened teaching. The assumption was that good teaching was inseparable from rigorous research; good research informs, enriches, and keeps current both undergraduate and graduate teaching practices (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). In fact, the alleged synergistic connection between teaching and research was

frequently asserted as an ex post facto rationale for grafting research and graduate education functions onto existing U.S. undergraduate institutions, in contrast to the German model which did not commingle undergraduate education and research.

Many studies were conducted in the 1980s and 1990s to assess the relationship between faculty research productivity and their teaching performance. The preponderance of these studies revealed no correlation, or only modest positive relationships between teaching and research performance. These findings led higher education researcher Ken Feldman (1987) to proclaim that "an obvious interpretation of these results is either that, in general, the likelihood that research productivity actually benefits teaching is extremely small or that the two, for all practical purposes, are essentially unrelated" (p. 227). A slightly more optimistic interpretation is that at least the growing preponderance of effort toward research had not significantly damaged undergraduate instruction; there was not, after all, evidence of widespread negative effects. Nevertheless, by the late 1980s, higher education leaders and policymakers were increasingly concerned about the structure of faculty work roles.

III. REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING OF FACULTY ROLES

The most influential statement to emerge from this period of reexamination of faculty roles was Ernest Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Boyer argued that the belief that colleges and universities are strengthened by an academic culture that rewards scholarship solely on the basis of research productivity and acquired research grants, may be counter-productive to faculty who find that their emphasis on research productivity detracts from their involvement in instruction, advising, and

curriculum development (Antonio, 2002). Boyer (1990) noted “on far too many campuses, teaching is not well rewarded, and faculty who spend too much time counseling and advising students may diminish their prospects for tenure and promotion” (p. xi). Similarly, Tierney and Bensimon (1996) argued that faculty members have been socialized to value research productivity over their roles as teachers:

Good teaching is not particularly valued, and service is often seen as a waste of time. Research is pursued not because of any intrinsic interest, but in order to attain job security. Collegial relationships are sporadic at best, and intellectual conversation appears to be on the verge of extinction (p. 128).

Several scholars (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff 1997; Lynton 1995; Rice, 1996; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000) have suggested that higher education has an obligation to create a faculty reward system that “acknowledges the multiple ways faculty contribute to their students, discipline, and society” (O’Meara, 2006a, p. 44). Boyer (1990) advocated for a reward system that defines faculty work in ways that can lead to more personalized and flexible criteria for gaining tenure, rather than restrict the range of what is viewed as quality faculty work.

In *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Boyer (1990) urged academia to consider a paradigm shift for re-thinking the ways in which scholarship had traditionally been measured and evaluated. He called on colleges and universities to adopt a much broader definition of scholarship, which recognizes and rewards a fuller scope of scholarly activity within the professoriate. In expanding the conceptualization of scholarship, Boyer proposed four separate but overlapping dimensions: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the

scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997).

The scholarship of discovery is characterized by a sense of the importance of knowledge for its own sake, by freedom of inquiry, and by disciplined investigation (Boyer 1990). This view of scholarship is what most academics think of when they refer to traditional empirical research. Boyer considered this type of investigation and research to be “at the very heart of academic life” (p. 18). Thus, Boyer was not advocating for the abandonment of empirical research. Instead, he was calling on the academy to acknowledge the importance of other forms of scholarly activity, which are also important to the missions and goals of higher education institutions. As Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) argue, “At its best, the scholarship of discovery contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university” (p. 9).

Integration, the second of the four forms of scholarship, involves research that makes connections across disciplines, and that places these academic specializations into larger social contexts. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) suggest that the scholarship of integration, “involves faculty members in overcoming the isolation and fragmentation of the disciplines” (p. 9). Glassick et al. suggest that this form of scholarship “is serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research” (p. 9). Boyer (1990) believed that “such work is, in fact, increasingly important as traditional disciplinary categories prove confining” (p. 19).

The distinction that Boyer makes between the scholarship of discovery and the scholarship of integration is best understood by the questions asked by the researcher. Faculty who engage in the scholarship of discovery ask, “What is to be known, what is yet to be found?” (p. 9);

whereas faculty who work in the scholarship of integration ask, "Is it possible to interpret what's been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive understanding?" (p. 19). Boyer suggested that the questions associated with the scholarship of integration call for serious, critical analysis and interpretation. "They have a legitimacy of their own and if carefully pursued can lead the scholar from information to knowledge and even, perhaps, to wisdom" (p.19).

The third perspective is the scholarship of application, now often referred to as the scholarship of engagement, which encourages faculty to use their professional expertise in partnership with both the community and the campus to address broad societal problems (O'Meara, 2006a). In a general sense, this form of scholarship recognizes faculty members' public service as a research contribution, but these forms of public service must be grounded in the faculty members' academic expertise. Boyer (1990) explained that "to be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity" (p.22). Scholars who work within this framework ask, "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems? How can it be helpful to individuals as well as institutions? And further, can social problems *themselves* define an agenda for scholarly investigation?" (p. 22).

Boyer's fourth perspective, the scholarship of teaching, recognizes the work that goes into mastery of knowledge, as well as the presentation of information so that others might understand it. "Teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well" (p. 24). Boyer argued that when faculty members interact with students, they often become motivated to find creative ways to convey and construct knowledge. Here, teaching itself can be viewed as mak-

ing scholarly contributions to the field of knowledge. Outcomes of such work, including curricula, web sites, and assessments, can be peer reviewed and evaluated for their impact on scholarly and professional communities.

Boyer hoped that colleges and universities would reform their faculty reward systems to emphasize the forms of scholarship that are most closely related to their institutional missions. As O'Meara (2006b) explained,

Baccalaureate institutions with primary teaching missions would reward the scholarship of teaching in their promotion decisions and not hold faculty back because they were not engaged in the same type of work as research faculty. Doctoral institutions might acknowledge the scholarship of application in promotion and tenure decisions, and the work of faculty in many master's institutions in developing interdisciplinary programs (the scholarship of integration) would not go unrecognized (p. 78).

Since the publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered*, hundreds of colleges and universities have changed their tenure and promotion criteria or put other policies in place to support multiple forms of scholarship. O'Meara (2006b) conducted a national survey of chief academic officers at four-year institutions, and found that within the previous 10 years, more than two-thirds (68%) of all four-year institutions had made some type of modification in their academic policies to acknowledge or support an expanded definition of scholarship.

The evidence is somewhat more mixed regarding whether these policy changes are having an impact on faculty members' and administrators' behaviors and attitudes. Braxton, Luckey, and Holland (2002), for example, conducted a national survey to

understand the extent to which faculty in four disciplines had institutionalized Boyer's four domains of scholarship. Study findings indicated that all four domains of scholarship had attained at least a basic or structural level of institutionalization, where faculty engaged in these activities with some degree of institutional support. The scholarship of discovery and the scholarship of teaching had also attained a procedural level of institutionalization, where these activities had become a regular part of everyday faculty work routines. However, only the scholarship of discovery (that is, traditional empirical research) achieved the highest level of institutionalization (the incorporation level) where faculty values and assumptions support the activity.

Other research indicates that when institutions expand their definitions of scholarship, faculty begin to engage more frequently in a wider range of scholarly activities; they also report higher levels of satisfaction in their academic work (O'Meara, 2002). O'Meara (2005) found that "campuses that initiated policy reforms to encourage multiple forms of scholarship were significantly more likely than their counterparts to report that teaching scholarship and engagement counted more for faculty evaluation, to report a broader set of criteria used to assess scholarship, and report a higher percentage of tenure and promotion cases that emphasized their work in these areas" (p. 479). Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) also noted that the proportion of time that faculty devoted to teaching increased during the 1990s, which the authors attribute to "a significant teaching-friendly correction" (p. 90) that ensued following the critiques of Boyer and others.

IV. POTENT CHALLENGES TO THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION

As noted in the introduction, expectations for faculty performance have become

more complex and fragmented in recent years. Existing institutional policies and practices may need to be modified so that faculty can shape their careers in ways that respond to emerging knowledge domains and societal challenges. The Boyer model, for example, is a response to those macro-level changes, and it reflects an approach that can provide a more flexible form of academic work, which can accommodate a wider range of roles, expectations, and functions. Yet the Boyer model itself represents an attempt to improve the existing systems and structures of academic work. The Boyer model retains as its focus the careers of full-time faculty members who are eligible for tenure and who enjoy the protections of academic freedom and the prerogatives to participate in the shared governance of their campuses. Current advocates of academic reform generally do not acknowledge that these traditional notions of academic work, as we know them, may be crumbling beneath the professoriate.

First, it is important to note that the full-time, tenure-eligible faculty on whom Boyer focused are a decided minority within the academic profession. Reflecting broader employment trends around the globe, academic work is now largely conducted by a contingent labor force. In 2003, only 35% of all faculty were tenured or tenure-track; 46.3% were part-time, and 18.7% were in full-time positions for which tenure is not a possibility (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). In fact, the majority (58.6%) of all full-time faculty hires in 2003 were appointed to non-tenure-eligible positions. Thus, among new hires, full-time faculty are more likely to be in a non-tenure position, than in a tenure-eligible position.

Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) explain that the growing use of non-tenure-eligible faculty appointments is not due to institutions abandoning their tenure policies. Instead the growth can be explained by the development of a parallel, non-tenure em-

ployment track, which is more prevalent for faculty positions in low-demand majors such as humanities and liberal arts, and is more common in the mass-provider, comprehensive universities than in the research universities or elite liberal arts colleges (the community college sector has largely opted for part-time appointments). This development suggests that tenure and the associated protections of academic freedom are available for a dwindling proportion of faculty—reserved primarily for faculty in elite institutions and for those in high demand fields with the most extensive research and economic applications.

Moreover, the dwindling size of the tenured faculty complicates shared governance, because there are fewer individuals who are willing or eligible to serve on decision-making committees, senates, and task forces. Part-time and non-tenure-track faculty are generally not compensated for activities beyond those associated with the courses that they have been assigned to teach. Even when part-time and non-tenure-track faculty wish to volunteer for such service without compensation, many governance committees are closed to their participation and admit only tenured faculty.

There simply are not enough faculty available to participate in the wide range of decisions that colleges and universities need to make on a routine basis. As a result, many major decisions are being made without faculty input or any substantive involvement. As Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) note, “The faculty role in academic governance generally and, more specifically, in the formulation of academic policy, admissions, and curricular decision making has shrunk, with more and more areas now increasingly subject to administrative determination” (p. 351).

Concurrently, faculty teaching roles on some campuses have become unbundled. Previously, the different tasks associated with teaching a course had been performed by a single individual or by a pair of in-

structors working collaboratively through team teaching. More recently, the different tasks have been disaggregated and distributed to different employees—some specializing in curriculum development, others in content delivery, others in instructional design, and still others in the assessment of learning outcomes. Different pieces of the teaching process are carried out by part-time faculty and by non-faculty professional staff, who are paid less than full-time faculty members. As such, the institution needs to employ fewer (more expensive) full-time faculty to accommodate the same or growing number of students that it serves.

Unbundled faculty roles are also consistent with the delivery models of many online instructional programs and continuing education divisions that rely quite extensively on contingent labor, rather than on full-time academics. Moreover, as Toma (2007) points out, online and continuing education programs typically do not proceed through the standard faculty governance approval processes; their courses and programs are not vetted through the curriculum committees of academic departments. Instead, decisions in these areas are made by managers in online, distance education, and continuing education divisions, thus further reducing the influence of faculty in academic decision making on campus.

In addition, there appears to be a concomitant “speed up” in expectations for full-time faculty work. Full-time faculty are now working approximately 20% more (national average of 49 hours per week compared to about 40 hours in 1984), but are earning only 70% of the median salary for other highly-educated professions. Schuster and Finkelstein (2006), therefore, raise concerns that faculty salaries may not be sufficiently competitive to attract the “best and brightest” to the professoriate.

Given these significant challenges to the academic profession, faculty development programs may become increasingly

important as one of the few remaining venues through which faculty can sustain and renew their creativity, vitality, and resilience (Lieberman, 2005). In the next section, we trace the historical development and contemporary context for faculty development programs.

V. THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

Faculty development programs can be defined as organizationally supported initiatives designed to improve faculty performance or enhance the quality of faculty work life. Although the earliest forms of faculty development can be traced to sabbaticals offered as early as 1810 at Harvard University, the contours of contemporary faculty development programs can be found in the 1950s and 1960s. Sorcinelli, et al. (2006) describe five distinct historical eras of faculty development. The first era, the “age of the scholar” (1950s and 1960s), emphasized the importance of research skills and content mastery. Institutions provided sabbaticals for research projects and financial support for faculty to participate in conferences and meetings of their academic discipline societies. Second, the “age of the teacher” (1960s and 1970s), was characterized by an increased institutional interest in faculty members’ instructional abilities. During this period, colleges and universities began to develop formal teaching improvement programs and workshops on their campuses. During the third era, the “age of the developer” (1980s), faculty development programs became more formalized and extensive. New professional staff members—faculty developers—were hired on many campuses to coordinate and deliver workshops and other services to faculty members. The fourth era, the “age of the learner” (1990s), revealed a shift in emphasis from teaching to student learning. The primary argument,

here, was that high quality teaching depended on a deep understanding of students and how they learn (Barr & Tagg, 1995). This approach valued students as co-creators of knowledge, and assigned importance to the experiences and expertise that they bring into the classroom.

Fifth, Sorcinelli et al. (2006) characterized the current era as the “age of the network.” They emphasized the idea of a network to convey the growing importance of faculty collaboration and interdisciplinary perspectives on faculty development. Faculty collaboration may be necessary to handle the rapid advances in instructional technology and in pedagogical approaches. Moreover, this era represents another shift in emphasis from developing the individual faculty member to also strengthening the entire institution. The focus on organization-wide change is justified by the argument that when colleges and universities fail to create opportunities for faculty members to collaborate around issues of teaching and learning, the transformative potential of curricular and pedagogical change is compromised (Grubb, 1999). “The result is that those who engage in innovative acts of teaching rarely build upon the work of others; nor can others build upon theirs,” thus “innovative practices often don’t influence other instructors” (Hutchings & Shulman, 2006, p. 285). Discrete, disconnected innovations lose their potential to transform institutional teaching and learning practices (Schoem, 2002).

The organization-wide approach inherent in the “age of the network” also suggests that faculty development programs can serve as an important mechanism for faculty to contribute to and inform academic policy decisions on their campuses. Faculty development programs with an organization-wide focus can also foster leadership development among faculty members who may become change agents on their campuses. Through an organization-wide lens, faculty members may begin

to understand teaching and learning issues in a broader context, and be able to see connections between their work and the practices of other departments and units in the institution. These insights can build collective capacity for change, as faculty members begin to collaborate on teaching and learning initiatives that can transform and improve institutional policies and practices.

The “age of the network,” however, may be more of an ideal type, rather than a representation of the reality of faculty development programs at most colleges and universities. In contrast to the holistic, comprehensive approach to faculty development suggested by the “age of the network” metaphor, most faculty development programs continue to focus on training individual faculty members in discrete skills associated with particular functional roles, such as technology and assessment. Institutions continue to use “one shot” workshops, sometimes with external speakers and consultants brought in, but which seldom build on each other in any coherent way, and which seldom result in the transformation of teaching and learning at either the individual or the institutional level (Kingston-Mann & Sieber, 2001). Similarly, Murray’s (1999, 2001) national study in the community college sector found that faculty development programs seldom addressed the pedagogical challenges that faculty members reported were most important to their work lives.

Another important gap in research and practice is the connection between faculty development programs and diversity on campus. Extensive research demonstrates that students achieve significant intellectual growth when they encounter a diverse student body and are taught by a diverse faculty (Chang, 1999; Hurtado, 2001). Diversity-related instructional activities and experiences with multicultural curricula improve learning outcomes for all students, regardless of their racial or ethnic

background. Students who participate in these activities tend to experience stronger gains in critical thinking, factual knowledge acquisition, and leadership abilities than their peers who did not engage in such experiences (Hurtado, 2001; Pascarella, Palmer, Moye, & Pierson, 2001). Although diversity is linked to higher levels of student achievement, colleges and universities need to create the instructional context necessary to maximize the potential for this type of learning. As Hurtado (2001) explains, “placing students of diverse backgrounds in a classroom is a necessary but insufficient condition for learning. Merely encountering differences can promote feelings of superiority or inferiority among students rather than growth and development” (p. 189). Therefore, faculty need to develop pedagogical skills that promote interaction and inclusion. Unfortunately, few faculty development programs address this important pedagogical need.

VI. THE NEW ENGLAND CENTER FOR INCLUSIVE TEACHING (NECIT): A CASE STUDY

A. About NECIT

NECIT was founded as a multi-institutional consortium to support faculty development in the areas of inclusive teaching and scholarship. Inclusive teaching, in this context, refers to pedagogical approaches that emphasize the unique skills, abilities, backgrounds, cultures, and experiences of students as frameworks to foster learning. Related curricula focus on infusing issues of diversity into a wide range of courses across disciplines, in contrast to approaches that emphasize the development of courses that focus specifically on diversity issues. Diversity was conceptualized broadly to include forms of difference associated with race, ethnicity, gender, age, social class, disability/ability status, sexual orientation,

language background, culture, religion, and country of origin, as well as differences in learning styles and prior academic preparation.

NECIT has its intellectual and structural roots grounded in the work of the Center for the Improvement of Teaching (CIT) at the University of Massachusetts Boston. The extensive history of CIT is documented elsewhere (Kingston-Mann & Sieber, 2001), but it is important to note that CIT was a pioneer in emphasizing inclusive teaching as a primary focus for faculty development efforts on a university campus. It was also among the first university teaching centers to offer semester-long faculty development seminars that focused on the needs of faculty members for growth, satisfaction, and connection with others across departmental boundaries. Again, this model is in contrast to many faculty development centers that emphasize the acquisition of discrete, functional skills, such as teaching with technology or developing effective assessment tools. In contrast, CIT puts the needs of faculty front-and-center in their approach to developing faculty across the career span in an urban university context.

Under the leadership of Esther Kingston-Mann, a faculty member in the history department at the University of Massachusetts Boston, NECIT was established in 2003 through a planning grant from the Ford Foundation to assess the feasibility of establishing a multi-institutional faculty development consortium. Then, in 2004, NECIT received a two-year grant from the Ford Foundation to implement the consortium plan, which would 1) link effective teaching to an understanding of student diversity, 2) reinforce the connections between the scholarship of teaching and issues of inclusive teaching, and 3) foster the scholarship of inclusive teaching by promoting inter-campus collaborations and exchanges among faculty in the New England region.

In 2004, seven institutions (including three public universities, two private liberal arts colleges, and two community colleges) responded to a broad call for proposals and were selected to join the NECIT consortium. Each participating institution received funds from the Ford Foundation grant to engage in a systematic assessment of their faculty development needs. A faculty team on each campus conducted an extensive needs assessment to identify areas for reform. Collectively, the seven needs assessment reports provided important insights into the role that faculty development programs could play in facilitating and supporting institutional change for teaching improvement and for inclusive approaches to teaching and learning. Common issues and questions across the seven needs assessment reports included:

1. *How to address pedagogical issues, given a highly diverse student population:* to encourage faculty to think beyond core courses and consider the entire educational experience, explore practices that enable diverse students to reach their maximum potential, and help institutions build capacity by developing their own experts on pedagogy and curriculum transformation
2. *How to change the policies and practices associated with faculty development:* to support faculty-led initiatives to improve practice, and emphasize sharing problems and solutions rather than blaming faculty for their deficiencies or blaming students for lack of preparation
3. *How to legitimize and highlight the intellectual rigor of a scholarship of inclusive teaching:* to provide venues for faculty to discuss, present, and publish research on inclusive teaching; encourage institutions to adopt a broader definition of scholarship; cultivate a culture of respect for the scholarship of teaching and learning, and demon-

strate the ways in which it improves instructional practice and institutional performance

4. *How to include faculty voices in debates on higher education policy:* to contribute a faculty perspective in public policy debates, especially in terms of access and equity; encourage faculty members to think of themselves as institutional change agents, and encourage faculty to be constant learners themselves
5. *How to connect faculty within and across campuses:* to provide sustained opportunities for faculty to work collaboratively, connect innovators, build momentum for transformational change, invite meaningful debate on issues and concerns about diversity, reduce isolation and burnout among faculty, and facilitate sharing of ideas and resources among institutions
6. *How to encourage administrators to view faculty development as a priority investment:* to facilitate dialogue between faculty and administrators regarding teaching, curriculum, and scholarship; encourage administrators to view faculty development as a mechanism for improving the campus learning environment; and envision ways for administrators to support faculty-led initiatives

Following the needs assessment process, each institution convened a faculty development seminar, which consisted of seven to nine participants. Participants in the seminar responded to a voluntary call, and were selected by the principal investigator in consultation with a senior faculty member at each institution who served as a liaison to the project. Selection criteria included variety in academic discipline, diversity in personal characteristics, range of teaching experience, and an expressed desire to engage in changes to improve teaching and learning. Ford Foundation funds were utilized to provide release time for

faculty to participate in weekly seminar meetings, engage in readings and research, and attend related events at the other participating institutions. Faculty members met weekly over an entire semester to engage in professional reflection and initiate grassroots change to improve curriculum and pedagogy.

Again, this model is in contrast to “one shot” faculty development workshops and other functionally-based training sessions, which seldom result in the transformation of teaching and learning (Kingston-Mann & Sieber, 2001). Rather than rely on outside experts or internal faculty development staff members, the seminars were led by a faculty member at each participating institution. The intent was to foster leadership development among the faculty, and build institutional capacity for ongoing pedagogical and curricular change. Each seminar group implemented a campus-wide change initiative to extend the impact of their work to the entire institution. The specific foci of the change initiatives were based in part on the results of the needs assessments and on the research that took place in the faculty development seminars. Some examples included:

1. Faculty seminar participants at a college that did not have a faculty development center created a center for teaching that provides ongoing support for faculty members’ pedagogical innovations across the entire institution;
2. Faculty seminar participants at one institution developed website resources that address specific teaching and learning issues (e.g., the assessment of writing for non-native speakers of English, tailoring of pedagogy to student learning styles);
3. Faculty seminar participants at another institution worked with a college committee to assess and reform the general education curriculum to be more inclu-

- sive of non-Western perspectives;
4. Faculty seminar participants on another campus worked with staff in the student affairs division to establish the college's first organization for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students.

B. Research Methods

A total of 51 faculty members participated in the seminars at the seven selected institutions. After the seminars concluded, each faculty member was invited to participate in a 60-minute interview to discuss her or his experiences in the seminar, as well as her or his overall growth and development as a faculty member. Forty faculty members agreed to participate and were interviewed by a member of the research team who was not affiliated with the implementation of the project (so as to minimize the potential for responses becoming conditioned by the relationship between faculty seminar participants and the principal investigator for the grant). The interview protocol (see Appendix) was not guided by a specific theoretical framework in order to give participants an opportunity to self-define growth, development, and desired outcomes (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

For this study, the data were analyzed to determine the impact of the seminar on the faculty participants' behaviors, perspectives, and attitudes. We began with a process of open coding (Kvale, 1996) in which only broad categories (behavioral impact, impact on perspectives, and attitudinal impact) were used to examine the data. Then, we examined the data within these broad categories, and noted that the data clustered around three more specific forms of impact: 1) how participants engaged in pedagogical change, 2) how participants' knowledge of students and student learning was enhanced, and 3) how participants developed as faculty leaders and change agents on their own campuses.

The depth of impact varied across these three themes with the deepest impact associated with pedagogical change and more limited impact in development as faculty leaders and change agents.

C. Study Findings

1. Pedagogical reflexivity

All seminar participants mentioned at least one new pedagogical technique that they tried in the classroom as a result of what they learned in the faculty development seminar. Eight participants had what can be considered significant, transformative experiences in the seminar in which they radically altered their teaching approaches, in some cases abandoning their prior lecture-oriented, didactic modes to use instead constructivist learning approaches that fostered critical thinking. In one case, a faculty member revised all of her course syllabi so that they emphasized community-based research and service; this was a significant departure from her previous textbook-oriented approach. Most participants, however, experienced more modest changes in their pedagogies, in no small part due to the fact that many of the seminar participants had a lengthy history of pedagogical innovation in their careers and were already engaged prior to the seminar in many of the practices associated with inclusive teaching. Nevertheless, even though many of the changes were modest, they were still viewed by the faculty as significant developments in building their skills and capacities for teaching.

The learning that the faculty members experienced in the seminar enhanced their sense of self-efficacy in the classroom and gave them confidence to experiment with new or different approaches. A humanities faculty member in a liberal arts college, for example, noted that:

I feel more empowered, less worried about how I will react if a hot topic will arise in the classroom. I feel better prepared to handle what could be a very difficult situation. For example, when teaching literature, often there are issues in the content. I will make sure that they are not ignored, issues that have to do, perhaps, with racism or homosexuality and injustice. At the same time, I have learned that I have to read a lot more about teaching. Now, I am becoming aware of different learning styles, and I am trying to incorporate different methods in my classroom, because of the learning I received in the seminar. So I need to do a lot more reading about different teaching methods.

The interdisciplinary context of the seminar also contributed to what faculty members learned through the seminar experience. Exposure to different pedagogies associated with various disciplinary traditions enabled faculty members to envision new approaches to their own teaching. As a faculty member at a public university explained:

Well, I was sitting there throughout most of the seminar, thinking, "well, I am in science. I can't use this. This doesn't apply to me." It wasn't until I said, "I am going to try implementing a journal" that I really felt the impact of the seminar. So I tried it, quick little questions for students. The student feedback was that they loved the journals. It freed them to write whatever they wanted. It opened more doors to question things in the classroom discussion. So, I learned that just because I teach in the sciences, or just because you

are in engineering or math, that you can still use the same tools as the humanities and English professors are using.

Faculty learning in the seminar context occurred organically (Dee, Daly, & Henkin, 2008). Rather than having faculty members learn a prescribed set of functional skills delineated prior to the delivery of a workshop, faculty members themselves shaped what each other learned. In other words, the faculty development seminars did not have an agenda or specific set of skills and ideas that were to be conveyed. Instead, the content and focus of the seminar sessions emerged from the interests and experiences shared by the seminar members. Initially, this organic, self-directed learning model was uncomfortable for some faculty participants. The seminar leader at a community college explained, "I have to admit that I was really frustrated at first. I guess I expected [the principal investigator] to tell me what we were supposed to be doing. But I guess that was the point. To figure it out for ourselves. And I am glad that we did, because now we have this shared experience of figuring something out together." Thus, in contrast to faculty development programs that focus on training faculty in functional skills, the seminars capitalized on the faculty members' own needs for growth, learning, and exploration.

2. Understanding students and how they learn

Knowledge of students' backgrounds, interests, motivations, and learning styles is an important component of effective teaching (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005). Participants in the faculty development seminars learned the importance of understanding students and how they learn. This realization had significant impact on their pedagogical approaches in the classroom. As a faculty member at a public university explained:

I learned to try to understand what their [students'] goals are. Their motivations are fairly diverse, and now I try to support and respect that. Some want to go on to graduate school, some want to become police officers, some want to become business managers, and everything in between. I have learned that I need to figure out ways to show that the content of my course can matter in their lives, regardless of what their lives will end up looking like. But also, I am trying to figure out how to get them to think about alternative visions of what life might look like for them, and where they would like to go. So it is about me understanding who they are, but it is also about me showing them that a wider range of possibilities is out there.

Faculty participants also learned that becoming more connected to their students' lives involves the need for more sophisticated understandings of diversity. A faculty member at a public university explained an example that pertains to social class.

I never doubted that I would leave my parents' home and leave the community where I grew up. I left [to go to college] and never looked back. But I know that is not the case for most of my students. They have family obligations, financial obligations. That takes some understanding on my part. So when I want to encourage one of my students to go on to grad school, and that usually means moving away from home, I have to think more carefully about the implications of all of that.

Some seminar groups began with the premise that self-knowledge is the foundation of understanding others. In these groups, faculty members wrote autobiographies that linked their personal histories to who they are as faculty members today. Several seminar participants remarked on how these processes of self reflection enabled them to relate to their students' experiences on a deeper level, even when their students' experiences were vastly different from their own. A community college faculty member who reflected on her experiences as an immigrant to the United States remarked that the deeper self knowledge that she obtained through the seminar motivated her to build exercises (short writing exercises and journal entries) into her courses that enabled her to learn more about her students' backgrounds and prior experiences with different forms of education.

3. Developing faculty as institutional leaders and change agents

The structure of the faculty development seminars allowed participants to set their own agendas, identify institutional needs, and develop initiatives to address related issues. Faculty members reported a sense of empowerment through this form of faculty development. They began to see themselves as campus leaders on faculty development issues. They advocated with their campus administrators to continue funding for the faculty development seminars after the grant funds had been expended. As one community college faculty member in the sciences explained, "I guess it was sort of like being baptized into a new religion. Once you go through the seminar, it sort of sticks with you, maybe for life. Now I feel an obligation to go out and get other faculty involved in this work, and to give them an opportunity to grow and develop in the same way that I did." In this way, faculty development seminars can ad-

dress faculty needs for self-determination and agency. Also, the model can foster a self-sustaining quality in that the campus builds capacity for ongoing faculty development initiatives; they develop their own experts in teaching and learning, rather than rely on outside consultants.

At some institutions, this form of faculty leadership represented a shift in the authority for faculty development programs; that is, there was a shift in power from administrators and professional development staff to the faculty members themselves. Some administrators embraced this shift, and others resisted. For example, after the grant funds were expended, administrators at three institutions decided to continue funding additional seminars and associated course releases through their institutional budgets, but at four institutions, the seminars ended when the funding ran out. At one liberal arts college, administrators required the seminar participants to apply for funds through an existing faculty development committee, which in turn rejected their application for ongoing support for the seminars. The faculty applicants clarified that they were not seeking funds for themselves to participate in another seminar, but instead were attempting to secure course releases for a new group of faculty who wanted to share a similar experience. The application was still rejected, because the committee refused to consider proposals from groups; they would consider proposals and projects only from individual faculty members. As one seminar participant at this campus explained, "there isn't much support for collaborative projects around here."

Thus, the organic, free-form structure of the faculty development seminars may have fostered a sense of empowerment among participants, but on several campuses, this desire among faculty to become change agents was resisted or blocked by campus structures and cultures that did not endorse faculty leadership of faculty devel-

opment programs, or was impeded by institutional cultures that reinforce the importance of individual accomplishment and fail to consider innovative, collaborative ideas from groups and teams.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this study, we examined the impact of NECIT faculty development seminars on the faculty participants. Within the historical and contemporary context of faculty development programs, we delineated the structures and processes that characterized these seminars. The study findings pointed toward three levels of impact: 1) how participants engaged in pedagogical change, 2) how participants' knowledge of students and student learning was enhanced, and 3) how participants developed as faculty leaders and change agents. We also emphasized the importance of having faculty development programs focus on the human needs of faculty members.

Based on the activities and outcomes associated with the faculty development seminars at the seven participating institutions, the principal investigator at the University of Massachusetts Boston created a set of principles (normative statements) that other colleges and universities could use to implement similar faculty development initiatives. These principles were derived by the project's principal investigator from ideas shared in evaluation forms completed by seminar members from all seven participating institutions (Table 1).

Principle one reflects the idea that faculty development programs may have long-lasting impact when their agendas and initiatives are developed by faculty members themselves, rather than by administrators or professional faculty development staff. The second principle relates to the idea that attention toward diversity-related learning experiences can enhance educational outcomes for all students; thus,

Table 1: Principles of Faculty Development Practice

1. Faculty development should be a **grassroots initiative** led by the faculty.
2. Faculty development should utilize a **broad definition of diversity**, and seek to improve the campus learning environment for all students.
3. Faculty development should foster **curricular and pedagogical transformation** for individual faculty members, for academic programs, and for entire institutions.
4. Faculty development should promote **inclusive teaching**, which incorporates pedagogical practices that engage all students in the teaching-learning exchange.
5. Faculty development should incorporate broad representation across **multiple academic disciplines and fields**.
6. Faculty development should build connections across **multiple institutions** of higher education.
7. Faculty development should build and support **democratic and collaborative leadership** by considering the voices of tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, adjunct and part-time faculty, administrators, staff, and students.

diversity and inclusive teaching should be an important programmatic emphasis for faculty development initiatives. The third principle holds that faculty development programs should aim for multi-level effects; related programs and initiatives should have the capacity to affect individual practices, departmental norms, and the learning environment for the entire campus. Principle four notes that inclusive teaching can foster higher levels of student engagement in academic work; this principle is in opposition to the notion that a focus on diversity “waters down” the curriculum and diminishes academic rigor. In fact, faculty members can enhance the rigor and challenge of academic work within their courses by incorporating inclusive teaching practices that foster higher levels of student engagement in the work itself.

The fifth principle pertains to the benefits that can accrue from an interdisciplinary approach to faculty development. Certainly, there are occasions in which discipline-specific issues will need to be ad-

dressed through carefully tailored faculty development programs. But faculty participants in this study noted the significant benefits of interacting with their peers across disciplinary and departmental boundaries. Principle six extends this notion by suggesting that faculty can benefit from interactions and exchanges with faculty at other institutions, including colleges and universities with different missions. As one example, a cooperative faculty development initiative between a community college and a university could improve college readiness and transfer of students between the two institutions. Finally, principle seven highlights the importance of collaborative leadership and the sharing of authority and responsibility to orient faculty development programs toward the needs of faculty and student learning.

APPENDIX: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Background questions

- For how many years have you been a teacher in a college or university setting?
- How long have you been in your present position at this institution?

Job satisfaction and socialization

- What do you enjoy the *most* about your job?
- What do you enjoy the *least* about your job?
- How did you learn to do your job?

Growth and development as a faculty member

- How would you describe your growth and development as a faculty member?
 - Follow-up questions as necessary:
 - in relation to how you allocate your time to different tasks
 - in the extent of your knowledge base
 - in your approach in the classroom
 - in your work with colleagues
- What steps have you taken to facilitate your growth and development as a faculty member?
- Which *experiences and events* have been most important in your development as a faculty member? (turning points—probe for when these events occurred; how many years ago)
- Which *people* have been most important in your development as a faculty member? (turning points)
- Has your growth and development as a faculty member occurred primarily within your original academic field/discipline, or has it extended to other fields/disciplines?

- Do you experience any barriers to your growth and development as a faculty member?

Improvement and self-assessment

- What does “improvement” mean to you in the context of your teaching?
- How do you know if you are improving your teaching?
- Describe your learning process. How do you learn new things related to your *teaching role* as a faculty member?

Faculty Development Seminar

- Why did you decide to participate in the faculty development seminar? What did you hope to gain through this experience?
- What have been your personal learning outcomes from the faculty development seminar?
- As a result of your participation in the seminar, do you do anything differently in your teaching role?
- Did your seminar group engage in any activities that had an impact on the institution as a whole (that is, activities that had an impact beyond your seminar group)?
- Through the seminar, what have you learned about yourself?
- Through the seminar, what have you learned about your colleagues at your institution?
- Through the seminar, what have you learned about your students?
- Through the seminar, what have you learned about your institution?

Other comments

- Is there anything that we did not discuss that you would like to add? Is there a question that I should have asked, but did not?

REFERENCES

- Akerlind, G. (2005). Academic growth and development: How do university academics experience it? *Higher Education*, 50, 1-32.
- Antonio, A. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (5), 582-602.
- Barr, R., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 27 (6), 12-25.
- Bess, J. (2006). Strategic ambiguity: Antidote to managerialism in academia. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 491-533). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Press.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Braxton, J., Luckey, W., & Holland, P. (2002). *Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through Boyer's four domains*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chang, M. (1999). Does racial diversity matter?: The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40 (4), 377-395.
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11 (4), 227-268.
- Dee, J., Daly, C., & Henkin, A. (2008, March). *Faculty development as a self-organizing system*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Feldman, K. (1987). Research productivity and scholarly accomplishments of college teachers as related to their instructional effectiveness: A review and exploration. *Research in Higher Education*, 26 (3), 227-298.
- Foucault, M. (1986). Disciplinary power and subjection. In S. Lukes (Ed.), *Power* (pp. 229-242). New York: New York University Press. (Reprinted from M. Foucault, *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*, C. Gordon, Ed., 1976, New York: Random House).
- Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Maeroff, G. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gouldner, A. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 281-306.
- Grubb, W. N. (with Worthen, H., Byrd, B., Webb, E., Badway, N. Case, C., et al.) (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York: Routledge.
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield (ed.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action*, pp. 187-203. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. (2006, February). *Learning about student learning from community colleges: Carnegie perspectives*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Kingston-Mann, E., & Sieber, T. (Eds.) (2001). *Achieving against the odds: How academics become teachers of diverse students*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J., & Whitt, E. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lieberman, D. (2005). Beyond faculty development: How centers for teaching and learning can be laboratories for learning. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, volume 131. Organizational learning in higher education* (pp. 87-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lynton, E. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Morphew, C. (2002). A rose by any other name: Which colleges became universities. *Review of Higher Education*, 25 (2), 207-223.
- Murray, J. (1999). Faculty development in a national sample of community colleges. *Community College Review*, 27 (3), 47-64.
- Murray, J. (2001). Faculty development in publicly supported two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25 (7), 487-502.
- O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education*, 26, 57-80.

- O'Meara, K. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education*, 46 (5), 479-510.
- O'Meara, K. (2006a). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Influence on faculty work life. *Planning for Higher Education*, 34 (2), 43-53.
- O'Meara, K. (2006b). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Have academic cultures really changed? In J. Braxton (Ed.), *Analyzing faculty work and rewards: Using Boyer's four domains of scholarship*, *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no. 129 (pp. 77-95). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E., Palmer, B., Moye, M., & Pierson, C. (2001). Do diversity experiences influence the development of critical thinking? *Journal of College Student Development*, 42 (3), 257-271.
- Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Rice, R. E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M., & Austin, A. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. New Pathways Working Paper Series, Inquiry #7. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Schoem, D. (2002). Transforming undergraduate education: Moving beyond distinct undergraduate initiatives. *Change*, 34 (6), 50-55.
- Schuster, J., & Finkelstein, M. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sorcinelli, M., Austin, A., Eddy, P., & Beach, A. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Stanton-Salazar, R. (1997). A social capital framework for understanding the socialization of racial minority children and youths. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67 (1), 1-40.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sykes, C. (1988). *Prof scam: Professors and the demise of higher education*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.
- Tierney, W., & Bensimon, E. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Toma, J. D. (2007). Expanding peripheral activities, increasing accountability demands, and reconsidering governance in U.S. higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 26 (1), 57-72.