

- Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Smith, R.M., Byrd, P., Nelson, G.L., Barrett, R.P., & Constantinides, J.C. (1992). *Crossing pedagogical oceans: International teaching assistants in US undergraduate education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Smock, R., & Menges, R. (1985). Programs for TAs in the context of campus policies and priorities. In J.D.W. Andrews (Ed.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 22. Strengthening the teaching assistant faculty* (pp. 21-34). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sorcinelli, M.D. (1986). Tracing academic career paths: Implications for faculty development. *To Improve the Academy*, 5, 169-181.
- Sprague, J., & Nyquist, J.D. (1989). TA supervision. In J.D. Nyquist, R.D. Abbott, & D.H. Wulff (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 39. Teaching assistant training in the 1990s* (pp. 37-56). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- State of California. (1987). *Resolution Chapter 102 of Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 39*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- Stokely, L. (1985, March). *Development of teaching assistants as apprentice faculty*. Paper presented at the Western Association of Graduate Schools Dean's Meeting, Reno, NV.
- Svinicki, M., Sullivan, T.A., Greer, M., & Diaz, M. (1989). *Combining departmental training with central support: A research project*. Paper presented at the Third National TA Conference, Austin, TX.
- Weimer, M., Svinicki, M.D., & Bauer, G. (1989). Designing programs to prepare TAs to teach. In R.M. Diamond & B.E. Adam (Eds.), *New Directions for Higher Education: No. 81. Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000* (pp. 57-70). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wise, W.M. (1967). Who teaches the teachers? In C.B.T. Lee (Ed.), *Improving college teaching* (pp. 77-89). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

AUTHOR

Laurie Richlin is the Director of the Office of Faculty Development, University of Pittsburgh (US). She is the Executive Editor of the Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, a peer-reviewed journal that provides a scholarly, written forum for discussion by faculty about all areas affecting teaching and learning. In addition, she is the Director of regional Lilly Conferences on College Teaching. Dr. Richlin's research and recent publications focus on graduate school preparation of the faculty of the future.

11.

The Development of New and Junior Faculty

Milton D. Cox

This chapter presents strategies to improve the teaching abilities of faculty in their first critical years as college and university professors. The effectiveness of these strategies is discussed, an award-winning program is described, and recommendations are made for successful new and junior faculty teaching development.

INTRODUCTION

New and junior faculty are one of the most important resources for colleges and universities. Yet, many of these faculty experience great stress in their initial years (Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992). They are a neglected resource (Boice, 1992b)—untapped in efforts to change campus cultures, isolated even from departmental colleagues, and, after a brief flurry of activity during orientation, forgotten by faculty developers and administrators to pay attention to the welfare of these faculty and to help them move from first year to tenure? The experiences of today's new and junior faculty will influence the quality of teaching and learning—in fact, all aspects of the academy—throughout the first half of the twenty-first century.

This chapter discusses strategies to enhance the teaching interests and abilities of new and junior faculty. However, in addition to enhancing teaching, junior faculty programs that are continued over time may have other

benefits. Studies of the longest, award-winning, continuing junior faculty development program in the United States will provide examples for analysis of many of the strategies for helping new and junior faculty. Evidence of the impact and long-term effectiveness of this program, particularly in relation to the tenuring of its participants, is encouraging. It is hoped that the successes of this program will inspire others to undertake similar initiatives at their colleges and universities.

DESCRIBING NEW AND JUNIOR FACULTY

Several definitions of new and junior faculty are found in the literature. In this chapter, a new faculty member is one in the first year at a two- or four-year college or university. Typically, this person will have recently completed the PhD or terminal professional degree and be full time, non-tenured, and in a tenure-track position (probationary appointment). However, the term *new faculty* also includes a few faculty in their first year at a particular institution who have just made a career change or who have had experience at a different institution. The term does not include part-time faculty, although there are exemplary faculty development programs that address the needs of new and junior part-time and/or adjunct faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Junior faculty are defined as former new faculty who are in year two through the year before their tenure decision (typically year five) at an institution.

What are today's new and junior faculty like? Finkelstein and Lacelle-Peterson (1992) characterized them as a focused and well-motivated group, choosing to enter academe at a time when a decreasing proportion of new PhDs are making this choice and competition for tenure-track positions is stiff (a job squeeze that has been increasing over the last 20 years). The cohort of the 1990s also has a significantly higher proportion of women, is older than previous groups, and includes more dual-career and commuter couples.

An interesting paradox can be found in the literature on new and junior faculty. Nearly all newcomers report high levels of satisfaction with their careers. When asked to identify aspects of academic life that consistently afford satisfaction, most new faculty describe their work as providing personal autonomy, a sense of accomplishment, the capacity to have an impact on others, and the opportunity for personal and intellectual growth. At the same time, however, virtually all of the same faculty rate their work as stressful. Words such as tension, pressure, anxiety, and worry stand

out in an even cursory reading of the literature. (Sorcinelli, 1992, p. 27)

New and junior faculty find these pretenure years both difficult and critical to later success in academe (Boice, 1991a; Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991).

With respect to the teaching difficulties of new and junior faculty, Fink (1992) reported, "Stress was not due to time taken to engage in creative teaching; most new faculty were lecturing almost all the time, thereby teaching little more than 'facts and principles'" (p. 40). Even the new faculty with experience as teaching assistants had only been taught "how to survive" in the classroom.

In a decade of interviewing and observing a wide range of new faculty over several successive semesters at both research and teaching campuses, Boice (1992b) noted some generalities worthy of mention. When new and junior faculty begin as teachers, most tend to:

- teach as they were taught, equating good teaching with good content
- teach defensively, worried about public failures at teaching, and trying to get their facts straight, not wanting to be accused of not knowing their material
- blame external factors such as poor students, heavy teaching loads, and poor evaluation instruments, for teaching failures such as bad student ratings
- be passive about change and improvement, in part because of a lack of teaching awareness
- shun outside help from resources such as faculty development programs
- specify no avenues to improvement beyond modifying lecture content and making assignments and tests easier
- claim, where they have some experience, that their defensive and factual styles of teaching are temporary regressions from how they had taught most recently at other campuses
- worry about public complaints and about heavy investments in new lecture notes
- establish comfort, efficiency, and student acceptance slowly (even by the fourth year, the majority of inexperienced new faculty reported feeling tense, worrying about not being in control of classes, and doubting that students liked them)
- state that their most important teaching goals are to cut down on teaching preparation time; yet they expend large amounts of time

on lecture preparation (18 to 27 hours per week for those with three-course loads)

- go to class with too much material and rush to say it all (Boice, 1991b, 1992b)

According to a limited survey by Gibbs, Gold, and Jenkins (1987), who interviewed five new geography faculty in Britain, the characteristics of new faculty there are similar to those in the United States.

However, five to nine percent of Boice's observed faculty behaved quite differently, exhibiting high energy, a sense of humor, and relaxed pacing in the classroom, with verbal and non-verbal cues encouraging students to participate. They had uncritical, optimistic attitudes toward undergraduates, few complaints about colleagues, and interest in seeking advice about teaching. They did not over prepare for teaching and integrated scholarly interests into undergraduate classes. Boice called these new faculty *quick starters*.

In conclusion, it is clear that new and junior faculty often begin their years in the professoriate under serious pressures and in dysfunctional academic communities. The resulting stress and lack of preparation for teaching lead to "survival teaching" unless there are thoughtful interventions.

HISTORY AND THE LITERATURE

Have new faculty always entered the professoriate under such trying conditions? Throughout history, most new faculty have started with little preparation for teaching. Fink (1990), in his bibliographic essay about beginning college teachers, wrote that "there have been periodic efforts for several decades to correct this deficiency by adding certain activities to graduate programs so that new professors will be prepared for teaching *before* their first appointment, rather than *after* the fact" (p. 235). He found it sobering to realize that this problem was being addressed as long ago as the 1920s through programs at several US universities—Chicago, Clark, Idaho, Iowa, Ohio State, and Oregon—but that today these efforts are all but forgotten, even though nearly identical initiatives have been established decades later.

Prior to World War II, most new faculty entered academe without today's pressure to publish, and they probably had small, supportive communities of experienced departmental or college colleagues. However, after World War II, the pace and focus of higher education changed. In the 1950s and 1960s, the number of undergraduates swelled, yet academic prestige came to be measured in terms of research grants and discovery schol-

arship. Faculty developed loyalties to their disciplines rather than to their institutions. By the 1970s, the expansionary stage of the previous decade was over and new academic positions became scarce, putting increasing pressure on new faculty to focus their efforts on research and publication. Undergraduate education was neglected.

In the 1980s, legislators, parents, and national higher education associations, such as the Association of American Colleges and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, voiced criticism of the quality of higher education and called for teaching reform. Academe has been slow to respond. Although many central administrators and deans have come to consider ways to balance the rewards and emphases on teaching and research, this is not usually true at the department level, where entrenched faculty and chairs have control.

The quality of records of the particular experiences and characteristics of new and junior faculty is steadily increasing. Information about new and junior faculty comes from national surveys, general empirical studies of the professoriate, and special empirical studies of new and junior faculty. Two kinds of national surveys provide data in the United States. The National Research Council annually surveys new doctoral recipients, providing data on academic discipline, career plans, current job prospects, ethnicity, and gender. In addition, US national faculty surveys are conducted by organizations such as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles, and the National Center for Education Statistics, providing data on a representative sample of faculty, including a comparison of current and past cohorts of junior faculty. Comprehensive general studies of the professoriate now usually contain information about new and junior faculty (e.g., Bowen & Schuster, 1986).

Most scholars agree that specific studies of new and junior faculty began with Fink's study of 97 new geography faculty (Fink, 1984), although published reports about programs to help new and junior faculty occurred before 1984; for example, Beeman's (1981) report about the Post-Doctoral Teaching Awards Program of the Lilly Endowment, Inc. Most of the research deals with the experiences of new faculty in one discipline at more than one institution or with new faculty in several departments at one institution.

Two books about new and junior faculty—*Developing New and Junior Faculty* (Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992) and *The New Faculty Member* (Boice, 1992b)—provide comprehensive, detailed summaries of research findings and strategies for improving the lives and careers of new and junior faculty. Both should be required reading for administrators and practitioners.

How have programs to help new and junior faculty evolved? Astin and Lee (1967) noted in a discussion of the results of a survey of deans in US higher education institutions that "most institutions [68%] have pre-registration orientation sessions, but other methods for supervising or training of new faculty are little used" (pp. 307-308). The other formal methods mentioned were seminars for new teachers given by the institution, supervision by an assigned or designated faculty member, seminars given by the department, and summer institutes or other such intensive programs.

There was an increase in the number of university-wide faculty development programs in the early 1970s because of the lack of departmental interest. In 1975, Centra conducted the first national survey to find out what was actually happening in these programs but included only one faculty development practice which directly addressed new faculty: master teachers or senior faculty working closely with new or apprentice teachers, a practice more likely to be used in small colleges. Yet, new teachers received the lowest ratings in the Student Instructional Reports sent to the Educational Testing Service (Centra, 1977, 1978).

Erickson's (1986) survey of faculty development practices in four-year colleges and universities in the US included only one item related to new faculty. Assigning lighter-than-normal teaching load for first year faculty was reported by 20% of institutions with faculty development activities.

In 1989, Kurfiss and Boice (1990) surveyed members of the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education (one member per campus) to determine existing and desired faculty development practices. With respect to new faculty, 53% reported having orientations on teaching skills, and 36% planned or desired to institute such programs; 25% involved senior faculty as mentors, and 50% indicated that they desired or planned to implement a mentoring program.

Wright and O'Neil's 1993 international survey of faculty development specialists, discussed in Chapter 1, asked respondents to rate 36 teaching-improvement practices according to the confidence the faculty developer had in the practice's potential to improve the quality of teaching in his or her university. Only one item directly involved new faculty: mentoring programs/support for new professors. In the survey results, this item ranked fifth among all countries, and sixth in the US portion of the survey.

These four faculty development surveys, spanning the entire period of the faculty development movement to date, did not focus on faculty development activities specifically designed to assist new faculty. This confirms that new faculty have become a neglected resource. The following sections describe methods of enhancing the quality of teaching through developmental programs for new and junior faculty.

AN AWARD-WINNING PROGRAM

This section examines an award-winning program for junior faculty. Later sections cover aspects of the program in more detail, its impact on the faculty participants, and other evidence of the program's success.

Established in 1978 by Miami University, in Ohio (US), the Teaching Scholars Program was developed to raise the level of the importance and quality of teaching at the university and to assist junior faculty during their early years in academe. This longest-running junior faculty development program in the United States enhances its participants' teaching interests and abilities through involvement in a two-semester series of special activities and individual projects related to teaching. The Miami Teaching Scholars Program won the 1994 Hesburgh Award, given to the faculty development program in the United States judged best in meeting the three award criteria: significance of the program to higher education; appropriate program rationale; and successful results and impact on undergraduate teaching and learning.

Founded in 1809, Miami University is a state-assisted, Doctorate-Granting I¹, residential university in Oxford, Ohio. The enrollment is approximately 16,000 (including 14,000 undergraduates), with an additional 4,000 students who spend their first two years on two nearby, non-residential, urban, regional campuses. Miami University has a history and tradition of emphasis upon undergraduate teaching, and its mission statement includes "to provide an environment conducive to effective and inspired teaching and learning, and to promote professional development of faculty..." During the 1950s and 1960s, as enrollment tripled and doctoral programs were developed, Miami University experienced a change in its academic culture. This was a period of growing expectations for the university to play an important role in producing new knowledge to contribute to the betterment of society. Concern that this change of culture could negatively affect learning by undergraduates led to a concerted search for solutions. A committee of senior faculty, students, and administrators appointed by the Provost in 1978 developed the Teaching Scholars Program. The initial three years, 1979-80 through 1981-82, were funded by the Lilly Endowment as part of the Lilly Teaching Fellows Program.

The objectives of the Miami Teaching Scholars Program are to provide junior faculty with opportunities to obtain information on teaching and learning; to observe successful teaching and practice using new skills and technology; to investigate—as individuals—teaching problems and projects; to share ideas and advice with senior faculty mentors; to experience the scholarship of teaching and to establish collegiality across disciplines;

and to share, via outreach, their enthusiasm and experience with other new faculty.

For the university, the long-term *goals* of the program are to increase faculty interest in undergraduate teaching and learning; inform faculty about teaching and active learning in the multicultural classroom; build university-wide community through teaching; increase faculty collaboration and the coherence of learning across disciplines; nourish the scholarship of teaching; and broaden the evaluation of, and increase the rewards for, teaching.

Program activities include group events, such as seminars on teaching and learning, retreats, and attendance at national conferences; individually, each participant selects and collaborates with a senior faculty mentor, and develops, carries out, evaluates, and gives presentations about a teaching project.

Participants receive release time from one course for one semester and are released from committee and service assignments for the other semester. The release time can be either first or second semester, and is negotiated by the participant and the department chair. The program covers participants' expenses, for example, travel and meals, as well as modest funding (\$100-\$400 US) for individual teaching project costs and books.

Since 1980, I have directed the program as University Director (formerly Associate Provost) for Teaching Effectiveness Programs (a half-time position). The program is advised by the University Senate's Committee on the Improvement of Instruction.

The program is supported by a one-third time secretary and a budget of \$36,000 (US), which funds programming, participants' release time, and the participants' costs as mentioned above. The director's and secretary's salaries, office expenses, and supplies are funded by the Provost. One objective is to keep administrative costs low relative to the amount of direct support available to faculty.

Selection of Participants

Full-time faculty in tenurable positions are eligible to participate in the program during their second through fifth years of teaching at Miami. Nine to 13 applicants are chosen by a faculty committee in April for participation the next year. Applicants are asked to describe their current teaching responsibilities, their reasons for wanting to participate in the program, their most pressing teaching needs, and their involvement in any innovative teaching activities. They are also asked how the program, and the mentoring aspect specifically, will help them achieve their professional goals; which area of teaching they wish to explore in their teaching project; and what they think they can contribute to the program.

Criteria for selection include commitment to quality teaching, level of interest in and potential for contributions to the program, need, and plans for the award year. During the first few years of the program, an attempt was made to avoid identification of the program as remedial in nature—selection was viewed as an award. Once the program was well established on campus, this was no longer a concern. Each group is selected to ensure gender balance and diversity across disciplines, campuses, needs, and experiences.

The number of applicants has varied from 11 to 27 over the years. Those not accepted one year are encouraged to apply the next, and most who continue to apply are eventually accommodated. From 1979-1989, 22% of new hires participated in the program (Table 1); about one third apply. Some faculty who are not quick starters apply at the urging of their department chairs or colleagues who have already participated in the program. On the other hand, some chairs discourage participation because a faculty member is already an excellent teacher and/or, for tenure reasons, needs to focus primarily on a research program.

Program Assessment

The Miami Teaching Scholars Program engages in a continuous evaluation of its program elements and the program's impact on the junior faculty participants. Each seminar and retreat is evaluated; an extensive mid-year progress report and final report are prepared by the participants. To honor a commitment to the mentors to keep paperwork at a minimum, they are not asked to evaluate their role; no doubt this is a tradeoff at the expense of better mentoring.

It is surprising to note that the 1989 faculty development survey (Kurfiss & Boice, 1990) found that only 13.5% of the respondents reported that their own programs were evaluated systematically. Assessment of programs provides continuous quality improvement, important statistical evidence for scholarly reports, and hard evidence for faculty and administrators that programs are working.

Table 2 provides a long-term picture of the impact of the programming elements as reported by the junior faculty participants, whereas Table 3 describes the impact of the Teaching Scholars Program on the junior faculty participants as teachers and members of the university community. Note that the strongest program impact is collegueship, which alleviates the isolation that new faculty experience. In terms of program outcomes, the strongest impact is on the participants' interest in the teaching process, followed by their interest in the scholarship of teaching, their comfort in the university community, and their effectiveness as teachers. These evaluations provide evidence that the program is meeting many of its objectives.

STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPING NEW AND JUNIOR FACULTY

Often-Discussed Initiatives

The landmark essay, *Who Teaches the Teachers*, states that "colleges must assume a fair portion of the responsibility for inducting new teachers" (Wise, 1967, p. 88). To meet this responsibility, Wise proposed three initiatives: reducing teaching loads for the first term or year, giving selected senior faculty responsibility for working with new faculty, and arranging cooperatively with other colleges for seminars and workshops to be conducted by outstanding leaders. In one form or another, these practices have been employed by some institutions.

Release time. In Erickson's (1986) survey of colleges and universities, a little over 20% of the institutions reported offering new faculty a lighter than normal teaching load. In Austin's (1990) survey of 25 former Lilly Teaching Fellows Programs in the 1974-1985 period, nine of the 16 respondents indicated that they provided release time, and three others provided summer stipends.

At Miami University, the one-course release time for one semester is important to the participation of the Teaching Scholars. Table 2 indicates that over 13 years, release time ranks second (a tie) out of the seven program elements in its positive impact on the participants. Over the years, "release time for the other semester" is the one response that appears repeatedly on the open-ended part of the program evaluation questionnaire in reply to "What could be improved about this program?" Participation in the program takes much time, and most comment that they could not do it without release time. However, Boice (1987, 1992b) found the opposite results about release time for scholarship development.

While some faculty and administrators question release time from teaching to participate in a teaching program, one must argue that to engage in scholarly teaching and in the scholarship of teaching, one has the same needs as for release time for research. Such scholarship requires the same opportunities for learning the literature, careful planning, experimentation, assessment, analysis, and disseminating the results.

Mentoring has been used for years in the business world and to foster the scholarly development of apprentices in the graduate programs of the academy. Although mentoring is of increasing interest on campuses and is often requested by new faculty who feel isolated, mentoring programs are not well developed or widely used. "Few campuses conduct mentoring in any systematic... way... Practitioners often imply that it demands too much

time, that some newcomers neither want nor need it, that pairings afford too many chances for exploitation or dependency, and that most... pairs will quit meeting... [M]ost advice about establishing programs is conjecture" (Boice, 1992b, pp. 107-108).

In the 1989 Kurfiss and Boice survey, 25% of the respondents reported that their campuses already had senior faculty mentors for new faculty, and 50% planned or desired to have them. Several new programs were described at the 1993 Conference of Academic Chairpersons (Kansas State University, 1993). Some special programs have been established to mentor new faculty who are women and minorities; others have involved *emeriti* faculty as mentors. The mentoring concept sounds good, but the goal of implementing effective programs has proved elusive.

Of the 16 former Lilly Teaching Fellows Programs reporting in the Austin (1990) survey, four of 12 mentoring programs failed. She found that where mentors were used with some degree of success, the patterns varied considerably, with no single model being 'the best.' "Any effective use of the Mentors depends completely on institutional culture, the personality and needs of the particular Fellow, and the personality and willingness of the Mentor to get involved in the Program" (p. 83).

Finding no empirical advice on the mentoring process, Robert Boice initiated a mentoring study at a large, comprehensive university. He described five general outcomes of value to other campuses:

- Arbitrary pairings and pairings across disciplines worked as well as departmental ones
- Requiring pairs to meet regularly early on helped ensure pair bonding
- Pairs working alone displayed narrow mentoring styles; for example, concentrating only on promotion and tenure issues
- Monthly group meetings helped broaden their interaction
- Mentors were reluctant to intervene, waited for requests for teaching help, then responded with vague admonitions which rarely translated into improved teaching

He concluded that "Mentoring pairs may need considerable mentoring" (Boice, 1992a, p. 55).

Mentoring has been an important part of the Miami Teaching Scholars Program since its inception in 1978. During the 15 years of the program, there have been 196 mentoring pairs involving 149 different junior faculty and 118 different mentors.

New participants select a mentor in consultation with the program director, their department chair, and colleagues. New participants find that former Teaching Scholars and Mentors are familiar with the program and

usually are pleased to serve. They bring an informed perspective to the mentoring relationship.

The trend has been to select a mentor from a different department. Pairing outside one's discipline is selected more often because of interest in exploring teaching in a new area, the safety of discussing weaknesses with colleagues not involved in one's tenure decision, and the new insights non-experts can bring to one's teaching. To encourage a broader experience, selecting two mentors is now encouraged, especially for those on a regional campus (who select a mentor there and on the main campus) or for those whose initial selection is within their department. Some participants work with one mentor the first semester and the other during the second.

Mentoring pairs engage in a variety of activities, such as attending each other's classes, meeting for lunch to discuss teaching or to explore university issues, and attending sessions at the Lilly Conference on College Teaching. The extent to which these activities occur depends on schedules, interests, and compatibility.

If one word could sum up the philosophy of mentoring in the Teaching Scholars Program, it is *flexibility*. Frequent meeting attendance and rigorous reporting demands are not made. However, if the program had more staff, more structure could be provided, as Boice recommended. As reported in Table 2, the mentoring element of the program has had a great impact on the participants over the years. Each year, at least one participant writes in the final report that mentoring is the most important element of the program.

Seminars, workshops, and retreats. As program director, I learned after my first year that seminar topics that were well received one year may not be of much interest the next. After that, the group was given a strong hand in selecting seminar topics. The new participants discuss successful seminars with the outgoing group at the May opening/closing retreat; then they begin planning their seminars and reach consensus on four or five topics for first-semester seminars. Flexibility is important, so some topics may change to accommodate varying interests. In a developmental way, as the year progresses, the Teaching Scholars move from "how to" topics (for example, how to lead discussions, how to use writing assignments) led by campus experts, to more controversial or philosophical topics, such as ethical dilemmas in teaching, often led by a member of the group.

At least two off-campus retreats occur each year, and both contribute to the social and intellectual bonding of the group. One retreat answers Wise's (1967) call for arranging seminars cooperatively with other colleges. The September retreat takes place on another campus whose students and curriculum differ from Miami's. This not only provides interesting teaching contrasts to discuss, but also enhances the Teaching Scholars' under-

standing of the Miami environment. Another retreat is held in May at a nearby country inn; here the newly selected participants spend a day with the graduating group, learning the pros and cons about teaching projects, mentoring, and seminar topics, as well as the traditions of the Teaching Scholars Program. This passing of the torch is an important rite, stimulating the new initiates to plan for the coming year and rewarding the missionary and playful zeal of the graduating class.

Austin (1990), in her survey of former Lilly Teaching Fellows Programs, reported that only 5 of the 16 responding programs held retreats. It is difficult to imagine another activity that could establish such important networks, friendships, and lore, as well as generate enthusiasm for the program.

New Faculty: The First Year

Orienting new faculty. Researchers have described the characteristics of successful orientation programs for new faculty. These include: participants are not overloaded; sessions which illustrate the topic; sessions less than one day long; small group interaction with other new faculty and with second-year faculty as guides; an unhurried pace; previews of workshops coming later in the year; and an emphasis on collegiality (Fink 1992, Boice 1992b).

The Miami orientation for first-year faculty—to which second-year faculty are also invited—incorporates many of these elements. Topics cover ways to enhance the effectiveness of teaching and scholarship. Two one-hour seminars in the late afternoon and evening are separated by a dinner and a reception introducing support personnel.

The goals of the orientation are: to emphasize the importance of and expectations for scholarship and teaching; to provide an overview of resources available for the support of teaching and scholarship at Miami; to provide an opportunity to reflect on ways to enhance scholarship and teaching; to introduce new faculty to leaders of programs that support teaching and scholarship; and to begin to build community by having new faculty meet one another and discuss teaching and scholarship across disciplines, divisions, and campuses. Formal feedback from participants indicates that these goals are well achieved and that the session should be repeated in subsequent years.

Role of the department chair. The department chair (or head) is crucial to the success of new faculty. Wheeler (1992) recognized the major roles that chairs can play in developing their new faculty, as resource link, mentor, facilitator of mentor relationships, institutional authority, evaluator, and model of balance. Boice (1992b) also suggested helpful strategies for chairs

working with new faculty, for example, how to handle the results of teaching evaluations. Boud (1988) described a pilot program at an Australian university designed to involve new faculty in ongoing planning sessions with the department head, including ways to establish accountability for teaching effectiveness. The paper examined ways in which fears and resistance can be addressed sensitively. The value of the approach appears to lie in the potential long-term benefits: Fewer problems should develop in later stages of faculty careers, and an infrastructure for working with all faculty can be established best when faculty are new and most receptive to improvement. In the Kurfiss and Boice survey (1990), only 16% of the respondents were training department chairs to facilitate teaching, but this was the most highly rated desired activity (60%). Working with chairs remains one of the top priorities—and challenges—for faculty developers.

Junior Faculty

Year two through the year of tenure consideration are crucial for junior faculty. After trying to get one's bearings in the department the first year, the next four years should offer opportunities for learning about teaching and establishing networks with colleagues in other departments in the university. A year-long teaching development program can provide these opportunities, but not during the first year. As one Miami faculty member wrote in his application this year, "After a year of adjustment here, I feel I have settled in but am not yet set in my teaching ways—this is a very appropriate time to develop an effective teaching program and good teaching skills for my career at Miami. Close communication with a mentor, peer reviews, specialized seminars, and interdisciplinary discussions with fellow participants would provide a wonderful environment in which to develop and grow as an educator."

Year-long teaching programs. An ambitious initiative to improve the teaching of junior faculty was started in 1974 by the Lilly Endowment's Post-Doctoral Teaching Awards Program (now called the Lilly Teaching Fellows Program). It invites selected research universities to design year-long programs for six to ten junior faculty in their second through fifth years of teaching. Selected programs are funded up to three years, with the university expected to continue funding afterwards. The Miami Teaching Scholars Program began in 1978 as part of this initiative.

Various program components incorporated by participating universities include release time, senior faculty mentoring, individual teaching projects, seminars, and retreats (Austin, 1992a). In a study of 30 programs from 1974 to 1988, Austin (1990) noted that, "Each of the programs we evaluated had some degree of positive impact on the Fellows and, with few exceptions, some significant institutional impact" (p. 61). "This study

shows that a program modest in cost, staff, and time can significantly assist faculty in dealing with their most challenging professional concerns" (Austin 1992b, p. 101).

Over 52 institutions have participated since 1974, including 65% of Research I institutions (Lundgren, 1994). Austin (1990) reported that by 1990, only seven of 30 programs were continuing after endowment funding had ceased. However, half of the institutions had established some other faculty development or teaching-related activities (such as teaching centers) with roots in the original program. The study also identified key factors associated with program continuation: attention to institutional culture, a committed and respected director, administrative support, cultivation of a broad institutional base, prestige of the program, excellent publicity, community built among the participants, and cultivation of university fiscal commitment. Pledges must go to the Lilly Endowment for its unique efforts to assist junior faculty.

The scholarship of teaching. Because a long-term goal of the Teaching Scholars Program is to increase campus rewards for teaching, and because scholarship is highly rewarded in disciplines and departments, the program always has taken a scholarly approach to teaching. The program has nourished the scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990) in a variety of ways. This scholarship is developed gradually over the year for the junior faculty participants through a sequence of steps: design and implementation of a teaching project; selection and use of classroom assessment techniques; reading of teaching literature; attendance at a national teaching conference, with opportunities to meet nationally known teacher-scholars; presentation of teaching seminars on campus, and a national teaching conference; and encouragement to prepare a manuscript for publication. Although the scholarship of teaching was not a buzzword when the program was first developed, the outward focus of the program participants was part of the movement that created high-quality teaching scholarship. Program seminars have featured teacher-scholars working at the cutting edge of teaching and learning theory. The participants rank the scholarship of teaching second of all elements of the program in its impact on their teaching (Table 3).

Two initiatives were taken by the program to promote the scholarship of teaching in a broader context. First, the program developed a national teaching conference, *The Lilly Conference on College Teaching*. Since its inception in 1981, the Lilly Conference on College Teaching at Miami has grown from 50 participants to 400. In addition, Miami University has developed and co-sponsored with various California institutions the Lilly Conference on College Teaching-West (1989) and The Lilly Conference-South (1995).

Teaching Scholars Program participants present at these conferences, where both novice and expert teacher-scholars from a wide variety of campus cultures share their classroom experiences and teaching and learning theories.

Second, the program developed the *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* in order to provide a written forum for discussion about all areas affecting teaching and learning. This nationally-refereed journal gives faculty the opportunity to share proven, innovative pedagogies and thoughtful, inspirational insights into teaching. Among the contributors are a large number of well-known experts.

The program's commitment to the scholarship of teaching bears out a corollary to the hard-easy rule (Boice, 1990): faculty developers must work to make teaching harder. "Teaching, so long as it remains ostensibly easy (i.e., seen as requiring little training, as unspecifiable in terms of excellence, as uncompetitively evaluated, as only occasionally labeled a failure), will not merit the same rewards and status as hard tasks like writing for publication" (p. 6). "Perhaps the greatest challenge facing faculty developers in expanding their roles is how to integrate scholarship into programs formerly focused exclusively on teaching" (Mann, 1990, p. 13).

IMPACT AND EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS

Long-Term Results

Katz and Henry (1988) stated, "We felt that the faculty development movement that had begun in the early 1970s had not had the transforming influence upon teaching that many have expected. We thought that the problem lay in the fact that efforts at faculty development usually were too short-term and episodic" (p. x). One reason for the recognition of the Miami Teaching Scholars Program is its distinction as the longest-running year-long junior faculty teaching development program in the United States. Because cultures change slowly, successful programs must be continued for several years to have an effect on campus cultures. On the Miami campus, the change in culture—restoring the balance between teaching and research—is notable, although exact balance has not yet been achieved. A university-wide community has been created and strengthened through teaching. In Table 3, the fourth-highest program impact is reported to be on the scholar's comfort as a member of the Miami University community. Evidence of this community and program impact includes:

- One-fourth of former participants still on campus have now served as program mentors; some have been seminar leaders; two are now department chairs.
- Program graduates have contributed to implementing a new general education program broadening cross-disciplinary curriculum and collaboration.
- Of the eight departments volunteering to participate in the first year of the teaching portfolio project, four had former Teaching Scholars as initiators and project coordinators.
- Teaching development grant and program funding from alumni has increased tenfold, from \$15,000 to \$150,000 US.
- The success of the Teaching Scholars Program led to the establishment of the similar Senior Faculty Program for Teaching Excellence at the request of senior faculty themselves.
- The number of annual awards for excellent teaching at Miami have increased fivefold.
- Undergraduate student learning has been enhanced in many ways. The Teaching Scholars become enthusiastic, interested teachers, some of whom report that their student evaluation ratings have increased an entire point on a four-point scale.
- The strength of the program has enabled it to be combined with Miami's Office of Research and Sponsored Programs to create a new Office for the Advancement of Scholarship and Teaching. This sends a clear message to the campus that teaching and scholarship are equally valued and supported. Several joint initiatives have been sponsored.

The Teaching Scholars Program has changed the Miami culture in a positive way, enhancing the role of teaching in the departmental and university-wide communities.

The Tenure Study

The tenure experiences of all faculty hired at Miami University in the academic years 1977-78 through 1988-89 were examined to determine the relationship between participation in the Teaching Scholars Program (TSP) and tenure decisions at Miami (Bailer & Cox, 1990; Richlin & Cox, 1989). One hundred and six (22%) of the 477 new hires during this period participated in the TSP. The majority of new hires and TSP participants were from the College of Arts and Science (the largest division at Miami). Table 1 provides a breakdown of new hires and program participation by academic division. On a percentage basis, the School of Education and Allied Professions has been most involved in the TSP.

A comparison of tenure decisions ("tenured" versus "left without tenure") is provided in Table 4. Of the 371 faculty for whom a tenure decision was made, there was a significant association ($p < .005$) between TSP participation and a positive tenure decision. Seventy-two percent of TSP participants were tenured versus 55% of the non-participants. To explore this association in greater detail, Table 5 shows tenure decisions by academic division. The School of Interdisciplinary Studies is not included, because they hired only 4 faculty during the study period. From this table, one notes that the strongest association ($p < .05$) between TSP participation and a positive tenure decision occurred in the College of Arts & Science and the School of Education & Allied Professions. As an aside, a few departments have never participated in the TSP program; however, the results remain unchanged even if these departments are removed from the analysis.

From the results presented above, one certainly sees no adverse effects of TSP participation. No causal claims that TSP participation leads to a positive tenure decision can be made. It could be that the TSP is populated by a majority of quick starters, and/or by faculty who are comfortable with their research programs. The TSP encourages development of the qualities of quick starters such as collegiality, interest, and comfort in teaching. The most important conclusion from this study is that the time invested by faculty in a year-long junior faculty development program does not affect tenure outcomes adversely, and in fact, may have a positive influence on such decisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Many recommendations are in print about planning, initiating, and conducting specific programs to assist new and junior faculty. Just about every article on a specific aspect of these programs contains suggestions about implementation and use. Helpful, in-depth recommendations can be found in Austin (1990, 1992a), Boice (1992b), and Jarvis (1991). I now offer recommendations, based on 15 years of experience directing such programs on my campus, and on the studies and stories of colleagues involved in similar ventures on other campuses.

Campus cultures are complex, differing by history, curriculum, mission, funding, governance, leadership, size, location, faculty, and student body (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). Tierney & Rhoads (1993) state that, "While we have noted that the institution is only one of the key forces that shape faculty culture and behavior, it nonetheless plays a critical role in the socialization of faculty" (p. 18). Good strategies for implementing and running programs for new and junior faculty will vary greatly from institution to

institution, and the institutional culture must be well understood and taken into account as one proceeds.

Initial planning for a program is crucial. Broad administrative and faculty support must be obtained. The president, academic vice-president, and deans must strongly endorse, fund, and otherwise promote the program. A "critical mass" of department chairs must be aware of and support the program, because their valuable resources—new faculty—are the essential ingredients. However, unanimity of chair support is rarely achieved; for example, some chairs do not value teaching as highly as research. Senior and junior faculty should be consulted and involved in planning. In fact, control should remain with the faculty, in the form of a respected advisory committee that is part of university governance, such as an existing teaching support committee. Long-term goals for the university should be included in the planning discussion. Program planners should survey new faculty to determine specific needs (Boice, 1992b) and should draw upon the literature (Shea & Knoedler, 1993). Resource decisions must be made with priority given to programs for junior faculty and/or new faculty: if resources are limited, they should be directed to first-year programs.

As planning and resources are addressed, a committed, conscientious director must be identified.

Much of the overall success of a teaching fellows program and the individual successes of the participants rest [sic] on the dedication, interest and hard work of the program director. An effective director is highly committed to the program and its purposes, [and] understands the challenges that confront junior faculty... Typically, directors are senior administrators, leaders of faculty development or teaching centers, or interested faculty members. (Austin, 1992a, p. 84)

Each of these roles has a different capacity to influence budget allocations; provide expertise about teaching and knowledge of useful resource people; and attract positive recognition across campus (Austin, 1992a).

The initial two or three years should be viewed as pilot testing, with the expectation of changing and fine-tuning various elements of the program. For the junior faculty program, one should select participants with the most potential for successful careers in higher education, seminar leaders of proven quality, and the most generous, well-respected faculty as mentors. I must caution, though, that some department chairs may want a remedial program instead. If the initial years are successful, the program can include some struggling faculty in subsequent years, once the program is well established.

With respect to hiring and first-year programs, one must work with department chairs to encourage mentoring of first-year faculty and the use of portfolios and pedagogical interviews. A campus-wide orientation program for new arrivals should be designed to fit the campus culture, to incorporate the approaches illustrated in seminars (for example, use of small groups), and to make faculty feel welcome (for example, inviting them to a dinner in their honor). Second-year faculty should be invited, too. The initial orientation should be followed by other sessions throughout the year.

Some general principles for ongoing, year-long programs for junior faculty include the following:

- The program application form should be designed to identify candidates' commitment to quality teaching, level of interest in the program, need, potential for contributions to the program, and plans for use of the award year.
- The approval of chairs and deans for application to the program should be required.
- Selection should create a diverse group across disciplines, campuses, experience, gender, race, and needs.
- At the start of the program year (for example, in May for the fall semester), a full-day opening/closing retreat or session should be held at which the graduating participants share their experiences and wisdom with the new group, so that they can plan ahead.
- Each year, the new participants should have a strong hand in determining the programming, including seminar topics, speakers, projects, and mentor selection.
- Mentoring is a complex process and should be designed according to campus culture.
- Release time from at least one course for at least one semester should be provided to the junior faculty participants.
- The scholarship of teaching should be developed gradually through a sequence of teaching projects, classroom assessment techniques, reading of the literature, campus presentations by the participants, and presentations at national teaching conferences.
- The participants should assess program seminars, components, and personal impact, and this feedback should be used for planning and making a case for continuing the program.
- Activities, accommodations, and recognition should be designed to make participants feel valued and respected by the college or university.
- Some activities should be designed to build community; for example, retreats or conferences off campus.

- Reunion activities should be provided for past participants, both for all alumni and for each group.

Since cultures change slowly, commitment to a junior faculty teaching program must be long term. Key words for development, selection, programming, leadership, and assessment of the program include *support, quality, flexibility, openness, comfort, balance, and diversity*.

Once faculty are admitted to the academy, every attempt must be made to help them develop as teachers and scholars. Working with new and junior faculty is one of the most rewarding forms of teaching and one which will shape the character of higher education in the new century.

REFERENCES

- Agresti, A., & Finlay, B. (1986). *Statistical methods for the social sciences* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Dellen.
- Astin, A.W., & Lee, C.B.T. (1967). Current practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. In C.B.T. Lee (Ed.), *Improving college teaching* (pp. 296-311). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Austin, A.E. (1990). *To leave an indelible mark: Encouraging good teaching in research universities through faculty development. A study of the Lilly Endowment's teaching fellows program 1974-1988*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Peabody College.
- Austin, A.E. (1992a). Supporting junior faculty through a teaching fellows program. In M.D. Sorcinelli & A.E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 50. Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 73-86). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, A.E. (1992b). Supporting the professor as teacher: The Lilly teaching fellows program. *The Review of Higher Education*, 16(1), 85-106.
- Bailer, A.J., & Cox, M.D. (1990, April). *Tenure decisions and faculty development programs*. Paper presented at the AAHE National Conference on Higher Education, San Francisco, CA.
- Beeman, A.L. (1981). *Toward better teaching: A report on the post-doctoral teaching awards program of the Lilly Endowment, Inc., September 1974-August 1980*. Indianapolis, IN: Lilly Endowment.
- Boice, R. (1987). Is released time an effective device for faculty development? *Research in Higher Education*, 26, 311-326.
- Boice, R. (1990). The hard-easy rule and faculty development. *To Improve the Academy*, 9, 3-12.

- Boice, R. (1991a). New faculty as teachers. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 62(2), 150-173.
- Boice, R. (1991b). Quick starters: New faculty who succeed. In M. Theall & J. Franklin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 48. Effective practices for improving teaching* (pp. 111-121). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boice, R. (1992a). Lessons learned about mentoring. In M.D. Sorcinelli & A.E. Austin (Eds.), *New directions for teaching and learning: No. 50. Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 51-61). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boice, R. (1992b). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boud, D. (1988). Professional development and accountability: Working with newly appointed staff to foster quality. *Studies in Higher Education*, 13(2), 165-176.
- Bowen, H.R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Centra, J.A. (1977, December). Plusses and minuses for faculty development. *Change*, pp. 47, 48, 64.
- Centra, J.A. (1978). Types of faculty development programs. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 49(2), 150-161.
- Erickson, G. (1986). A survey of faculty development practices. *To Improve the Academy*, 5, 182-196.
- Fink, L.D. (1984). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 17. The first year of college teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fink, L.D. (1990). New faculty members: The professoriate of tomorrow. *The Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development*, 8, 235-245.
- Fink, L.D. (1992). Orientation programs for new faculty. In M.D. Sorcinelli & A.E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 50. Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 39-49). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Finkelstein, M.J., & LaCelle-Peterson, M.W. (1992). New and junior faculty: A review of the literature. In M.D. Sorcinelli & A.E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 50. Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 5-14). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Gibbs, G., Gold, J.R., & Jenkins, A. (1987). Fending for yourself: Becoming a teacher of geography in higher education. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 11(1), 11-26.
- Jarvis, D.K. (1991). *Junior faculty development: A handbook*. New York, NY: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation & Development. (1993). *Proceedings of Tenth Annual Conference: Academic Chairpersons: Selecting, Motivating, Evaluating and Rewarding Faculty*. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, National Issues in Higher Education, Division of Continuing Education.
- Katz, J., & Henry, M. (1988). *Turning professors into teachers: A new approach to faculty development and student learning*. New York, NY: ACE/Macmillan.
- Kuh, G.D., & Whitt, E.J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Kurfiss, J., & Boice, R. (1990). Current and desired faculty development practices among POD members. *To Improve the Academy*, 9, 73-82.
- Lee, C.B.T. (Ed.). (1967). *Improving college teaching*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Lundgren, R. (1994, February 24). Personal communication. Indianapolis, IN: Lilly Endowment, Inc.
- Mann, M.P. (1990). Integrating teaching and research: A multidimensional career model. *To Improve the Academy*, 9, 13-28.
- Richlin, L., & Cox, M.D. (1989, June). *What works and when should we do it: Innovative programs to prepare new instructors to teach more effectively*. Paper presented at the STLHE National Conference, Edmonton, AB.
- Shea, M.A., & Knoedler, A.S. (1993). *Becoming a teacher: From pedagogy to praxis*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Sorcinelli, M.D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 50. Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 27-37). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sorcinelli, M.D., & Austin, A.E. (Eds.). (1992). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 50. Developing new and junior faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Theall, M., & Franklin, J. (Eds.). (1991). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 48. Effective practices for improving teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tierney, W.G., & Rhoads, R.A. (1993). *Faculty socialization as cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6).

Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Turner, J.L., & Boice, R. (1987). Starting at the beginning: The concerns and needs of new faculty. *To Improve the Academy*, 6, 41-55.

Wheeler, D.W. (1992). The role of the chairperson in support of junior faculty. In M.D. Sorcinelli & A.E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: No. 50. Developing new and junior faculty* (pp. 87-96). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Whitt, E.J. (1991). Hit the ground running: Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 14(2), 177-197.

Wise, W.M. (1967). Who teaches the teachers? In C.B.T. Lee (Ed.), *Improving college teaching* (pp. 77-89). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

AUTHOR

Milton D. Cox is University Director for Teaching Effectiveness Programs, Miami University, Ohio (US), where he directs the 1994 Hesburgh Award-winning Teaching Scholars Program and the university's Teaching Portfolio Pilot Project. He founded and directs the national Lilly Conference on College Teaching, and is editor-in-chief of the *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*. For the past 28 years, he has taught mathematics at Miami University, designing courses that celebrate and share with students the beauty of mathematics. Nationally, Dr. Cox has helped develop programs to enable the presentation of undergraduate student papers at national professional meetings. In 1988, he received the C.C. McDuffee Award for distinguished service to Pi Mu Epsilon, the National Mathematics Honorary Society.

NOTES

¹ The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1987 ed.). *A classification of institutions in higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Author.

TABLE 1
New Hires ($n=477$) and TSP Participation
by Academic Division

TSP Participation Division	Did Not Participate ($n=371$)	Did Participate ($n=106$)
Business	19%	21%
Arts and Science	44%	31%
Education	12%	25%
Applied Science	12%	9%
Fine Arts	11%	11%
Interdisciplinary Studies	1%	3%

TABLE 2
Miami University Teaching Scholars Program
Evaluation of Program Elements

How would you rate the impact of each of the following elements of the Teaching Scholars Program on you?
"1" indicates a very weak impact and "10" indicates a very strong impact.

Elements	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
(1) The collegueship	(3)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(6)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
8.8 and learning from the other Teaching Scholars	8.8	8.9	8.1	8.9	9.0	6.5	9.0	9.1	9.9	9.8	9.3	9.0	8.5
(2) The retreats	(5)	(6)	(6)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(4)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(2)
8.3 and conferences	7.7	7.6	7.2	8.9	9.4	8.1	8.7	8.1	8.6	8.8	8.7	8.1	8.3
(2) Release time	(1)	(4)	(3)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(7)	(3)	(2)	(7)	(4)	(2)	(3)
8.3	9.0	7.9	8.0	9.7	8.3	9.5	7.1	8.1	9.5	5.7	7.8	8.5	8.2
(4) The teaching	(1)	(1)	(1)	(5)	(7)	(4)	(6)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(4)	(4)
8.2 project	9.0	9.1	8.3	8.6	7.4	7.5	7.8	8.4	9.0	8.1	7.6	8.0	8.0
(5) The Mentor	(4)	(2)	(4)	(2)	(5)	(3)	(2)	(5)	(6)	(5)	(6)	(6)	(6)
8.0 relationship	8.7	8.9	7.8	9.5	8.0	8.0	8.9	7.1	7.1	8.0	7.1	7.3	7.7
7.6	7.3	7.1	7.4	7.9	8.0	5.8	7.9	7.4	7.9	8.4	8.1	7.7	7.9
(7) Observation	(7)	(5)	(7)	(6)	(3)	(5)	(4)	(6)	(7)	(6)	(7)	(7)	(7)
6.9 of Mentor's or others' classes	6.3	6.8	6.8	8.3	8.8	7.0	8.3	5.6	5.9	7.0	6.3	6.6	6.6
OVERALL MEAN													
8.0 FOR COHORT	8.1	8.0	7.7	8.8	8.4	7.5	8.2	7.7	8.3	8.0	7.8	7.9	7.9

*Overall mean and rank across years; number in parentheses is ranking by each year's group; number on second line is mean for that element.

TABLE 3
Miami University Teaching Scholars Program
Ratings of Program Outcomes

Estimate the impact of the Teaching Scholars Program as a totality on each of the following areas.
"1" indicates a very weak impact and "10" indicates a very strong impact.

Areas	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
(1) Your interest in the teaching process	(1)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
8.5	8.4	9.5	8.6	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.9	8.5	8.1	9.0	9.1	8.4	9.4
(2) Your understanding of the scholarship of teaching & interest with respect to the scholarship of teaching	(1)	(4)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(3)
8.1	8.9	7.0	9.0	7.2	8.0	8.0	8.5	8.2	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.2	7.9
(4) Your comfort as a member of the Miami University community	(2)	(3)	(3)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(4)	(3)	(4)	(3)
7.8	7.2	7.3	8.9	8.2	7.3	8.3	8.3	7.9	8.3	7.5	7.8	7.9	7.9
(6) Your awareness of ways to integrate the teaching/research experience	(3)	(4)	(3)	(6)	(3)	(6)	(4)	(4)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(5)
7.2	7.1	7.2	6.8	7.9	6.1	7.7	7.1	7.0	7.8	7.1	7.3	7.7	7.7
(7) Your technical skill as a teacher	(4)	(6)	(5)	(6)	(3)	(6)	(4)	(4)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(8)
7.2	6.3	6.8	7.6	7.9	6.4	7.4	7.4	6.1	6.7	7.5	7.3	6.8	6.6
(8) Your understanding of the role of a faculty member at Miami University	(6)	(5)	(2)	(4)	(4)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)
8.1	6.3	7.4	8.3	7.7	6.4	7.4	7.4	6.1	6.7	7.5	7.3	6.8	6.6
(9) Your research and scholarly interest	(5)	(3)	(6)	(5)	(6)	(4)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(6)	(6)	(8)	(9)
6.9	7.9	6.3	8.2	6.3	6.9	6.8	6.2	7.2	7.1	6.3	7.0	6.4	6.4
OVERALL MEAN													
7.7 FOR COHORT	7.1	7.7	7.4	8.4	7.6	7.0	7.7	7.3	7.6	7.9	7.7	7.6	7.6

*Overall mean and rank across years; number in parentheses is ranking by each year's group; number on second line is mean for that area.

TABLE 4
Tenure Decision and TSP Participation

Did Not Participate		Did Participate		<i>p</i> -value*
Tenured	Left W/O	Tenured	Left W/O	
55%	45%	72%	28%	.005
(<i>n</i> =295)	(<i>n</i> =295)	(<i>n</i> =76)	(<i>n</i> =76)	

TABLE 5
Tenure Decision and TSP Participation
by Academic Division

Division	Did Not Participate		Did Participate		<i>p</i> -value*
	Tenured	Left W/O	Tenured	Left W/O	
Business	55%	45%	56%	44%	.929
	(<i>n</i> =60)	(<i>n</i> =60)	(<i>n</i> =16)	(<i>n</i> =16)	
Arts & Science	60%	40%	88%	12%	.008
	(<i>n</i> =124)	(<i>n</i> =124)	(<i>n</i> =25)	(<i>n</i> =25)	
Education	37%	63%	67%	33%	.049
	(<i>n</i> =38)	(<i>n</i> =38)	(<i>n</i> =15)	(<i>n</i> =15)	
Applied Science	46%	54%	67%	33%	.231
	(<i>n</i> =39)	(<i>n</i> =39)	(<i>n</i> =9)	(<i>n</i> =9)	
Fine Arts	61%	39%	67%	33%	.529
	(<i>n</i> =33)	(<i>n</i> =33)	(<i>n</i> =9)	(<i>n</i> =9)	

**p*-value for test of the independence of tenure decision and TSP participation (small *p*-values => dependence). *P*-value based on Chi-square test of independence (Agresti & Finlay, 1986).

12.

Improving Teaching: Academic Leaders and Faculty Developers as Partners

Mary Deane Sorcinelli
Norman D. Aitken

Faculty developers have long recognized the key role to be played by chairs, deans, and senior academic administrators in the success of instructional development programs. This chapter describes the role administrators can play in faculty development and outlines strategies to involve the academic leadership in efforts to enhance teaching in the university.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been increasing pressure on institutions of higher education to improve teaching. External constituencies such as parents, employers, and legislators have focused a critical eye on colleges and universities, calling for graduates who are better prepared for the demands of an increasingly complex society. Associations that represent higher education—Association of American Colleges, American Association for Higher Education, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching—have challenged the academy to improve support for teaching, especially at the undergraduate level (Association of American Colleges, 1985; Boyer, 1987; Edgerton, 1988). Even within the academy, faculty, chairs, deans, and aca-