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Chapter 1
Introduction
Background and Evolution of the Problem

According to the Veterans Administration, (Walters, 1984) there are 103 historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). These institutions are committed to providing postsecondary educational opportunities for black citizens. Liberal admissions policies of the 1970s gave educationally disadvantaged students the opportunity to further their education. Although HBCUs stand by this commitment, in many cases they have not adequately provided the faculty with the skills, understandings, knowledge areas, and attitudes required to meet the special needs of the students. Because liberal admissions policies of the 1970s gave educationally disadvantaged students the opportunity to further their education, three problems in particular have confronted HBCUs: (a) high attrition rates, (b) large numbers of students needing remedial services, and (c) high failure rates on standardized tests. Faculty members have the responsibility of addressing these problems, but they have not been provided with quality experiences that would enable them to combat the problems.
A significant number of students are accepted into HBCUs even though some are not prepared to meet the challenges of postsecondary work (Koutrelakos, 1986); these institutions are reluctant to deny educational opportunities to less-abled minority students. The aim is to give students a chance by accepting them and then working to remediate their deficiencies by providing various types of remedial services during the freshman year.

Difficulties stemming from years of educational disadvantages and other societal factors account for the staggering attrition rates in HBCUs. As far back as 1964, McGrath (1965) revealed in a study of 54 black institutions that in at least two, half of the incoming students left before beginning the sophomore year. In twelve of them, one-fourth of the freshman class left by the end of that year. More recently, Cooper (1986) reported that between 1976 and 1981, of all black graduates, the percentage of degrees awarded by historically black institutions decreased from 32.8 percent to 24.8 percent. During the same period, black institutions experienced a loss of 13,000 full-time undergraduate students.

In an effort to alleviate deficiencies in the secondary education of students and to decrease attrition rates, many of HBCUs spend large shares of their
resources on remedial services, specialized instruction, and on a variety of special educational devices for freshman students (McGrath, 1965). There are numerous funded programs designed to assist students in various areas of deficiency, but matching funds have not been provided to address corresponding faculty needs.

On a further note, this society is increasingly becoming one in which opportunities for higher education and career advancement are based upon performance on norm-referenced standardized examinations. Black students have historically performed lower on standardized tests than non-minority students (Frierson, 1986). Nationally, white students have approximately an 86 percent rate of success on various standardized tests as compared to a 26 percent success rate for black students and other minorities (Cooper, 1986). The high failure rate on standardized tests by students in predominantly black institutions stems from students' limited analytical and problem-solving abilities and poor reading skills.

High failure rates on standardized tests are especially evident with black education graduates. Along with the deficiencies cited above, Cooper (1986) cites deficiencies in their general education courses as reasons for their low passage rates on teacher certification tests. Although historically black institutions train a significant percentage of black
teacher graduates, adequate steps have not been taken to provide faculty members with the instructional techniques required to improve the test performance of black students; therefore, teacher education programs in black institutions are in grave danger.

The need for well-structured faculty development programs is becoming increasingly more evident. The attainment of quality programs can no longer be a simple one-shot procedure. In order for such programs to have the desired effects, attention is going to have to be paid to those factors which are perceived to interfere with program effectiveness. Those conditions that are perceived by faculty members and administrators to reduce the positive effects of the program should be identified and if at all possible, eliminated.

Problem Statement

Higher education is experiencing changes brought on by declining enrollments, enrollment of nontraditional students, and increasing developments in knowledge and technology. Responses to these changes include moves toward retrenchment and increased demands for accountability. They have also made necessary the acquisition of new and additional skills and understandings by faculties. In better times, an adequate response simply would have meant the hiring of new faculty members who
already possessed the abilities. The state of the nation's economy has accounted for smaller appropriations from state legislatures and less generous support from individuals and private concerns (Peretomode, 1984). This in turn has limited the abilities of universities to employ new faculty members. Universities have had to assume the responsibility of providing opportunities for the faculty to develop new skills and understandings. Providing developmental activities requires carefully planned faculty development programs.

According to Peretomode (1984), the purpose of faculty development is to help the faculty acquire new skills, knowledge, and understandings; to keep abreast of new technology; and to improve the ability of faculty members to solve educational and social problems. Institutions of higher education hold certain performance expectations of their faculty which include presenting papers at professional conferences, generating funds through proposal writing, chairing committees, etc. In order for faculty members to fulfill these expectations, there are corresponding enabling skills, knowledge areas, and understandings that must be possessed. When there is a perception at the institution that the faculty is not living up to expectations, the institution becomes compelled to provide opportunities for the faculty to develop the desired competencies and understandings.
Although universities provide certain programs as means of enhancing faculty performance, faculty members and administrators perceive some programs as being effective while others are perceived as being largely ineffective. In light of such perceptions, it is logical to assume that there are factors which are thought to enhance the effectiveness of such programs as well as factors which are believed to inhibit the effectiveness of faculty development programs.

The purpose of this study was to ascertain perceptions held by faculty members and administrators of historically black colleges and universities related to the attainment of the goals and purposes of faculty development programs in black institutions. This purpose was served by obtaining insight into an important problem in faculty development: What factors are perceived to affect the effectiveness of and to influence perceptions regarding the effectiveness of faculty development programs in historically black institutions?

More specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What do deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members in HBCUs perceive to be the primary goals and purposes of faculty development programs?
2. What factors are perceived by deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members to be the major inhibitors to the realization of established faculty development program goals and purposes?

3. What effects do perceptions concerning inhibiting factors have on respondents' perceptions of the achievement of program goals and purposes?

4. What effects do perceptions concerning the funding of, the existence of, and the need for a faculty development program have on respondents' perceptions of the achievement of program goals and purposes?

5. What effects do demographic factors have on respondents' perceptions of the achievement of program goals and purposes?

Significance of the Problem

Faculty improvement, faculty renewal, staff development, inservice education, and faculty development are all terms that are used interchangeably and synonymously to denote efforts toward positive change in faculty performance. The literature on faculty and staff development is replete with research involving the value
of inservice, teachers' and administrators' perceptions of
teachers' inservice needs, the effectiveness of certain
staff development programs, and components of successful
staff and faculty development programs. These studies
sought to determine the most desired and effective means
of enhancing the professional and personal skills of
teachers and soundly documented the need to ascertain and
utilize the expressed needs of participants in planning
faculty development programs (Rogers, 1984; Althoff, 1981;
Tucker, 1981; Wood and Thompson, 1980).

Many studies have been conducted on the secondary and
elementary levels. Joyce and Showers (1980) analyzed more
than 200 studies in which researchers investigated the
effectiveness of various kinds of training methods. It
was concluded that most of the studies were not designed to
measure perceived or actual levels of impact or the value
of each training component. Conclusions nearly always
addressed the issue of whether skills were acquired and
demonstrated. The question of transfer at the classroom
level—effectiveness—was addressed in relatively few
studies.

The number of studies which involved college and
university faculty development programs is limited.
Although several studies have been conducted at the junior
and community college level in the area of faculty
development needs and practices, most of these studies were
not concerned with perceived needs of both faculty members and administrators nor faculty development programs at historically black colleges and universities. Research by Peretomode (1984), Davis (1984, and Nelsen (1980) involved perceptions of college and university faculty members and administrators. The findings indicated that administrators and faculty members have different perceptions regarding faculty development needs.

The perception level is an important and necessary stage for sensitizing faculty and administrators to the significance of having an effective development program for faculty who work with freshmen in HBCUs; therefore, this study is significant in that it seeks to, in an exploratory way, shed some light on the perceived goals of such programs and factors which affect the realization of the goals. It is also significant in that it seeks to point out those perceived factors, those differences in perceptions found among deans, department chairpersons and faculty members, and other variables which might account for differences in perceptions of academic faculty concerning faculty development programs.

The significance of this study is based upon four premises: (a) there is a deficit in the research involving college and university faculty development; (b) the gap in the research regarding the perceptions of both administrators and faculty members needs to be
bridged; (c) those factors which affect the effectiveness of faculty development programs as perceived by faculty members and administrators need to be identified and utilized in planning and evaluating programs; and
(d) efforts to promote the success of entering freshmen, to improve the quality of the graduates, and to promote the survival of historically black institutions must include enhancing the skills of the faculty.

The effectiveness of such efforts is dependent upon faculty perceptions of the overall development program. Hopefully, the understandings gained as a result of this study will prove to be invaluable in the planning of renewal activities, and at the same time, shorten the gap that exists in the research regarding the body of knowledge relevant to faculty development in higher education.

Limitations of the Study

The population involved in this study was restricted to personnel associated with historically black undergraduate institutions within the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Due to the unique nature of these institutions, generalizations may not be applied to institutions of other descriptions. Because the questionnaires were distributed by administrators at the various universities, it is only assumed that they were distributed as directed. Since the methods of
distribution undoubtedly varied, the composition of the sample in terms of positions and job descriptions was uncertain. This and the small percentage of respondents presented additional limitations of the study; consequently, no attempt will be made to generalize the findings.

Scope of the Study

This study deals specifically with identifying those factors which are perceived by deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members to affect the effectiveness of faculty development programs in historically black institutions, and with identifying factors which influence perceptions of program effectiveness. The responses in this study were limited to those of university faculty who work with freshman programs in historically black institutions.
Definitions of Terms

There are numerous definitions of faculty development and synonymous terms. Marty's (1976) definition of professional growth includes self-initiated efforts by faculty members to improve their effectiveness as teachers and to produce published evidence of craftsmanship. These efforts should be organized, systematic, and comprehensive. Gall (1976) perceives faculty development as a means of improving the education of students and of strengthening the institution. Embraced in that definition is the preservation of high standards and the promotion of knowledge. According to Peretomode (1984), the concept of faculty development embraces several elements: (a) improving teaching effectiveness, (b) promoting organizational, instructional, and personal and professional development of the member and his or her career, and (c) promoting research, scholarship, problem solving, and contributions to campus and community life. According to Peretomode, faculty development is non-remedial.

For the purposes of this study, faculty development is defined, in part, in terms of concepts identified by Tucker (1981): Faculty development is a series of planned activities and procedures that aid faculty members in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable them to become more effective in performing all
functions related to academic life. Other terms that are critical to this study are defined as follows:

**Administrator** - The dean of a school or college or the head of an academic department.

**Dean** - The administrative head of a college or school.

**Department Chairperson** - The coordinator or administrator of an academic unit within a college or school. This term is used interchangeably with the term department head (Peretomode, 1984).

**Effective** - A faculty development program or activity is effective if it produces desired changes as evidenced by the attainment of previously specified criteria, expectations, and goals.

**Enhancer** - A factor or condition which contributes positively to the effectiveness of faculty development efforts.

**Faculty Development** - A series of planned activities and procedures that aid faculty members in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable them to become more effective in performing all functions related to academic life (Tucker, 1981).

**Faculty Members** - Department personnel engaged in instruction, research, and/or service to that academic department (Peretomode, 1984).
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) - Those institutions of postsecondary education that were originally founded for the purpose of providing educational opportunities for individuals of the "Negro or Colored" race, and which continue to have as one of their primary purposes the provisions of postsecondary opportunities for Black Americans (Walters, 1984).

Inhibitor - A factor or condition which interferes with the effectiveness of faculty development efforts.

Perception - The insight, intuition, understandings, or observations made or felt by faculty members or academic administrators concerning faculty development programs or activities.
Chapter 2
Review of the Literature

Introduction

The plethora of research on the secondary and elementary levels have uncovered many significant findings concerning the nature of in-service education. Although the number of studies related to faculty development in higher education does not approach the quantity of that on the other levels, it was necessary to comb the available research as a foundation for this inquiry. A review of the literature was conducted to determine the current status of faculty development programs in higher education, and the perceptions among educators concerning the effectiveness of faculty development efforts. It was of equal importance to this study, however, to examine the theory regarding various aspects of this relatively new area of research. The following review begins with these theoretical insights.

The Need for Faculty Development

Public and private institutions are now in a state of financial retrenchment. This unfortunate situation manifests itself in pressures on administrators for more efficient use of faculty (Peretomode, 1984), declining
enrollments, competition for students, loss of funds to support research, declining rate of faculty mobility, and in a decrease in the number of new faculty members (Marty, 1976). According to Wolke (1980), the population of traditional college-age students was expected to decrease by 15 percent by 1985. Even though colleges are actively recruiting minorities and older non-traditional students, these students are not expected to make up the deficit. College students are becoming more heterogeneous, and colleges and universities are now responsible for addressing the needs of economically, educationally, and culturally disadvantaged students, minority and international students, as well as the needs of students with learning and physical disabilities.

The challenges posed by the times call for faculty members to adapt to new curricula, to constantly strive for currency in their respective disciplines, to develop new skills that may not be directly related to developments in their disciplines such as student advisement or grantsmanship, and to keep abreast of new and more sophisticated instructional methods and techniques. The enhancement of instruction may be a particularly important challenge for some faculty members because of the nature of their graduate training.

According to Wildeman, Pavelich and Sloan (1980), a serious gap exists between the formal education of faculty
members and teaching. Many have been well trained as professional scientists, humanists, or engineers but have had little or no formal training as educators. An examination of practices of graduate schools by Barnes (1984) revealed that doctoral programs are designed to produce scholars and researchers but do not provide instruction in pedagogy in order to produce college teachers. Barnes' study sought to determine the level of perceived need among college professors to include formal curricula in pedagogy for students in academic doctoral degree programs. Results indicated that 70 percent of all respondents were found to be in favor of curricula in doctoral programs which would prepare candidates for teaching. Even those educators who may have had training as educators may not be equipped to accommodate the various needs of non-traditional students. The need for faculty development in that respect is evident.

Instruction, according to Gaff (1976), is the primary role of most faculty members, but instructional quality is affected by their performance in other roles such as research, committee work, and community involvement. Faculty members can and should be encouraged to grow in each of these areas.

The need for well-planned faculty development programs encompasses, as stated earlier, more than instructional enhancement. Smith and Ovard (1979) of Brigham Young
University include in a program of professional development activities theoretical, directed, and applied research; publication of books and journal articles; and curriculum planning and revision. Peretomode (1984) includes in his list of faculty development needs, skills in the areas of grantsmanship, academic advisement, leadership techniques, and interpersonal relationships with students and colleagues.

Brown (1976) emphasizes the professional and personal development of women and minorities through asserting that if universities are to preserve and advance knowledge, higher education institutions must strive for the promotion and advancement of women and minorities through including them in the powerful research and decision-making circles of intellectual life. Brown pinpointed the need to provide opportunities and experiences that can enrich the professional life of women and minorities. There exists a need to expand opportunities for them to attend professional meetings, to serve on committees, or to take part in bargaining sessions. This would broaden the knowledge base of women and minorities as well as their exposure and opportunities to acquire contacts.

In the past, it had been left up to the individual faculty member to renew skills; in fact, Becker (Ruch, 1984) argues that faculty development and professional growth are the responsibility of the individual faculty
member. Because individual efforts have been inadequate, Tucker (1981) argues that faculty development and professional growth are the responsibility of a department chairperson. The development of faculty, according to Peretomode (1984), to meet today's challenges will require resources, ideas, mechanisms, and inspections of all levels of university administrators.

The Facilitation of Change

Regardless of the complexity or the simplicity of the various definitions of faculty development, inherent in each definition is the concept of change. The concept of change is disguised in such terms as acquiring new skills, keeping abreast or current, renewal efforts, extending, and improving. Faculty development, however, is not a remedial concept for poor teachers or underachievers but an opportunity to bring about a desired change. Change does not result from coercion, indoctrination, or technological developments (Prentice-Hall, 1974). According to Gaff (1976), change in an individual requires a challenge to one's habit patterns, one strong enough to stimulate new forms of behavior but not so strong as to become overwhelming. According to Tucker (1981), faculty members must perceive a need to change before they will commit themselves to participating in a faculty development effort whether in teaching or in other professional areas.
Unless faculty members are convinced of the need to be involved in the activity program and participate willingly, the probability of program success is slim. Wood and Thompson (1980) have found that adults will commit to learning something when the goals and objectives of the developmental activity are perceived by the learner as being important and immediately useful. Adults will learn, retain, and use what they perceive is relevant to their personal and professional needs (Wood and Thompson, 1980). Gaff (1976) sums up the prerequisites to change in the following manner:

Faculty members will change when: (a) they have knowledge about alternative ways of behaving, such as information about alternative teaching-learning practices; (b) they have the belief that change is desirable; (c) they believe that they can change in the desired ways; (d) they receive nonthreatening feedback about their own behavior; (e) they are praised, recognized, and rewarded for effectiveness and for improvement. For faculty, this means the reward structure must recognize their development efforts or they will not long strive for improvement. (p. 17)

Gaff also insists that although all persons resist change, they are also motivated toward growth and improvement.
Faculty development programs have a better chance of bringing about desired change if they are built around assessed needs and preferences as indicated by the people who are the intended beneficiaries of these programs.

The effectiveness of any planned program of change should be felt by the participants, and the measurement of permanent change should take place over time. Evidence of desired change should carry over into other intended areas. Utilizing the perceptions of faculty members in planning and evaluating programs should yield programs with more positive perceptions of effectiveness.

Ruch (1984) suggests human resource development (HRD) concepts where institutional program priorities and needs as well as faculty needs are identified. Where faculty needs overlap with institutional needs, faculty development activities are generated. This is a logical approach to the planning of faculty development programs because, according to Tucker (1981), faculty members often perceive developmental activities as unnecessary infringements on their schedules because their personal goals may not be concurrent with the goals of the department or the college.

Peretomode (1984) agrees that there must be a high degree of congruence between the programmatic needs of the institution and the developmental needs of the faculty members in order for a faculty development program to be
successful. Peretomode further states that it is not only important for faculty development to identify individual faculty development needs, but it is just as essential for faculty to know the expectations and perceptions of academic administrators regarding development needs and practices.

It is equally important for faculty members and administrators to be conscious of those factors which are perceived to affect the effectiveness of faculty development programs. All parties should be aware of the perceptions of significant others. This is important not only in terms of assisting administrators in examining their planning procedures, but as in the HRD model, in identifying perceptions that are common to faculty members and administrators.

Evaluation of Faculty Development Programs

According to Noonan (1972), no faculty development program should be planned without an accompanying system for its evaluation. Evaluation serves to compare developmental activities to program expectations, goals, and values (Bergquist and Phillips, 1977). Evaluation is an important tool in clarifying objectives because, as Noonan (1972) and Bergquist and Phillips (1977) claim, it is impossible to make an evaluation until program goals, priorities, values, expected outcomes, success criteria,
measurement instruments, strategies, and procedures are first identified.

Aside from clarifying objectives, the evaluation of faculty development programs also includes these functions: determining the attainment of objectives; documenting success based upon pre-determined criteria; assisting faculty developers in improving programs and cost effectiveness; and determining influences of the program on other activities in the institution (Peretomode, 1984).

There are various studies which exemplify the potential value of faculty development programs. These studies provide descriptions of activities and evidence of faculty participation in these programs, but sound evidence of the impact of these programs on participants, students and institutions as observed by Gaff (1976), is very limited. Kelly (Peretomode, 1984) holds a similar view by insisting that it is difficult to determine that substantial change in student performance has occurred due to faculty renewal activities.

Administrators use many different criteria for measuring the success of faculty development programs. Participant involvement, the number of workshops or conferences attended or presented, the increase in the number of faculty publications, favorable opinions of participants, and favorable reports from objective
assessment teams are just a few of the criteria that institutions are using (Peretomode, 1984; Centra, 1982). Firth (1977) questions the extent to which accurate evaluation of staff development activities can be achieved. He also admonishes that in many cases, administrators base their claims of successful change on the installation of new programs. The success of a program is assessed in terms of the number of changes that have been achieved. The assessment is often quantitative. According to Firth, assessment must address both program innovations, and teacher successes. Oftentimes a successful program becomes one that meets legal requirements and one that is executed smoothly, efficiently, and according to schedule. A survey of department heads at 134 institutions revealed that the three criteria that were most often utilized were the number of articles published in quality journals, the number of books published, and the quality of research conducted as judged by peers at the institution. Many of the criteria listed may be used as data in evaluating a program, but do not reflect accurate measures of success or failure (Peretomode, 1984).

It would seem logical to base the measurement of program effectiveness upon the attainment of predetermined objectives. According to Bergquist and Phillips (1979) however, some faculty development programs should be able
to demonstrate an impact on student learning, for that is
the primary reason that the program was established, while
in other cases, the success of a faculty development program
should be measured in terms of faculty change and
development.

While it has been noted that there are various
criteria being utilized to evaluate programs, no one method
will adequately evaluate all faculty development programs.
Present faculty development programs lack data that would
indicate their impacts on universities, so the real
effects of faculty development programs are questionable.

Pertinent Research

There are several studies on the elementary and
secondary levels which may have some bearing on faculty
development practices in higher education. A study by
Davis (1974) investigated teachers' and principals'
perceptions of teachers' inservice needs during a court-
ordered desegregation process. An adaptation of the
Teacher Needs Assessment Instrument developed by Gary
Ingersoll of Indiana University was used to survey
elementary, junior high and high school teachers and
principals in Cleveland, Ohio about their perceptions of
teachers' inservice needs. Results indicated that the
perceptions of teachers and principals concerning
teachers' inservice needs differ significantly, indicating
that inservice activities ought to reflect the perceptions of both groups. Davis explained that administrators' views often reflect the logistics of program implementation. The effective inservice, according to Davis, should address the goals of the system, as well as the needs of the teachers.

Davis further noted that perceptions should change as inservice becomes increasingly effective, and that this change should be viewed as a possible indicator of program effectiveness. It was also recommended that teachers' and administrators' perceptions be compared over time as an area of future study. While the results of this study hold important implications for the planning of inservice, it still did not address those factors which faculty members perceived to contribute to or interfere with the effectiveness of faculty development programs.

Brown (1981) conducted a study that investigated similar relationships to those in the Davis study; the results, however, were quite different. Administrators' perceptions of teachers' inservice needs and teachers' identification of inservice needs were found to be basically congruent. There were only 5 out of 19 areas where perceptions differed.

Another study that investigated teachers' perceptions of inservice education was conducted by Khoury (1982). This study assessed the perceptions of public school
teachers in Jordan for the purpose of evaluating current objectives and methods of inservice training. A seven-point scale was used to gather information about perceived satisfaction with current inservice and perceived needs for inservice. Significant differences were found in the perceptions of Jordanian teachers. There does arise a question, however, as to whether the term satisfaction is synonymous with effectiveness. In other words, if a teacher is satisfied with an inservice activity, is it automatically perceived by that teacher as being effective? A subject for further research may be to identify and separate perceptions of teachers' satisfaction with inservice from those perceptions of effectiveness.

Along similar lines, Harris (1982) conducted a study of inservice education to (a) describe inservice education in Wisconsin, (b) to consider the relationships that exist between elements of effective inservice and measures of teacher satisfaction with inservice, and (c) to determine teachers' perceptions concerning whether inservice activities are meeting their needs. It was concluded that inservice activities should focus on both school and district problems, include evaluation of inservice, and should include the use of needs assessment activities that allow time for the clarification of needs.
In a statewide research study in Tennessee on teacher attitudes towards inservice education, 94 percent of the participants responded that one of the most important ways to judge the effectiveness of an inservice program is whether the teacher uses the results of the training in his classroom. Just 13 percent of the teachers surveyed stated that there is adequate follow-up to determine the effects of inservice activities in their system (Brimm and Tollett, 1974). Implications of this study would seem to indicate that training is implemented for the purpose of meeting specific objectives, but there is little real certainty that the objectives have been realized.

Several studies in higher education have been conducted as well. Peretomode (1984) conducted a study which was a major impetus for this study. The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of deans, department heads, and faculty members in public research universities regarding personal, instructional, and instructional development needs of faculty members as well as their preferences for types of activities. Results indicated that deans' perceptions differed significantly from the perceptions of faculty members in regard to instructional development needs. Deans were more concerned with the need for instructional improvement than were faculty members and department heads. There were significant differences among deans, department heads, and
faculty members in perceptions regarding institutional and personal development needs.

In a study of perceptions of teaching and teaching improvement, Smith (1984) collected data from university faculty members. The data revealed that faculty members and faculty developers have different perceptions of the need for and the nature of teaching improvement. Most faculty members reported doing some work on improving their teaching, but they were likely to engage in these activities only when they saw a problem and felt it was solvable.

Other studies investigated the existence of faculty development programs. Poythress (1984) reviewed professional development programs for middle managers in education and in business and industry to determine the area in which the programs differed to determine professional development needs of middle managers in both groups. Participants included all division heads and the staff members responsible for professional development in all public junior colleges in Georgia and five middle managers and the employees responsible for professional development in 18 randomly selected businesses in the SMSA of Atlanta, Georgia.

There was disagreement among the participants associated with the junior colleges regarding which
activities could really be classified as professional development activities. They also expressed dissatisfaction with their development programs. Very few colleges employed a director of professional development, and none of the junior colleges surveyed had a professional development program for middle managers. Eble (as cited in Peretomode, 1984) conducted a national survey of career development programs for teachers in colleges and universities. Only 6 out of the 150 institutions surveyed reported their institutions as having effective faculty development programs.

The implementation of faculty development activities is a very necessary means of enhancing the personal and professional skills of faculty members. The potential value of these programs cannot be realized if they are not planned so that they meet the perceived needs of the intended beneficiaries and if they are not properly evaluated to determine if they are actually satisfying the identified needs. The research indicates not only a deficit in faculty development research in higher education but also a lack of well-structured faculty development programs and evaluation systems. There is also little evidence to show that efforts have been made to determine and utilize faculty perceptions of those factors which enhance or inhibit the effectiveness of faculty development activities in planning such programs.
Summary

A review of the literature revealed several pertinent findings related to faculty development programs:
(a) the research on the university and college level concerning faculty development programs is very limited;
(b) perceptions of faculty members and administrators differ significantly in relation to faculty development needs, practices, and preferences; (c) there are very few structured faculty development programs in higher education; and (d) faculty development programs are perceived by faculty members as being largely ineffective. Theoretical insights indicate that concurrent goals and mutual awareness of expectations and perceptions among faculty and administrators are important prerequisites to planning faculty development programs. Provisions for needs assessments and preferences, rewards, and positive feedback must also be operative before any measure of success can be expected.
Chapter 3
Method and Procedure

Method

The purpose of this study was to identify those factors that are perceived by faculty members, department chairpersons, and deans to affect the effectiveness of faculty development programs in historically black colleges and universities. The descriptive-survey method of investigation was selected to facilitate this inquiry because it is useful, according to Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1979), in determining the nature of a situation as it exists at the time of the study with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. These variables are studied in an effort to obtain information that will provide solutions to impending or existing problems. This information is gathered through (a) studying relationships, (b) determining opinions, (c) determining attitudes, (d) determining preferences, and (e) securing perceptions of persons (Borg and Gall, 1979).

Population

The sample for this study was drawn from the faculty and administrators from 98 of the historically black institutions. Only those institutions with undergraduate
programs and the faculty members who work with freshmen or freshman programs were surveyed. The list of historically black colleges and universities and their addresses and presidents was obtained from information supplied by the Office of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs (Walters, 1984) (Appendix A). The Education Directory: Colleges and Universities 1983–84 (Broyles and Fernandez, 1984) was used to eliminate those schools that do not serve undergraduate students or are not located within the continental United States. Participants from each institution included one college dean, one director or department chairperson, and five other staff and/or faculty members.

A "Perceptions of Faculty Development Programs Survey" was sent to a total of 686 potential participants at 98 historically black colleges and universities (Appendix B). This number included 196 administrators and 490 faculty and staff members.

Procedures

A letter was sent to presidents, deans, or other administrators at historically black undergraduate institutions who are familiar with faculty development efforts at their colleges and universities (Appendix C). These administrators were asked to identify a dean or department chairperson, and five other staff or faculty
members who work with freshmen and to provide each with a cover letter (Appendix D) and the "Perceptions of Faculty Development Programs Survey." Each participant was asked to complete the instrument and return it in the self-addressed envelope to the researcher.

Instrument

An instrument designed specifically for this study was employed to gather data relevant to the factors which affect the effectiveness of faculty development programs. A thorough review of the literature and selected university educators and administrators were the major sources of the items and the response choices included in the questionnaire.

The "Perceptions of Faculty Development Programs Survey" consisted of 6 items designed to provide demographic data and an additional 13 items designed to secure faculty members' and administrators' perceptions concerning faculty development programs in their respective colleges or departments. Each respondent was asked to either select the response or responses to each item according to his or her perceptions of the faculty's development programs in his or her college or department or to rate certain items relating to faculty development programs or practices according to his or her own perceptions.
Establishing Validity of the Instrument

A commonly accepted method of validating items of a questionnaire is that of using a panel of qualified judges to evaluate the items. In constructing the instrument for the study, the researcher, through an extensive review of the literature, compiled a list of faculty development needs, goals, skills, knowledge areas, understandings, activities, performance expectations, enhancers, and inhibitors. In order to test the content validity of the items to be included in the questionnaire, this list was submitted to four experts in the area of education administration and psychological services on the Atlanta University campus. They were asked to examine the items for importance/relevance for inclusion in a faculty development program questionnaire. Suggestions were also made relevant to the intended format, sequencing, and wording of the items.

The developed questionnaire (Appendix E) was then sent to a panel of four university educators and administrators from three universities for validation (Appendix F). The judges were requested to evaluate each item on the questionnaire with regard to eight criteria: (a) Is the item relevant? (b) Is the item clear and unambiguous? (c) Are the response choices clear and unambiguous? (d) Are the response choices exhaustive? (e) Are the rating scales appropriate (Items 3, 7, and 8)?
(f) Does each item appear in a logical sequence? (g) Does the item need to be discarded? and (h) Do other items need to be included? (Appendix G). It was decided that approval of an item by three of the four judges, as indicated by Item g above, was sufficient to include the item in the final form of the questionnaire since this represented a majority decision of the judges. None of the original items were discarded. Some items, however, were revised; the position of others in the questionnaire was changed; some items were included that were not included in the original draft and additional response choices for some of the items were recommended for the final form of the questionnaire.

Data Collection

On March 18, 1986 each of the 98 institutions was sent a packet containing seven questionnaires, explanatory cover letters, and self-addressed stamped envelopes. The questionnaires were coded according to institutions so that follow-up letters could be sent to non-respondents. By April 7, 1986, the return date indicated on the initial cover letter, 111 surveys had been returned. One complete package was returned by the post office as undeliverable.

On April 8, 1986, follow-up letters were sent to the institutions that had not responded (Appendix H). The final date for receiving returns was extended to
April 22, 1986. The follow-up letters yielded an additional 56 responses. Communication from the former presidents of Lomax-Hannon Junior College and Morristown College indicated that those institutions were no longer operative. The elimination of these three institutions, Shaw College at Detroit, Lomax-Hannon Junior College, and Morristown College reduced the sample to 95 institutions receiving a total of 665 questionnaires. By the end of the cut-off date, 167 surveys had been returned representing 51 historically black institutions. This constituted 53.6 percent of the HBCUs that were eligible participants and 25.1 percent of the individuals sampled. Of the 190 administrators surveyed, 101 (53.1 percent) responded while 66 (13.89 percent) of the 475 faculty members surveyed responded.

Respondents were requested in item four of the questionnaire to indicate their academic positions. Response choices were dean, department chairperson, and others. Space was provided to specify other positions. Such position titles as division chairperson, counselor, staff member, and assistant dean were indicated by respondents. Since data were to be tabulated in terms of perceptions held by deans, department, chairpersons, and faculty members, the researcher had to determine the most appropriate position (dean, department chairperson, or faculty member) in which to include those responses. Space
was also provided in item five for an alternate response. Such responses, however, did not have to be reclassified.

Method of Presentation and Analysis of Data

The responses for each item on the survey were computer tabulated for frequency counts and percentages. Eleven of the 19 items were then coded and tabulated on record sheets; these items were further analyzed using programs available from the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS-X).

Regression analysis and factor analysis were the statistical procedures used to determine the relationships specified in the research questions. The data were analyzed to determine what effects the demographic factors, perceptions of inhibiting factors, funding, and the need for a faculty development program had upon the respondents' perceptions of the achievement of program goals and purposes.

Factor analysis was employed with questions three, four, and five to determine if there were identifiable factors that were moderately or highly correlated with one another in forming perceptions concerning the achievement of faculty development goals and purposes. Factor analysis is particularly helpful in investigations utilizing a large number of variables because it provides a basis for reducing these factors to a few making the
data more manageable for analysis and interpretation (Borg and Gall, 1979). Regression analysis was used to single out the factor which had the most prediction value concerning perceptions of whether or not goals are being met. Survey items used in the analysis were items one through six (demographic data); seven and eight (items concerning the existence of and the perceived need for a faculty development program), item ten (ratings of the extent to which goals are being met), eleven (funding) and item sixteen (ratings of the extent to which goals and purposes are being met).

In answering the questions related to the problem, the corresponding data are displayed in tables and analyzed in terms of the tables. Much of the data is ordinal in nature; therefore, an appropriate statistical procedure is ranking. The overall rankings of the responses are displayed in the tables.
Chapter 4
Presentation and Analysis of Data

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors which affect the effectiveness of faculty development programs in historically black institutions through ascertaining the perceptions of deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members. The participants were restricted to those who work with freshmen or freshman programs.

Five research questions were developed which addressed more specifically the intent of this study. In order to provide the data for the research questions, a questionnaire consisting of 19 items was constructed. The first six items provided demographic data. The remaining items were designed to ascertain perceptions concerning various aspects of faculty development.

Presentation of Demographic Data

An examination of the demographic data in Table 1 reveals that male and female respondents were equally represented. Data also indicated that the majority of the respondents (66.6 percent) are between the ages of 30 and 50. Responses submitted by deans account for only 20.3 percent of the returns while responses submitted by
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairperson</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience in Higher Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and Over</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
department chairpersons (40.1 percent) and faculty members (39.5 percent) are almost equal. Almost half of the respondents, 42.6 percent have provided between 11 and 20 years of service to higher education. Over 81 percent of the respondents are black, and the various academic ranks are equally represented.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Relating to Question One

**Question One:** What do deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members in HBCUs perceive to be the primary goals and purposes of faculty development programs?

As displayed in Table 2, the most frequently indicated faculty development program goal and purposes was that of improving instructional skills (82.3 percent). This purpose was most frequently cited by respondents of all positions. Although exact rankings varied, all categories of respondents agreed that the next five primary goals and purposes include the following: (a) providing knowledge and understanding of current findings in academic disciplines (70.7 percent), (b) improving subject-matter competence (68.9 percent), (c) enhancing academic advisement skills (65.2 percent), (d) developing research skills (62.1 percent), and (e) developing computer skills (58.5 percent).
Table 2  Responses Concerning the Perceptions Related to Primary Faculty Development Goals and Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve instructional skills</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve subject matter competence</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance academic advisement skills</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop research skills</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop computer skills</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve problem-solving and</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop skills in grantsmanship</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop leadership skills</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase understandings of and</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve interpersonal skills</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance writing and speaking skills</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase understanding of and involvement</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To obtain competence in another subject matter</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 164
Corresponding with the overall perceptions of faculty development goals and purposes were the perceptions of the areas of the greatest faculty development needs. Instructional skills (22.6 percent) was perceived to be the area of greatest need. The areas of student communication skills development (21.3 percent) academic advisement (18.9 percent), and scholarly research (18.8 percent) also ranked highly (Table 3). Viewed separately, only deans (27.2 percent) cited instructional skills as the greatest area of need while department chairpersons (24.6 percent) listed communication skills, and faculty members (22.0 percent) chose research skills. All categories of respondents viewed student communication skills as a high-ranking area of need.
Table 3  Responses Concerning the Perceptions of Greatest Faculty Development Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional skills</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student communication skills development</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly research</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student analytical and mathematical skills development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 159*
The highest ranking overall first choice selection as appropriate faculty development activities were attending seminars, workshops, and symposia (27.8 percent), conducting scholarly research (25.3 percent) and attending professional conferences (22.7 percent). Deans (25 percent) and faculty members (33.8 percent) cited conducting scholarly research more often as a first choice selection, while department chairpersons (1.5 percent) did not view it as a priority activity. They ranked attending workshops, seminars, and symposia (37.5 percent) as highly appropriate activities. Table 4 displays overall results in more detail. The faculty members' first-choice activity corresponds with their perception of the greatest area of need.
Table 4 Responses Concerning the Perceptions of Appropriate Faculty Development Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending seminars, workshops, and symposia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting scholarly research</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional conferences</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolling in courses at your university</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading scholarly research</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in internal dialogue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing faculty members who are considered experts in the needed area of development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 158</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall the respondents chose commitment of faculty (56.3 percent), commitment of administrators (53.9 percent), availability of funds (46 percent) and motivation of faculty (46 percent) as major enhancers of faculty development efforts (Table 5).

Table 5 Responses Concerning the Perceived Enhancers of Faculty Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of faculty</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of administrators</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of faculty</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of money to finance programs</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved student performance</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty incentives/awards</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to react with other professionals with similar problems and interests</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 165
Improved academic performance (85.1 percent) was perceived to be the most frequently expected change in student performance as a result of faculty development efforts. Improvements in communication skills (76.5 percent) and improved study habits (67.2 percent) were also rated frequently. Responses were relatively consistent among deans, department chairpersons, and deans (Table 6). Improved instructional skills (82.3 percent), improved teaching/learning climates (77.9 percent) and increases in the degree of professional involvement (65.4 percent) were the most frequently expected changes in faculty performance as a result of faculty participation in development activities (Table 7). The most frequently cited perceived change in administrative performance or attitude was greater response to faculty needs (69.8 percent). Other frequently cited changes include improved commitments to program objectives and goals, improved communications with faculty and staff regarding department or college expectations, and greater efforts to increase faculty motivation. These results are displayed in Table 8.
Table 6 Responses Concerning Perceived Changes in Student Performance due to Faculty Development Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved academic performance</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in communications skills</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved study skills and habits</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in mathematical and analytical skills</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer student dropouts</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More appropriate programs and career choices</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased career opportunities</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More appropriate programs and career choices</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 162
Table 7  Responses Concerning Perceived Changes in Faculty Performance Due to Faculty Development Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved instructional skills</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved teaching/learning climate</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in the degree of professional involvement</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in professionalism</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in the number of funded proposals</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in the number and quality of paper presented at conferences</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in the use of analytical and problem-solving skills in teaching</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in the acceptance of leadership responsibilities</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in the number and quality of published works</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved standardized test scores</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 159
Table 8  Responses Concerning Perceived Changes in Administrative Performance and Attitudes Due to Faculty Development Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater response to faculty needs</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved commitments to program objectives and goals</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased willingness to accept innovative efforts of faculty</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved communication with faculty and staff regarding department or college expectations</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater efforts to increase faculty motivation</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased faculty involvement in program planning</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater understanding of student needs</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased participation of administrators in developmental activities</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased level of accountability</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased program follow-up</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased accuracy in program evaluations</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 156
Presentation and Analysis of Data
Relating to Question Two

**Question Two:** What factors are perceived by deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members to be major inhibitors to the realization of established faculty development goals and purposes?

The presentation and analysis of data concerning question two must begin with the presentation and analysis of data relating to the perceptions of the major faculty development program goals and purposes followed by the perceptions of the goals that are not adequately being met. With these items in focus, it then becomes possible to analyze these perceived inhibitors in terms of those unmet goals.

Previously in this chapter, it was determined that the overall perceived goals and purposes include improving instructional skills, keeping abreast of new developments in the respective academic areas, and improving academic advisement skills. Faculty members also rated developing research skills highly as a faculty development goal. With these goals in mind, Table 9 displays faculty rankings of the goals and purposes that the respondents feel are being inadequately met. Items are ranked in terms of frequency.

The following items were rated by the respondents as being inadequately met: developing research skills
(35.7 percent); developing skills in grantsmanship (22.4 percent); acquiring knowledge and understanding of current findings in academic disciplines (20.0 percent); increasing understandings of and participation in college or university governance (20.0 percent); and increasing understanding of and participation in community problems (20.0 percent). Those goals that are ranked lowest included improving academic advisement skills (12.7 percent); improving instructional skills (12.1 percent); and development skills in the use of computers/technology (9.0 percent).
### Table 9  Responses Concerning the Perceptions of Unobtained Goals and Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To develop research skills</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop skills in grantsmanship</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide knowledge and understandings of current findings in academic findings</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase understandings of and participation in college or university governance</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase understandings of and participation in college or university governance</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance writing and speaking skills</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve interpersonal skills</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop leadership skills</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide problem-solving and analytical skills</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop sociological understandings of the student population</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve academic advisement skills</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve instructional skills</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop skills in the use of computers/technology</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 156
Table 10 displays total survey responses which reveal those factors which are perceived to be major inhibitors of faculty development efforts. Limited funds (59.1 percent); heavy teaching loads (40.2 percent); lack of faculty incentives/rewards (36.5 percent); lack of support from administrators (33.5 percent); and lack of time to attend conferences, workshops, symposia, etc., (25 percent) are the 5 most frequently indicated inhibitors of faculty development efforts. Limited funds are rated as the major inhibitor of faculty development efforts across all three positions lines. Discrimination and inaccessibility to technological equipment are ranked by all positions at or near the bottom of the list making them minor inhibitors.
Table 10 Responses Concerning the Perceived Inhibitors of Faculty Development Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited funds</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy teaching loads</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of faculty incentives/rewards</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from administrators</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to attend conferences, workshops, symposia, etc.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown in communication systems</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities to conduct research</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative resistance to change</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of faculty motivation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty resistance to change</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no program follow-up</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commonality among departmental, college, and faculty needs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear perception of program objectives</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate program evaluation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manditory participation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative participation in activities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessibility to technological equipment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited access to publishers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination (sex, racial, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 164
Presentation and Analysis of Data Relating to Questions Three, Four, and Five

Questions Three: What effects do perceptions concerning inhibiting factors have on respondents' perceptions of the achievement of program goals and purposes?

Question Four: What effects do perceptions concerning the funding of, the existence of, and the need for a faculty development program have on respondents' perceptions of the achievement of program goals and purposes?

Question Five: What effect do demographic factors have on respondents' perceptions of the achievement of program goals and purposes?

In order to address the effects of the perceptions specified in these questions, it is first necessary to examine the corresponding perceptions held by respondents. Those perceptions concern (a) inhibiting factors, (b) funding, (c) the existence of faculty development programs, and (d) the need for a faculty development program. Demographic data will also be reviewed.

As determined by the data relating to question two, the major inhibitors of faculty development efforts are perceived to be limited funding (59.1 percent), heavy teaching loads (40.2 percent) lack of faculty incentives and rewards (36.5 percent) and lack of support from
administrators (35.5 percent). Inasmuch as funding is listed as the highest-ranking inhibitor of faculty development efforts, a further analysis of perceptions related to the funding of faculty development programs is appropriate.

Total response figures reveal that 22.4 percent of all respondents perceive funding as being adequate, 27.8 percent perceive it to be inadequate, and another 27.8 percent of the respondents are undecided. This division is similar across all positions with faculty members being the only category to perceive the funding of faculty development activities as adequate. Table 11 displays this data.
Table 11  Responses Concerning the Perceptions of Financial Allocations for Faculty Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, responses indicate that funding should come from state allocations (29.9 percent), and faculty members (33.3 percent) agree with this. Department chairpersons (35.8 percent) however, place this responsibility with the federal government, while 38.7 percent of the deans feel that these programs should be funded through private sources (Table 12). Data concerning the primary sources of support from the participating institutions were not collected. This information may have some bearing on the responses.
Table 12 Responses Concerning the Perceptions of Appropriate Sources of Funding for Faculty Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dean N</th>
<th>Dean %</th>
<th>Chairpersons N</th>
<th>Chairpersons %</th>
<th>Faculty N</th>
<th>Faculty %</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 167
Only 46.6 percent of the respondents indicated that there is a structured faculty development program in their school or department, while overall, 95.5 percent of the total respondents perceive a need for such a program. Table 13 gives a breakdown of the responses.

Table 13  Responses Concerning the Perceived Need for Faculty Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Yes N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Undecided N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairpersons</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Members</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 158
A review of Table 1 indicates that the majority of the respondents are black, and between the ages of 31 and 50. Department chairpersons and faculty members represent the majority of the respondents; 79.9 percent of the respondents are professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, and over 42.6 percent of the respondents have been affiliated with higher education for 11 to 20 years.

A factor analysis was conducted to determine if there were identifiable categories of factors which could be used to describe variables that were highly related in their effects upon respondents' perceptions of the achievement of program goals. The resultant matrix of factors yielded four factors; the items loading highest on each factor are listed as follows: (1) experience (.86812), age (.71107), rank (.65058); (2) structured development program (.70877), funds (.63797), program need (.51623); (3) inhibitors (.72798), sex (-.57331), position (.44744); and race (.85853), perception of goals met (.58.348). Table 14 displays the complete rotated factor matrix.

To identify the single factor with the strongest predictor value, a regression analysis was conducted. The analysis identified position as that factor. Appendix I summarizes the analysis indicating the multiple $R$ value, the $R^2$ value, the $F$ ration, and the level of significance.
Table 14  Rotated Factor Matrix of Variables Affecting Perceptions of the Achievement of Program Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.05436</td>
<td>.24244</td>
<td>-.57331*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.02091</td>
<td>-.03996</td>
<td>-.14926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.71107*</td>
<td>.02735</td>
<td>.10548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.41725</td>
<td>.21471</td>
<td>.44744*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>.65058*</td>
<td>-.08700</td>
<td>.11042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.96812*</td>
<td>.04348</td>
<td>-.14080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. Prog.</td>
<td>.08561</td>
<td>.70877*</td>
<td>-.10502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>.08973</td>
<td>-.51623*</td>
<td>-.17202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibit</td>
<td>-.02528</td>
<td>.00618</td>
<td>.72798*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals Met</td>
<td>.16117</td>
<td>.26649</td>
<td>.38916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>.04438</td>
<td>.63797*</td>
<td>-.14167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

Summary of Findings

The purpose of conducting this study was to identify factors which are perceived to affect the effectiveness of faculty development programs at historically black institutions. Deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members who work with freshmen or freshman programs at HBCUs were surveyed. The "Perceptions of Faculty Development Programs Survey," developed by the researcher, was the instrument used to collect the necessary data.

Completed surveys were obtained from 167 respondents representing 51 HBCUs. Conclusions have been drawn based upon this sample and the answer to the five research questions. The analysis of the data uncovered several findings relative to perceptions held by administrators and faculty members of faculty development programs in HBCUs.

1. The most frequently indicated faculty development goal and purpose was improving instructional skills (82.3 percent).

2. The area of instructional skills was ranked as the area of greatest faculty development need (27.6 percent).
3. Attending seminars, workshops, and symposia (27.8 percent) were considered highly appropriate faculty development activities.

4. Commitments to the goals by faculty (56.3 percent) and administrators (53.7 percent) was perceived as the major enhancer of faculty development efforts.

5. Improved student performance (85.1 percent), improved instructional skills (82.3 percent), and greater response by administrators to faculty needs (69.8 percent) were the most frequently perceived changes as a result of faculty development efforts.

6. Developing research (35.7 percent) and grantsmanship skills (22.4 percent) were perceived as being inadequately addressed through faculty development efforts.

7. Improving academic advisement skills (12.7 percent), instructional skills (12.1 percent) and computer skills (9.0 percent) were ranked low indicating that these skills were perceived as being adequately met through faculty development efforts.
8. Limited funds (59.1 percent) was perceived to be the major inhibitor of effective faculty development programs.

9. Funding of faculty development programs was perceived as being adequate by 22.4 percent of the respondents and inadequate by 27.8 percent of the respondents. Another 27.8 percent of the respondents were undecided.

10. The state was the most frequently cited source of funding for faculty development programs (29.9 percent).

11. Structured faculty development programs was indicated as existing in schools and departments of 46.6 percent of the respondents.

12. Four factors were identified in the factor analysis. Those factors were related to experience, program status, inhibitors and race.

13. The regression analysis identified position as the strongest predictor variable.

14. There was little difference in the perceptions among deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members.
Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions have been drawn:

1. The perceptions among deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members relate to faculty development are basically compatible.

2. Faculty and administrators of HBCUs perceive a need for faculty development, feel that it can be effective, and want to improve and implement faculty development programs.

3. The compatibility of perceptions among deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members also indicates general agreement among historically black institutions concerning the goals and purposes of faculty development programs.

4. Faculty and administrators are interested in producing quality graduates and in promoting the survival of HBCUs.

5. There is general agreement between administrators and faculty that many of the established faculty development goals are not being adequately met.
6. The overall concern of faculty and administrators at HBCUs is for the improvement of student communication skills.

7. An examination of faculty responses reveal that they perceive faculty involvement in scholarly research as a departmental expectation or desire and feel the need to develop these skills through faculty development activities.

8. Although there is overwhelming support for faculty development programs, there are very few structured faculty development programs in historically black institutions.

9. At least three of the six highest ranking goals and purposes (improving academic advisement skills, improving instructional skills, and developing computer skills) were perceived as being adequately met through faculty development efforts.

10. Commitment to the goals and purposes by all levels within the schools or departments coupled with adequate funding for activities were perceived to be major
enhancers of the effectiveness of faculty development efforts.

11. Limited funding was perceived overall as the major inhibitor of faculty development efforts.

12. Faculty members and department chairpersons ranked lack of support from administrators as one of the top five inhibitors while deans ranked faculty resistance to change among the top five inhibitors.

13. The responses concerning the adequacy of funding for faculty development programs indicated that there was disagreement within the three positions but not among the position lives. Respondents were almost evenly divided in their responses. (Approximately one-third of the faculty members perceived funding to be adequate, one-third perceived it to be inadequate, and approximately one-third were undecided). The perceptions were basically the same for department chairpersons and for deans.
14. Although limited funding was perceived to be the major inhibitor, it did not appear to inhibit the development of computer and other technical skills in terms of accessibility to technological equipment.

15. Heavy teaching loads, lack of incentives and rewards, lack of administrative support, and insufficient time to attend enhancement activities were perceived to interfere with the effectiveness of faculty development efforts.

16. Three of the primary faculty development goals and purposes, improving instructional skills, improving academic advisement skills, and improving student communication skills were directly related to enhancing the development of students as opposed to enhancing the personal development of faculty members. These were the goals that were perceived as being adequately met through faculty development activities.

17. The goals that were perceived as being inadequately met through faculty development efforts (developing skills
in research and grantmanship, and developing understandings of current findings in academic disciplines) were more directly related to the personal development of the faculty although faculty enhancement ultimately affects the performance of students.

18. Improvement in student performance and in instructional skills, and greater response to faculty needs were perceived as being direct outcomes of participating in faculty development efforts.

19. Position appeared to be strongest predictor variable in determining perceptions of the effectiveness of faculty development efforts. Because its value was low, perhaps there are other variables not considered in this study such as organizational climate which may be stronger predictors.

Implications and Recommendations for Practice

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following implications and recommendations have been made for administrators and faculty developers in historically black institutions and for further research.
1. Inasmuch as historically black institutions train a significant percentage of black teacher graduates, passage rates on standardized certification tests must be increased. This points to a need for extensive professional development for education faculty members in order to promote more effective teaching methods and procedures.

2. If minority students are to have access to advanced educational and career opportunities, they need to be provided as freshmen with the necessary test-taking skills. This will require the enhancement and involvement of educators who work with freshmen or freshman programs because faculty must possess a working knowledge of test-taking techniques in order to help students become more effective test-takers.

3. While funds have been made available to implement remedial programs, it is equally important to allocate funds to provide faculty member with the assistance that they might need in developing the necessary competencies and in altering
their teaching techniques through faculty development activities.

4. The development of computer skills, a goal perceived as being adequately met through faculty development efforts, requires funding for instructors and/or for the computers. Since the inaccessibility to technological equipment is not perceived to be an inhibitor, it would seem that: (a) this equipment is accessed in ways that do not require funding; (b) that funds are provided to acquire the necessary equipment; or (c) that although this equipment is inaccessible, it does not prevent that goal from being met. A subject for investigation would be determining the funding required and the source of funding for providing training in this area as a possible avenue of funding for other faculty development areas.

5. Two of the other primary goals, improving instructional skills and improving academic advisement skills (which are perceived as being adequately met) also do not appear to be inhibited by limited
funding or lack of time, incentives, or administrative support. Perhaps these goals can be met with very little financial resources. Perhaps the time required is limited or provided by administrators. An area for investigation would be determining the types of activities involved in developing those skills, the amount of funding required, and the sources of funding for such activities.

6. Developing skills in research and grantsmanship, and acquiring knowledge and understanding of current findings in academic disciplines are areas that were perceived as being inadequately met through faculty development efforts. The attainment of these goals and purposes would necessarily require some financial resources, released time from teaching responsibilities, and incentives such as compensation, recognition, and overall support from administrators. These factors would allow faculty members to attend workshops and conferences, and to enroll in
classes that would enable these goals to be met.

7. The fact that there is support for faculty development programs in higher education is significant in that research conducted on the elementary and secondary levels indicates that teachers consider inservice to be an unnecessary infringement upon their time while higher education faculty consider faculty development to be valuable. Perhaps, participation in development activities in universities is more attractive because organized efforts are few whereas in many public systems, the number of faculty development activities is mandated.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based upon the conclusions of this investigation:

1. It is recommended that a more thorough investigation be conducted to determine the specific relationships between the demographic variable, position, and the perceptions of the effectiveness of faculty development efforts.
2. It was determined that the goals that are perceived as being adequately met are directly related to student performance. It is recommended that a study be conducted to determine the level of impact of faculty development activities on specified areas of student performance.

3. It is recommended that a more thorough study be conducted to determine which inhibitors affect which goals and purposes.

4. It is recommended that deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members of HBCUs utilize the data concerning perceived unmet goals and inhibitors to determine ways to address ineffective programs.

5. It is recommended that a replication of this study be conducted using a larger sample.

6. The responses to the questionnaire indicate that HBCU faculty and administrators: (a) feel a need for faculty development; (b) feel that it can be effective; (c) want to improve
ineffective programs; and (d) want to implement programs to address areas of need. It is, therefore, recommended that administrators and faculty developers accept this as a challenge and capitalize upon this stage of readiness by providing the faculty with quality programs that are based upon assessed needs.

7. Although faculty and administrators are in harmony in terms of goal perception, combined efforts to plan or improve faculty development programs have either not been attempted or have not been successful. For this reason, it is recommended that more attention be given to the reason for perceptions of ineffectiveness and to identifying the specific perceived inhibitor(s).

8. There is a need for increased funding in order to provide a development program of the caliber needed to produce positive results on teacher certification tests, increase retention rates, and to upgrade student communication and analytical skills. Conventional means of funding faculty
development activities have been inadequate; therefore, more creative ways of generating funds are necessary. Major emphasis should be placed upon improving skills in grantsmanship, one of the perceived unmet goals. Once this skill is developed, it can be used to secure grants that would provide faculty members the opportunity to enroll in classes or attend workshops, the time to devote to research, or the funds to provide rewards and incentives to upgrade skills. In other words, plans should be made to allow the meeting of a goal in one area to fund faculty development efforts in another area.

9. It is recommended that greater efforts be taken to enhance the effectiveness of faculty development programs at HBCUs by reducing teaching workloads, providing salary increases, or other incentives.

10. Administrators must take the lead in improving the quality of faculty development programs by setting positive tones. Commitment to the goals should be
evident in sincere efforts to support faculty needs and innovations.
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Appendix A

List of Historically Black Undergraduate Colleges and Universities
LIST OF HISTORICALLY BLACK UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Alabama

Alabama A&M University
Normal, AL

Alabama State University
Montgomery, AL

S.D. Bishop State Jr. College
Mobile, AL

Concordia College
Selma, AL

Lawson State Community College
Birmingham, AL

Lomax-Hannon College*
Greenville, AL

Miles College
Birmingham, AL

Oakwood College
Huntsville, AL

Selma University
Selma, AL

Stillman College
Tuscaloosa, AL

Talladega College
Talladega, AL

Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, AL

Arkansas

Arkansas Baptist College
Little Rock, AR

Philander Smith College
Little Rock, AR
Arkansas Continued

Shorter College
Little Rock, AR

University of Arkansas
Pine Bluff, AR

Delaware

Delaware State College
Dover, Delaware

District of Columbia

Howard University
Washington, D.C.

University of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Florida

Bethune-Cookman College
Daytona Beach, FL

Edward Waters College
Jacksonville, FL

Florida A&M University
Tallahassee, FL

Florida Memorial College
Miami, FL

Georgia

Albany State College
Albany, GA

Clark College
Atlanta, GA

Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley, GA

Morehouse College
Atlanta, GA
Georgia Continued

Morris Brown College
Atlanta, GA

Paine College
Augusta, GA

Savannah State College
Savannah, GA

Spelman College
Atlanta, GA

Kentucky

Kentucky State University
Frankfort, KY

Louisiana

Dillard University
New Orleans, LA

Grambling State University
Grambling, LA

Southern University A&M College
Main Office
Baton Rouge, LA

Southern University in New Orleans
New Orleans, LA

Southern University in Shreveport-Bossier
Shreveport, LA

Xavier University
New Orleans, LA

Maryland

Bowie State College
Bowie, MD

Coppin State College
Baltimore, MD
Maryland Continued

Morgan State University
Baltimore, MD

University of Maryland
Princess Anne, MD

Michigan

Shaw College at Detroit**
Detroit, MI

Mississippi

Alcorn State University
Lorman, MS

Coahoma Junior College
Clarksdale, MS

Jackson State University
Jackson, MS

Mary Holmes College
West Point, MS

Mississippi Industrial College
Holly Spring, MS

Mississippi Valley State University
Itta Bena, MS

Natchez Junior College
Natchez, MS

Prentiss Normal and Industrial Institute
Prentiss, MS

Rust College
Holly Springs, MS

Tougaloo College
Tougalo, MS

Utica Junior College
Utica, MS
Missouri

Lincoln University
Jefferson City, Missouri

North Carolina

Barber-Scotia College
Concord, NC

Bennett College
Greensboro, NC

Elizabeth City State University
Elizabeth City, NC

Fayetteville State University
Fayetteville, NC

Johnson C. Smith University
Charlotte, NC

Livingstone College
Salisbury, NC

North Carolina A&T State University
Greensboro, NC

North Carolina Central University
Durham, NC

Shaw University
Raleigh, NC

St. Augustine's College
Raleigh, NC

Winston-Salem State University
Winston-Salem, NC

Ohio

Central State University
Wilberforce, OH

Wilberforce University
Wilberforce, OH
Oklahoma
Langston University
Langston, OK

Pennsylvania
Cheyne State College
Cheyne, PA

Lincoln University
Lincoln, PA

South Carolina
Allen University
Columbia, SC

Benedict College
Columbia, SC

Chaflin College
Orangeburg, SC

Clinton Junior College
Rock Hill, SC

Morris College
Sumter, SC

South Carolina State College
Orangeburg, SC

Voorhees College
Denmark, SC

Tennessee
Fisk University
Nashville, TN

Knoxville College
Knoxville, TN

Lane College
Jackson, TN

LeMoyne-Owen College
Memphis, TN
Tennessee Continued

Meharry Medical College
Nashville, TN

Morristown College*
Morristown, TN

Tennessee State University
Nashville, TN

Texas

Bishop College
Dallas, TX

Houston—Tillotson College
Austin, TX

Jarvis Christian College
Hawkins, TX

Paul Quinn College
Waco, TX

Prairie View A&M University
Prairie View, TX

Southwestern Christian College
Terrell, TX

Texas College
Tyler, TX

Texas Southern University
Houston, TX

Wiley College
Marshall, TX

Virginia

Hampton Institute
Hampton, VA

Norfolk State University
Norfolk, VA

St. Paul's College
Lawrenceville, VA
Virginia State University
Petersburg, VA

Virginia Union University
Richmond, VA

*Inoperative

**Surveys returned by Post Office
Appendix B

Perceptions of Faculty Development Programs Survey
PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS SURVEY

This instrument is designed to elicit the perceptions of administrators and faculty members concerning factors which influence the effectiveness of faculty development programs in "Historically Black Colleges."

PART I. DEMOGRAPHICS

Please respond to each of the following items:

1. Sex: Male_______ Female_______
2. Race: Black_______ White_______ Other_______
3. Age: 21-30_______ 31-50_______ Over 50_______
4. Position held at institution: Dean_______ Department Chairperson_______
   Faculty Member_______ Other (Please specify)_______
5. Academic Rank: Professor_______ Associate Professor_______
   Assistant Professor_______ Instructor_______ Other (Specify)_______
6. Years of employment in higher education:
   0-5_______ 6-10_______ 11-20_______ 21 and above_______

PART II. PERCEPTIONS

Please indicate your perceptions concerning faculty development programs in your college or department by responding to each item as directed.

7. Is there a structured faculty development program in your school or department?
   Yes_______ No_______

8. Do you perceive a need for a faculty development program in your college or department?
   Yes_______ No_______ Undecided_______
9. What do you perceive to be the primary goals and purposes of faculty development programs in your college or department? (Check all that apply.)

a. _____ To develop research skills
b. _____ To develop skills in grantsmanship
c. _____ To enhance writing and speaking skills
d. _____ To provide knowledge and understanding of current findings in academic disciplines
e. _____ To improve interpersonal skills
f. _____ To improve instructional skills
g. _____ To enhance academic advisement skills
h. _____ To develop sociological understandings of the student population
i. _____ To improve problem-solving and analytical skills
j. _____ To develop leadership skills
k. _____ To increase understandings of and participation in college or university governance
l. _____ To develop computer skills
m. _____ To improve subject matter competence
n. _____ To obtain competence in another subject matter area
o. _____ To increase understandings of and involvement in community problems.
p. _____ Other (Please specify)

10. What are your perceptions of the extent to which the college or department where you are working is meeting the following goals and purposes? Circle the response that best indicates your perceptions using the following scale:

1 = inadequate; 3 = adequate; 5 = highly adequate

a. To develop research skills  
   1 2 3 4 5
b. To develop skills in grantsmanship  
   1 2 3 4 5
c. To enhance writing and speaking skills  
   1 2 3 4 5
d. To provide knowledge and understanding of current findings in academic disciplines  
   1 2 3 4 5
e. To improve interpersonal skills  
   1 2 3 4 5
f. To improve instructional skills  
   1 2 3 4 5
g. To improve academic advisement skills  
   1 2 3 4 5
h. To develop sociological understandings of the student population
   1 2 3 4 5
i. To provide problem-solving and analytical skills
   1 2 3 4 5
j. To develop leadership skills
   1 2 3 4 5
k. To increase understandings of and participation in college or university governance
   1 2 3 4 5
l. To develop skills in the use of computers/technology
   1 2 3 4 5
m. To increase understandings of and participation in community problems
   1 2 3 4 5
n. Others (Please specify)____________________________

11. Do you perceive the funding of faculty development efforts in your college to be adequate?

   Yes_______ No_______ Undecided_______

12. What do you perceive to be the most appropriate source of funding for faculty development programs? Check one response.

   a. ____ State
   b. ____ University
   c. ____ Federal
   d. ____ Private
   e. ____ Other (Specify)____________________________

13. What faculty development activities do you perceive to be the most appropriate for meeting the goals and purposes in your department or college? Please rank the top three choices. Use one (1) for your first choice and three (3) for your last choice.

   a. ____ Reading scholarly research
   b. ____ Conducting scholarly research
   c. ____ Attending professional conferences
   d. ____ Attending seminars, workshops, and symposia
   e. ____ Enrolling in courses at your university or at other universities
   f. ____ Observing faculty members who are considered experts in the needed area of development
   g. ____ Engaging in internal dialogue
   h. ____ Others (Please specify)
14. In what areas in your college or department do you perceive the greatest need for faculty development activities? Rank the top five choices. Use one (1) for your first choice and five (5) for your last choice.

a. _____ Academic advisement
b. _____ Personal counseling
c. _____ Student communication skills development
d. _____ Student analytical and mathematical skills development
e. _____ Instructional skills
f. _____ Scholarly research
g. _____ Proposal writing
h. _____ Others (Please specify) _______________________________

15. What factors do you perceive as being major enhancers of faculty development activities in your department or college? Rate each item. Use one (1) for minor enhancers and five (5) for major enhancers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Enhancers</th>
<th>Major Enhancers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Commitment of faculty</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Commitment of administrators</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Motivation of faculty</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Availability of money to finance programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Faculty incentives/awards</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Improved student performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Opportunities to react with other professionals with similar problems and interests</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Internal dialogue</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Others (Specify) _______________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Which of the factors listed below do you perceive to be major inhibitors of faculty development efforts in your college or university? Rate each item. Use one (1) for minor inhibitors and five (5) for major inhibitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Inhibitor</th>
<th>Major Inhibitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Limited access to publishers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Limited opportunities to conduct research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Lack of time to attend conferences, workshops, symposia, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Lack of faculty motivation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Lack of faculty incentives/rewards</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Lack of support from administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Limited funds</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Discrimination (sex, racial, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Inaccessibility to technological equipment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Lack of faculty involvement in program planning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Faculty resistance to change</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Administrative resistance to change</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Unclear perception of program objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Lack of commonality among departmental, college, and faculty needs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Breakdown in communication systems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Little or no program follow-up</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Inadequate program evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Mandatory participation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Lack of administrative participation in activities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Heavy teaching loads</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Other (Specify)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. What changes do you perceive in student performance as direct outcomes of faculty participation in development programs in your college or department? Check all that apply.

a. _____ Improvements in communications skills
b. _____ Improvements in mathematical and analytical skills
c. _____ More independence in course and program selections
d. _____ More appropriate programs and career choices
e. _____ Improved study skills and habits
f. _____ Increased career opportunities
g. _____ Improved academic performance
h. _____ Fewer student drop-outs
i. _____ No change
j. _____ Others (Specify)______________________________

18. What changes do you perceive in faculty performance as direct outcomes of faculty participation in development programs in your college or department? Check all that apply.

a. _____ Increases in the number and quality of published works
b. _____ Increases in the number and quality of papers presented at conferences
c. _____ Increases in the number of funded proposals
d. _____ Increases in the use of analytical and problem-solving skills in teaching
e. _____ Increases in professionalism
f. _____ Improved instructional skills
g. _____ Increases in the acceptance of leadership responsibilities
h. _____ Increases in the degree of professional involvement
i. _____ Improved teaching/learning climate
j. _____ Improved standardized test scores
k. _____ No change
l. _____ Other (Specify)______________________________
19. What changes do you perceive in the performance and attitudes of administrators as direct outcome of faculty development programs? Check all that apply.

   a. _____ Greater response to faculty needs
   b. _____ Improved commitments to program objectives and goals
   c. _____ Greater understanding of student needs
   d. _____ Increased program follow-up
   e. _____ Increased accuracy in program evaluations
   f. _____ Increased participation of administrators in developmental activities
   g. _____ Greater efforts to increase faculty motivation
   h. _____ Increased faculty involvement in program planning
   i. _____ Improved communication with faculty and staff regarding department or college expectations
   j. _____ Increased willingness to accept innovative efforts of faculty
   k. _____ Increased level of accountability
   l. _____ No change
   m. _____ Other (Specify)_______________________________________________________
Appendix C

Letter to Administrators
March 17, 1986

Dear College Administrator:

I am writing you today to solicit your cooperation in a research project which is designed primarily to identify factors which are perceived to influence the effectiveness of faculty development programs at "Historically Black Colleges and Universities." Responses to a questionnaire are being sought from select administrators and faculty members who are associated directly with freshman programs and students.

You have been identified as one who is knowledgeable of faculty development efforts at your institution and one who would be willing to lend your expertise to the project. Therefore, I am asking you to take a few minutes and identify one other administrator and five faculty and staff members to participate in this project. A "Perceptions of Faculty Development Programs Questionnaire", a cover letter, and a self-addressed envelope has been enclosed for each of you. Please forward one of the enclosed survey packets to each of the other participants at your earliest convenience. I would like to have the completed surveys on or before April 7, 1986.

Your involvement in this project is needed and highly appreciated.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Saundra J. Winston
Appendix D

Letter to Faculty Members
March 17, 1986

Dear Educator:

New developments in knowledge and technology, and changes in student populations have compelled many colleges and universities to implement faculty development programs in order to meet the resulting new challenges. While some efforts to enhance the performance of faculty members have been perceived as largely effective, others have been perceived as largely ineffective.

I am writing you today to solicit your cooperation in a research project which is designed primarily to identify factors which are perceived to influence the effectiveness of faculty development programs at "Historically Black Colleges and Universities." Responses to a questionnaire are being sought from you and other select administrators and faculty members who are associated with freshman programs and students.

You have been identified as one who is knowledgeable of faculty development efforts at your institution and as one who would be willing to lend your expertise to this project. Therefore, I am asking you to take a few minutes; complete the "Perceptions of Faculty Development Programs Questionnaire", and mail it to me in the self-addressed envelope on or before April 7, 1986.

Your involvement in this project is needed and highly appreciated. Hopefully, the findings of the study will aid in the implementation of more effective faculty development programs at institutions of higher education which serve large numbers of black students.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Saundra J. Winston

Saundra J. Winston
Appendix E

Original Draft of Survey
PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

PART 1. DEMOGRAPHICS

Please indicate the correct response for each item.

1. Sex: Male _______ Female _______

2. Race: Black _______ White _______ Other _______

3. Age: 21-30 _______ 31-50 _______ over 50 _______

4. Name of University ____________________________

   Name of College __________________________________

   Name of Academic Department _______________________

5. Position held at institution: Dean _______ Department Chairperson _______

   Faculty Member _______ Other (Please Specify) _______

6. Academic Rank: Professor _______ Associate Professor _______

   Assistant Professor _______ Instructor _______ Other (Specify) _______

7. Years of employment in higher education:

   0-5 _______ 6-10 _______ 11-20______ 21 and above _______
PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

PART II. PERCEPTIONS

Please indicate your perceptions concerning faculty development programs in your college of department by responding as directed to each item.

1. Do you perceive a need for a faculty development program in your college or department?
   Yes ________  No ________  Undecided ________

2. What do you perceive to be the primary goals and purposes of faculty development programs in your college or department? (Check all that apply)
   a. __ To develop research skills
   b. __ To develop skills in grantsmanship
   c. __ To enhance writing and speaking skills
   d. __ To provide knowledge and understanding of current findings in academic disciplines
   e. __ To improve interpersonal skills
   f. __ To improve instructional skills
   g. __ To enhance academic advisement skills
   h. __ To develop sociological understandings of the student population
   i. __ To improve problem-solving and analytical skills.
   j. __ To develop leadership skills
   k. __ To increase understandings of and participation in college or university governance
   l. __ To develop computer skills
   m. __ Others (Please Specify)
3. What are your perceptions of the extent to which the college or department where you are working is meeting the following goals and purposes? Circle the response that best indicates your perceptions using the following scale: 1= not at all; 2= to some extent; 3= to a great extent.

a. To develop research skills
b. To develop skills in grantsmanship
c. To enhance writing and speaking skills
d. To provide knowledge and understandings of current findings in academic disciplines
e. To improve interpersonal skills
f. To improve instructional skills
g. To improve academic advisement skills
h. To develop sociological understandings of the student population
i. To provide problem-solving and analytical skills
j. To develop leadership skills
k. To increase understandings of and participation in college or university governance
l. To develop skills in the use of computers
m. Others (Please Specify)
4. What do you perceive to be the most appropriate source of funding for faculty development programs? Check one response.
   a. _____ State
   b. _____ University
   c. _____ Federal
   d. _____ Private
   e. _____ Other (Specify)

5. What faculty development activities do you perceive to be the most appropriate for meeting the goals and purposes in your department or college? Please rank your top three marking 1 for your first choice and 3 for your last choice.
   a. _____ Reading scholarly research
   b. _____ Attending professional conferences
   c. _____ Attending seminars, workshops, and symposia
   d. _____ Enrolling in additional courses at your university or at other universities
   e. _____ Observing other faculty members who are considered experts in the needed area of development
   f. _____ Others (Please specify)
6. In what areas in your college or department do you perceive the greatest need for faculty development activities? Rank the top five marking 1 for your first choice and 5 for your last choice.

- Academic advisement
- Personal counseling
- Student communication skills development
- Student analytical and mathematical skills development
- Instructional skills
- Scholarly research
- Proposal writing
- Others (Please Specify)

7. What factors do you perceive as being major enhancers of faculty development activities in your department or college? Rate each item marking 1 for major enhancers and 5 for minor or insignificant enhancers.

- Commitment of faculty
- Commitment of administrators
- Motivation of faculty
- Availability of money to finance programs
f. Faculty incentives  & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 

h. Improved student performance & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 

i. Opportunities to react with other professionals with similar problems and interests & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 

j. Other (Specify) & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 

8. Which of the factors listed below do you perceive to be major inhibitors of faculty development efforts in your college or university? Rate each item marking 1 for major inhibitors and 5 for minor or insignificant inhibitors.

a. Limited access to publishers & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 
b. Limited opportunities to conduct research & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 
c. Lack of time to attend conferences, workshops, etc. & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 
d. Lack of faculty motivation & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 
e. Lack of faculty incentives & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 
f. Lack of faculty rewards & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 
g. Limited funds & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5
h. Discrimination (sex, racial, etc.)

i. Inaccessibility to technological equipment

j. Lack of faculty involvement in program planning

k. Faculty resistance to change

l. Administrative resistance to change

m. Negative perceptions of program objectives

n. Incongruence between needs of department or college and needs of faculty

o. Lack of faculty awareness of department or college expectations

p. Little or no program follow-up

q. Lack of non-monetary support for programs

r. Inadequate program evaluation

s. Mandatory participation

t. Lack of administrative participation in activities

9. What changes do you perceive in student performance as direct outcomes of faculty participation in development programs in your college or department. Check all that apply.

a. ___ Improvements in communications skills

b. ___ Improvements in mathematical and analytical skills

c. ___ More independence in course and program selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Inhibitor</th>
<th>Minor Inhibitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. ___ More appropriate program and career choices

e. ___ Improved study skills and habits

f. ___ Increased career opportunities

g. ___ Fewer students on academic probation

h. ___ Fewer student drop-outs

i. ___ Others (Specify) ____________________________________________

10. What changes do you perceive in faculty performance as direct outcomes of faculty participation in development programs in your college or department? Check all that apply.

a. ___ Increases in the number and quality of published works

b. ___ Increases in the number and quality of papers presented at conferences

c. ___ Increases in the number of funded proposals

d. ___ Increases in the use of analytical and problem-solving skills in teaching

e. ___ Attainment of competencies for other teaching areas

f. ___ Improved instructional skills

g. ___ Increases in the acceptance of leadership responsibilities

h. ___ Increases in the degree of professional involvement

i. ___ Improved teaching/learning climate

j. ___ Other (Specify) ____________________________________________
II. What changes do you perceive in the performance and attitudes of administrators as direct outcomes of faculty development programs? Check all that apply.

a. Greater response to faculty needs
b. Improved commitments to program objectives and goals
c. Greater understanding of student needs
d. Increased program follow-up
e. Increased accuracy in program evaluations
Appendix F

Panel of Validators
PANEL OF VALIDATORS

Dr. Willie C. Armstrong
Assistant to the Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. James H. Fortenberry, Professor
of Education
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. Philip Bradley, Professor
Education Administration
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Coy Williams, Professor
Department of Psychological Services
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Olivia Boggs, Professor
Education Administration
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. John H. Jones, Professor
Special Education
Alabama State University
Montgomery, Alabama

Dr. Ruby Thompson, Department
Chairperson, Curriculum Department
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Ganaga Persaud, Department
Chairperson, Administration Department
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia
Appendix G

Validation Form
VALIDATION FORM

Instructions: Please evaluate each item on the questionnaire with regard to the criteria below. Check in the space labeled yes or no in response to each item. Space has been provided following the eight evaluation criteria in the event that you desire to elaborate on particular responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validation Criteria</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the item relevant to the subject?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the item clear and unambiguous?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the response choices clear and unambiguous?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are the response choices exhaustive?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are the rating scales appropriate (Item #3, #7, &amp; #8)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does each item appear in a logical sequence?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Criteria</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the item need to be discarded?</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do other items need to be included?</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

---

---

---

---
Appendix H

Follow-up Letter
April 7, 1986

Dear Administrator:

A short time ago I mailed to you a packet of seven questionnaires and asked the cooperation of several members of your faculty in an investigation of the factors affecting the effectiveness of faculty development programs in historically black institutions. Since the instrument was submitted to a select group it is vital that I secure the reactions of those faculty members.

Please encourage the seven members of your faculty that you identified to participate to use the stamped, self-addressed envelopes that were provided to return the completed surveys to me. It is imperative that I complete the study by the end of April. Thank you again for your much needed assistance.

Sincerely,

Saundra Winston

Saundra Winston
Appendix I

Results of Regression Analysis
APPENDIX I

RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS

| Multiple R | .25854 |
| R Square   | .06684 |
| Adjusted R. Square | .05972 |
| Standard Error | 11.16206 |

$F = 9.98364$  
Significant $F = .0027$

VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SIG T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>4.15980</td>
<td>1.35796</td>
<td>.25854</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.95282</td>
<td>2.51170</td>
<td>.25854</td>
<td>9.138</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>BETA IN</th>
<th>PARTIAL</th>
<th>TOLER</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SIG T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.01227</td>
<td>.01238</td>
<td>.95103</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.8879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.11599</td>
<td>.11958</td>
<td>.99184</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>.1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01216</td>
<td>.01200</td>
<td>.90845</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.8914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>.14003</td>
<td>.13005</td>
<td>.80487</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>.1372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper</td>
<td>6.4759E-03</td>
<td>.00622</td>
<td>.86141</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.9436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devprg</td>
<td>.23987</td>
<td>.24802</td>
<td>.99761</td>
<td>2.919</td>
<td>.0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>-.11194</td>
<td>-.11573</td>
<td>.99742</td>
<td>-1.328</td>
<td>.1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibit</td>
<td>.17731</td>
<td>.18132</td>
<td>.97586</td>
<td>2.102</td>
<td>.0375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>.17528</td>
<td>.18071</td>
<td>.99.180</td>
<td>2.095</td>
<td>.0381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>