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ABSTRACT

Community College Faculty Attitudes on Professional Development Attendance and Incentives

By

Patricia T. LaFlamme

Dr. Dale Andersen, Examination Committee Co-Chair
Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Dr. Cecilia Maldonado, Examination Committee Co-Chair
Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The full-time teaching faculty of the Community College of Southern Nevada responded to a survey designed to gather their views on internal professional development activities coordinated by the Faculty Center for Learning & Teaching (FCLT). The survey items elicited what types of activities or attitudes interfered with faculty attendance at such activities and what potential incentives or rewards were attractive to them in return for their participation in the activities.

Significant findings for reasons that faculty do not participate in professional development primarily revolved around the faculty demographic characteristics of gender or teaching area (vocational or academic). This was true when considering teaching obligations, scheduled training times, content of sessions not serving to improve teaching, and no desire to participate.
In regard to incentives for participation in professional development activities
respondents generally favored a paid subscription to a professional publication or paid
dues for membership in a professional organization. Paid travel expenses (with
limitations) to professional conferences also had a lucrative overall response.

Written comments from faculty included suggestions for other types of incentives,
scheduling professional development activities, better marketing strategies for the FCLT,
and training topics to be offered.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

All strata of employees at a community college can benefit from professional development workshops and activities in order to effectively contribute to the institution’s goals.

Since the single most important resource is human rather than fiscal or physical, the continued high quality and flexibility of your faculty, support staff, and administrative staff should be assured by initiating comprehensive, college-wide, future-oriented, and personalized professional development programs of worth. (Norris, 1989, p.3)

As stated by Norris, the key to a successful professional development program is that it offers activities and opportunities perceived as being of worth by organizational members. Professional development programming for faculty can discourage future participation if it is seen by them as haphazardly planned and organized, has little or no relevance to their profession, or cannot be realistically applied.

In particular, community college faculty is on the front lines and will receive the credit or the blame when it comes to meeting students’ needs or institutional goals (Scott, 1990). They can make the difference between students’ understanding instead of confusion, satisfaction instead of disappointment, and success as opposed to failure. A faculty member can find it personally rewarding to better his/her best and can revitalize
him/herself by discovering more about his/her subject area as well as learning about new methods, materials, and activities with positive andragogical implications. An opinion poll of higher education faculty in the United States, which was sponsored by TIAA-CREF (2000), found that 56% of those polled felt that it was very important to be able to enhance their knowledge in the disciplines in which they taught.

Why Some?

“Some of the best teaching I have seen and some of the most dedicated and caring faculty members I have met are in the community colleges” (Parnell, 1985, p. 95). These words seem very complimentary; however, the use of the word “some” is very vague. If some of the best educators are in the community colleges, then, obviously, some are at the preschool level, some are in the public schools, and some are at universities. This statement could be one for community college instructors to take pride in if only the word some was replaced with most.

Clues in the Historical Background

Establishing a community college was the trend for educationally motivated communities in the 1960s and early 1970s. As new brick and mortar campuses were built, faculty development as well as other human resource development was necessary for the purposes of effectiveness and efficiency. In-service, as a faculty training delivery system, peaked in the 1970s during the heyday of America’s community colleges.

Community colleges went about the business of education and did not realize until the mid-1980s that a subtle change in the nation’s community colleges had
“...resulted from a potpourri of ingredients and the natural progression of a complex recipe that has been adapted over the years to meet individual tastes and needs” (Manzo, 1996, Introduction section, ¶ 3).

O'Banion (1997) once stated that, “Resistance to change is a hallmark of higher education” (p. 28). In order for institutions to appropriately respond to changes and challenges and yet remain competitive in attracting students, faculty must be willing to participate in professional development activities to accept and address these changes in their classrooms. Parnell (1985) wrote, “Folk wisdom has it that teachers are a generally dissatisfied lot and that...community college faculty members...are the most dissatisfied of all” (p. 94). Eaton (1989) supports this perception by writing, “...that faculty are angry, aging, and annoyed” (p. 36). The adage about change being the only constant in life may be very true. Even though change is expected to be continually occurring, it is still capable of producing negative attitudes in faculty; among those is financial restriction on opportunities for faculty professional development (Michael, 1996).

Even though faculty development has been strongly advocated for college-level instructors since the 1960s, it has been reported that its effects do not seem to have reached the classrooms (Murray, 1995; Schuster, Wheeler & Associates, 1990). It was not until the mid to late 1980s that American community colleges began to focus on quality teaching to facilitate student learning (Manzo, 1996).

Eaton (1989) commented on the challenges that had impacted higher education in the 1980s when she wrote, “Community colleges have been affected by...changes in student population and public expectation....These concerns may suggest a need for change in deep-rooted practices and attitudes” (p. 36). These changes are ongoing especially when
one considers the impact that technology has made in the field of education and how post-secondary institutions must stay abreast of changes and advances in technology in order to remain a competitor with other educational entities.

Is it possible to surmise that many community college faculty members are dissatisfied because changes are affecting their traditional ways of teaching, interacting with students, and contributing in service to their institutions? Is what they know right now sufficient to take them through the entire spans of their teaching careers? Are these educators to be exempt from lifelong learning? "...the faculty as a whole can be highly resistant to change...Faculty...do not embrace alternative ideas with enthusiasm..." (O'Banion, 1997, p. 29).

In their study, however, Fugate and Amey (2000) found that faculty generally felt that their careers were positively enhanced and/or affected by engaging in professional development activities.

Purpose of the Study

A full-fledged, comprehensive community college faculty development program traditionally includes orientation, andragogical training, career development assistance, recognition programs, and support in planning for retirement (Burnstad, 1994). In this sense, the Community College of Southern Nevada (CCSN) has a comprehensive faculty development program, but its program is not centralized. In fact, CCSN is a relative newcomer in regard to having any form of an internal faculty development office.

In January of 1998 CCSN set up an office to coordinate professional development activities for its faculty on all three campuses. The office was named the Faculty Center...
for Learning & Teaching (FCLT), and it was designated to report directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Reporting to a top executive of the college would not only show that the FCLT was an institutional priority, but it would also lend credibility to its efforts (Kapp, 1996). The director of this office recruited faculty to form the FCLT Advisory Committee and worked with this group in networking with as well as visiting other colleges to learn about other institutions' faculty development programs. The director ordered a limited amount of resource materials which faculty could borrow, hosted a breakfast to welcome the 110 faculty who were newly hired for the 1997-1998 academic year, and offered six workshops in the spring of 1998, all of which were related to using the computer. Near the middle of 1998, the director resigned, and in July of 1998 two faculty members were asked to take a reduction in their teaching loads and work as co-directors, sharing the duties and responsibilities related to the FCLT.

It is generally accepted that teaching is the heart of the community college (Outcalt, 2000). This idea is at the forefront in the student-centered Learning College concept at CCSN. The FCLT exists to encourage and facilitate faculty professional excellence. It develops, coordinates and promotes opportunities that can assist faculty in enhancing their professional skills - both inside and outside of the classroom - which, in turn, provide quality education for CCSN students. Thus, the individual faculty member and, in effect, the institution will be supporting both CCSN’s mission statement and goals.

The FCLT is not responsible for items of faculty interest such as retirement planning or the formal mentoring program; however, the FCLT works in conjunction with those who are responsible for these and other non-teaching related activities. By not being
required to “be all things to all people,” the FCLT can concentrate its efforts on professional excellence.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to determine how often CCSN faculty attended professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT between August 2000 and November 2002, why many CCSN faculty do not participate in FCLT offerings, and what incentives or inducements might be used or what other measures can be taken to motivate faculty to attend workshops, seminars, discussions, and other opportunities offered through the FCLT.

CCSN employs 606 full time administrative and teaching faculty as well as anywhere from 800 to 1200 part-time faculty each semester (C.P. Petrie, personal communication, October 9, 2002). With such a large number of instructors, it is amazing that there were usually less than 15 faculty members in attendance at the majority of the professional development sessions sponsored by the FCLT since its existence.

Conceptual Framework

The two predominant theories on workplace motivation are those of Abraham Maslow and Frederick Herzberg.

Maslow’s theory holds that motivation is intrinsic and that an individual is motivated by the next level of needs that s/he has not yet met. In respect to workplace motivation, once the four lower levels of needs are met, the last one left is self-actualization, which
encompasses self direction and personal responsibility for one’s own continued learning (as cited in O’Connor, Bronner, and Delaney, 1996).

Herzberg believed that an increase in employees’ motivation would occur if motivators were increased as maintenance (also referred to as **hygiene**) factors were decreased in number or in influence (Herzberg, 1993). He viewed achievement, recognition, advancement, responsibility and the actual work as motivators. Maintenance factors, on the other hand, were elements in the work environment itself such as relationships with all levels of co-workers, job security, salary, fringe benefits, supervisory practices, and corporate policies. Herzberg saw his motivators as blending with the higher levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs pyramid and his maintenance factors as fitting in with Maslow’s lower levels.

By combining these two theories, one can discern that the lower level needs/maintenance factors are represented by the work environment and that motivation is triggered when a person pursues self-actualization [Maslow] and is satisfied with what s/he has achieved in his/her job or is satisfied with the job itself [Herzberg] (as cited in Owens, 1995).

A study by Sergiovanni in the late 1960s tested Herzberg’s theory in an educational environment and reported that responsibility and teaching itself were highly motivating to instructors as was the possible opportunity for growth (as cited in Owens, 1995).

A third theory that may be applicable to this study is Victor Vroom’s Expectancy Theory. In this theory Vroom unarguably holds that needs cause behaviors to occur. He additionally states that workers view valued rewards/outcomes for their quality
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performance as a positive aspect of the work environment (as cited in Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson, 2001).

Through the questionnaire used in this study, the researcher attempted to determine what percentage of CCSN faculty feel a "need" for any aspect or amount of professional development and, therefore, voluntarily attended internal professional development activities. Additionally, the results of this study indicated what proportion of the faculty would view a reward system for professional development participation as a positive addition/nurturing function on the part of the institution.

If these workplace motivation theories are accurate in regard to the field of education, then the CCSN faculty should be holding the attitude that recognition, achievement, responsibility, and the work itself are genuine motivators if the faculty members are indeed aiming to achieve personal esteem and self-actualization (Owens, 1995).

It is a generally accepted belief that workers strive to do the best they can. The word workers should be substituted with the word faculty to be specific to this study. Therefore, it is generally assumed that college instructors are intrinsically motivated to be the best educators that they can be. Strategies by which they can improve themselves in regard to scholarship and teaching skills include participation in the various types of FCLT activities. Since many CCSN faculty did not take advantage of these opportunities in order to enhance their levels of professionalism, it was important to look for the variables that impeded their motivation to attend.

These variables included but were not limited to:

- not being intrinsically motivated
- not being satisfied with previous training sessions
session topics not being applicable to their particular needs
not seeing how to apply the target topic/skill to their subject areas
being already overworked
feeling underpaid in their jobs, so they do not want to take on anything "extra"
too involved with other aspects of their profession
too involved with other aspects of their lives
feeling under-appreciated
conflicts with time/other commitments
want incentives/rewards for attendance/participation
newly hired faculty members are too busy becoming acclimated to the institution
deans and students' evaluations are satisfactory, so they do not feel a need to improve
already experiencing "burn-out"

Since attendance and participation demand time, and since it takes effort (and sometimes hard work) to improve, some faculty members may find it easier to ignore or avoid professional development opportunities because mediocrity is acceptable at the least.

Research Questions

In the period spanning from January 1998 to June 1999, the 88 sessions offered or sponsored by the FCLT had an average attendance of 15 attendees (LaFlamme and Sherfield, 1999). In the 1999-2000 academic year, the 61 training activities yielded an average of 12 attendees (LaFlamme and Sherfield, 2000). Some of these attendees
participated in several of the offerings each year; others attended only one session. The research questions, therefore, were:

1. What patterns of attendance have been exhibited by CCSN faculty members at internal professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT?

2. What incentives, based on findings in a literature review, have been used elsewhere to motivate faculty to attend more often?

3. What incentives do CCSN faculty identify as attractive to them in return for their participation in internal professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT?

Research Design and Methodology

The FCLT's advisory committee is comprised of seven faculty members (three in vocational areas and four in academic subjects), two deans of vocational divisions, and one administrator from the college's Office of Grants and Educational Administration. This committee was used as a focus group whose comments and suggestions guided the design of this study.

Figures of the number of workshops that had been offered over the last two years and the average number of workshop attendees were presented to the FCLT Advisory Committee. A discussion followed, and the ensuing concerns, perceptions, and ideas were used as the basis on which to formulate the research questions and to customize the development of the items for the survey.
The 376 members of the full-time teaching faculty at CCSN during the Fall 2002 semester were the subjects of the study. This population of instructors allowed for all teaching faculty, whether tenure-track or non-tenure track, to be included for maximum input.

The study instrument was a paper/pencil questionnaire that consisted of three parts. Part I collected the demographic information of the subjects. Answers to items regarding information such as gender, age, tenure status, highest degree earned, division of the college in which one teaches, years of teaching experience, years of teaching at CCSN, and past attendance at professional development offerings were solicited.

Part II asked the faculty to report their professional development participation and to give actual reasons for instances of nonattendance. These items were answered through the use of a Likert-like scale. The instrument adapted items from pertinent questionnaires available in *The Handbook of Tests and Measurements in Education and the Social Sciences* by Lester and Bishop (2000) and from parts of an existing instrument used in a previous, similar study (Montgomery, 1990) and structured most of the survey items to be based on information in the literature review.

Part III consisted of one open-ended question that attempted to elicit faculty opinions as to what might be done to increase faculty frequency of attendance at in-house professional development activities offered through the FCLT. This item was included so as to allow for responses that were not options given in the items listed in Part II and that may be innovative, thus not found in the literature or anticipated by the researcher.

This comparative-descriptive study sought variables associated with nonattendance. The analysis includes descriptive statistics of the subjects and makes comparisons within
the existing faculty membership as well as explores relationships in the data through cross-tabulations. Chi-square tests were used to look at the relationships between selected variables.

Significance of the Study

At present the FCLT is a stand-alone office, and its activities are available to enhance faculty professional development. Faculty who attend and benefit from these activities do so on their own time, for their own knowledge, application, and satisfaction. The best attendance at workshops, panel discussions, master teacher demonstrations, hands-on computer software training, etc., is during the college’s in-service weeks, which occur during the week prior to the first day of classes in the spring and fall semesters. Attendance at these sessions generally ranges from eight to thirty participants. Opportunities for ongoing professional development are also available during the semesters. Attendance at the ongoing sessions generally ranges from six to twenty although an occasional session will have no one in attendance.

The researcher questioned how faculty viewed internal professional development activities. Perhaps attendance seemed so sparse because CCSN did not require attendance at them. Perhaps participation was proportionately low to the number of full-time faculty because it did not “count” when it came to achieving tenure or acquiring merit pay. Perhaps it was because the faculty body was using out-of-classroom time to plan and design lessons, grade assignments, perform committee work, or make contacts with the community, thus already using their valuable time to participate in other types of professional responsibilities.
A survey of 130 colleges by Murray (1999) resulted in not one of them having a formal, structured faculty development program with designated leadership to implement the program. Conversely, he questioned whether lack of leadership in such programming accounted for little enthusiasm for such activities on the part of the faculty. He also discovered that these colleges considered promotion into administrative positions, bestowment of tenure, and time off for sabbatical leaves to be the most favorable vehicles for professional development.

Other authors held that the input of faculty in their own professional development programming is crucial in order to address their real needs and to give them ownership in the resultant activities (Murray, 1999; Scott, 1990; Garinon, 1997).

In response to these findings and views, CCSN has the FCLT, a structured, professional, instructional development program for faculty with leadership that equals 80% of a full time administrative position. The FCLT also has a full-time administrative/technical assistant who takes responsibility for the clerical and technical functions of the office. The FCLT continuously solicits faculty input as to topics of need, anticipated need, or interest to be addressed through workshops or other types of activities. The logo for the FCLT includes its slogan “Promoting Professional Excellence”. The FCLT strives to achieve this philosophy by enhancing the instructors’ skills in teaching as well as knowledge in their disciplines and, ultimately, enriching their professional lives.

Enhancement of scholarship and improvement of teaching skills are critical issues for community college faculty in the twenty-first century. Most institutions subscribe to the
purpose of faculty professional development as improving the effectiveness of the faculty while renewing and maintaining their vitality for their professions.

The grand entrance of the electronic age into the post-secondary educational arena in the late 1980s had explosive implications, even for faculty who taught in non-technical subject areas. Technology impacted distance education, reshaped and updated vocational training programs, triggered new vocational programs and curricula, and has even found its way into technically equipped classrooms which are used by academic faculty. Technical skills are an asset as well as an advantage for today's community college instructor, no matter what his/her teaching field/discipline might be. As little as fourteen years ago it was rare to find in-house faculty professional development offices offering technology-for-teaching workshops to their faculty (Shapiro and Cartwright, 1998).

Technology, many times, overwhelms newly hired faculty, and that is usually not their only concern. Palmer (1989) observed that many of them “…undergo an acculturation process [into the new institution of employment] that diminishes faculty effort in instructional innovation and disciplinary scholarship…leading many new teachers to compromise their commitment to academic standards” (p. 431). Newly hired faculty members usually need to find the time to learn the technical skills that will help them to execute their duties better as well as efficiently; the FCLT offers many ongoing technology workshops for beginning, intermediate, and advanced learners.

Unfortunately, most teacher preparation programs offered at universities are not adequate insofar as preparing an individual to teach at a community college, so an institutionally supported professional development program is highly necessary. It is not unusual for newly hired faculty who leave business and industry to teach at a community
college to need assistance in “becoming an instructor”. This type of assistance includes training sessions on how to design a syllabus, how to construct fair and valid tests, etc. In most instances faculty can also participate in external professional development opportunities as the needs arise, usually more subject-based than teaching-based. Some external training seminars and activities are commercial offerings. Others allow colleges to join in partnerships with corporate America to augment their funding and to enhance their training (Shapiro and Cartwright, 1998).

Most importantly, community college faculty should have ongoing training workshops and activities available to assist and enable them to be more effective in teaching and in working with students. Learning how to accommodate students’ lack of preparedness for college level studies is a current concern (Garmon, 1997; Milosheff, 1990; Outcalt, 2000; Yates, 2000). Another pertinent and timely topic is how to understand and work effectively with a diverse, changing, adult student population (Alfano, 1993; Miller, 1997). In a student-centered institution such as CCSN there needs to be ongoing training sessions that address these issues.

This study, therefore, was significant in identifying steps and/or actions that could increase faculty enthusiasm to participate in professional development opportunities.

Limitations

Although the information gained from this study renders the opportunity to implement strategies to increase faculty attendance at FCLT professional development offerings, it may not be as helpful or easily applicable to other institutions that may be
experiencing the same phenomenon and, therefore, may be interested in the reasons for and the results of this study.

First, the study was conducted with CCSN faculty and the results will apply specifically to CCSN. Second, a nonrandom sample was used; the entire target population was the accessible population, and all were given the opportunity to participate in the study. Third, the results of this study and the implications were based on the assumption that all respondents were honest in their responses. Fourth, this study was intended to provide direction to the co-directors of the FCLT. The FCLT is not in itself a comprehensive faculty professional development program; therefore, the study will be narrowed to specifically address the concerns of the aspects of faculty professional development for which the FCLT is responsible. Finally, the results may be skewed because responses may not be obtained from a particular characteristic in the faculty population.

Delimitations

The delimitations initially followed the path of examining faculty motivation. Instructor motivation was defined to equate with attendance at faculty professional development opportunities, which was narrowed to include those occurring only internally and then only those sponsored by the FCLT. This process led the researcher to ask what actually interferes with attendance at some or all of the faculty development activities provided through the FCLT.
Definitions
In this study, the following definitions were applied for the terms listed below.

Academic - describes faculty or courses that come under the Arts and Letters, Philosophical and Regional Studies, and Sciences divisions of CCSN

Faculty - full-time teaching faculty positions, both tenure and non-tenure tracks

Faculty professional development - activities that: promote the faculty’s ability to teach effectively; allow faculty to enhance their knowledge in the subject area(s) that they teach; assist faculty to develop skills, both in and out of the classroom, that are related to the teaching profession

Motivation - self-initiated, voluntary participation

Vocational - describes faculty or programs that come under the Computer and Information Technology, Health Sciences, Business and Applied Technologies divisions of CCSN

Summary
Community colleges are constantly undergoing changes, and the most important changes are the ones that faculty need to make in order to best assist the learners in their classrooms.

Community colleges share the general philosophy that all individuals with potential have an equal opportunity for an education that can result in a career, ready them for transfer to a university, or lead to other positive changes in their lives. Community college faculty, therefore, are the mentors and instructors who can choose to accept and face the challenges of change by enhancing their professional skills.
The FCLT's mission is to facilitate faculty professional excellence. It encourages instructors to enhance their instructional skills, improve their technical skills, and enjoy the collegiality of their peers – all through participation in scholarly activities.

Many faculty, however, do not take advantage of the professional development opportunities offered on CCSN's three campuses. There are many possible reasons for their nonparticipation. They might be too involved with other professional responsibilities. They may already be satisfied with their current performance in the classroom. They may not rank professional development as a priority in either their careers or their lives.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was: to determine CCSN faculty attendance patterns at in-house professional development activities; to consult the literature to learn what others have found regarding faculty reasons for not participating as well as their viewpoints on the use of incentives/rewards; to uncover the CCSN faculty's reasons for nonattendance; and to determine if any incentives/rewards would be received well by them.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature with regard to the most common reasons for post-secondary faculty give for nonattendance at professional development activities as well as faculty members' appreciation for specific incentives and rewards. Chapter 3 discussed the design of the research study. Chapter 4 gives statistical results ascertained from the responses submitted; these results include crosstabulations and chi-square test results. Chapter 5 discusses the results, implications, recommendations for action, and recommendation for further study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Learning is a lifelong process. In regard to post-secondary faculty Boyer (1990) stated, "...good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners" (p. 24) and that faculty must seek and learn how they can best interact with their students for the purposes of transferring and extending knowledge. The purpose of faculty professional development is to enhance professional skills. This may mean borrowing or adapting strategies, methods, and activities but, most importantly, is the focus of becoming more skilled in instruction to ensure student learning in the classroom (van Note Chism, 2002).

The open door policy of the community college ushers students in despite their level of preparedness (Outcalt, 2000). Dedicated instructors may spend hours every week to find or develop teaching strategies to assist these students. Few could argue with Fairweather’s (1993) statement that “...enhancing teaching is a labor-intensive activity” (Improving Teaching section, ¶ 1). Boyer (1990) echoed this sentiment when he wrote, “One reason legislators, trustees, and the general public often fail to understand why ten or twelve hours in the classroom each week can be a heavy load is their lack of awareness of the hard work and the serious study that undergirds good teaching” (p. 23).

Newly hired faculty who do not hail from the field of education can greatly benefit from instruction in and support with teaching methods and skills. It is important to
provide plenty of varied types of support to the first year faculty members so that their confusion, frustration, and possible inadequacies in teaching may be rectified, thus saving them from being ousted from education and seeking a career in the private sector (Fugate and Amey, 2000). It is also crucial to provide veteran faculty members with opportunities to stay abreast of developments in their fields and to learn new and better ways to communicate and connect with students in the classroom.

In 1990 Boyer wrote that the definition of scholarship needed to be expanded so as to encompass a variety of activities that can help faculty to grow professionally. There are many available opportunities at CCSN by which members of the faculty can enhance their levels of quality of teaching…and professional development is the vehicle.

Although no research study has been uncovered that listed reasons given by faculty members for their non-attendance at internally sponsored professional development activities as its primary focus, studies, books, and articles that at least partially address issues and concerns associated with this study have been identified. Said issues and concerns that were found in a review of the literature were: faculty professional development as scholarship; faculty attitudes and reasons for attending/not attending; faculty motivation to participate in professional development; and administrators' perspectives on faculty development activities.

Faculty Professional Development

as Scholarship

Scholarship is an umbrella term. It is usually defined as including activities that help an instructor achieve and maintain "expertness" in his/her subject area or field. This
includes knowing about any debates, changes, challenges, new theories, advancements, etc., that have occurred or are recurring in his/her discipline and being able to successfully convey that knowledge to students (Parilla, 1987). Additionally, scholarship has been noted as being a prime vehicle by which a faculty member can be invigorated or revitalized (McKeachie, 1983).

Mahaffey and Welsh (1993) conducted a study at Midlands Technical College (South Carolina) to determine if the vitality of faculty was improved after they became involved in activities that promoted scholarship. They found that although faculty viewed scholarship as valuable overall, many of them did not involve themselves in enhancing it. Surprisingly, 47% of those surveyed expressed dissatisfaction in regard to their personal scholarship. These findings were supported by Palmer’s (1994) project which researched perceptions and behaviors of community college faculty. He commented that those who worked to better their teaching and who involved themselves in scholarship beyond the classroom were in the minority. He also felt that their belief that community colleges did not value out-of-classroom scholarship was reflected by the limited reward systems they tended to have.

There were many examples of the need for continuing education for faculty at post-secondary institutions. For instance, the faculty in Fugate’s and Amey’s (2000) study appreciated workshops on how to assess and adapt one’s teaching pedagogy to continually meet the changing needs of students; this idea included sessions on teaching methods and diversity in the classroom. In the case of technology training, it was written that it was crucial for professional development program to remain flexible so as to meet
the challenges posed by organizational needs, individual needs, and changing resources (Padgett and Conceicao-Runlee, 2000).

Dickinson (1999) held that community college faculty were transitioning into “learning process managers”. She purported that faculty members would have to relinquish some of their duties that interfered with this role, and they would also have to bypass outdated and inefficient procedures, methods, and tactics to tackle this student-centered responsibility. Faculty, therefore, should benefit from training to develop or hone the appropriate skills by which to prepare for such an important role.

Faculty Attitudes and Reasons for Attending/Not Attending

Not all members of the faculty take advantage of the professional development opportunities which are made available to them internally. Some of the most common obstacles to faculty participation, in general, are: a very limited amount of time available to participate; a non-existent reward system; and little, if any, administrative support for such activities (Sterner, 1999; Outcalt, 2000).

A literature review of faculty professional development indicated that lack of time appears to be a prevailing reason for lack of participation in professional development activities. Even in the community colleges where research and publication are not demanded of faculty, the faculty was always busy participating in professional organizations, serving on institutional committees, developing curriculum, performing departmental tasks, and working with students outside of class while keeping abreast of developments in their subject areas and with andragogical methods. For full-time
teaching faculty, teaching was the focus, and the preparation and presentation of course information as well as evaluation of students’ understanding, progress, and success required much of their time.

A report on faculty morale by Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) noted that faculty members felt they did not have enough time to do the things that their profession demanded (Bowen and Schuster, 1986). This same report also divulged that 86% of faculty who completed a national survey in 1999 concurred that they experienced being pressed for time (Magner, 1999). Boyer (1990) had also commented that the demands and obligations of college faculty were extremely time consuming. Further, he believed that it was the reward system of an institution that guided faculty in setting priorities for the precious time that they do have.

Sterner (1999) conducted a study to determine faculty attitudes towards assuming the responsibilities of grant-funded projects as professional development opportunities. The activities included writing, monitoring progress, maintaining accountability, and writing final reports at a project’s completion. She discovered that even faculty who wanted to pursue such activities found it difficult to find the “spare time” that would allow them to participate. Almost 73% of the faculty in her study reported heavy teaching loads, and 84.2% reported administrative assignments and committee work as consuming so much of their time that extra activities were not options for them.

In a qualitative study conducted at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, faculty members indicated that they had little time available to learn to use electronic resources available through the campus library. They also commented that if they could not attend a scheduled training session, then they had no choice but to pass on the opportunity. One
faculty member in the study had an interesting perception: some of the fellow colleagues had negative feelings about learning to use the electronic resources because of the pressure exerted on them to become proficient in this domain (Starkweather and Wallin, 1999). Murray (1999) showed support for this viewpoint when he wrote that faculty appreciated a work culture that supports faculty professional development and encourages improvements in teaching and tend to oppose and resist professional development activities that are mandated by the college administration.

Padgett and Conceicao-Runlee (2000) found that some of the faculty members at their institution were less motivated to attend professional development sessions - specifically in learning to use technology in their disciplines - if they were at either tenure’s door or retirement’s door. The other popular reason given for faculty non-attendance was that their time was totally consumed by their other professional duties and responsibilities. Palmer (1989) agreed that heavy teaching loads along with the out-of-classroom time that goes with teaching (lesson preparation, grading, subject area research, etc.) leave community college faculty with less unencumbered time to pursue professional development. All of these time-consuming professional development activities render faculty more at-risk to job burn-out. One respondent in Mahaffey’s and Welsh’s (1993, Conclusions section, ¶ 1) study commented on the priorities of the role of a faculty member by stating, “We are paid to teach and do administrative chores. So, what we do beyond that we do for the love of it [the discipline], and to be involved in it and to share that.” Boyer (1990), too, had come across a comment by a professor who stated that it is a general assumption that faculty automatically teach exceptionally well and do not have to spend a lot of time on becoming better at teaching. The professor bluntly conveyed that
the instructional responsibilities of faculty are grossly misunderstood, and the appreciation for what they do is generally lacking when he stated, “Good teaching is assumed, not rewarded” (p. 32).

In a refreshing contrast to these examples, Fugate and Amey (2000) found that newly hired faculty members appreciated training that dealt with daily tasks and events and the opportunity to be exposed to the philosophy of the college as well as its structure and dynamics. The new-hires also reportedly enjoyed their participation in a mentoring program.

Faculty Motivation to Participate

There is currently a considerable amount of controversy as to whether or not an incentive plan or reward system should be developed to encourage faculty in their continuing professional development. If an institution deems it a good idea, it must then determine how to reward faculty for jobs well done. In regard to professional competence, Cross (1997) reported that stipends, acknowledgement of publication, and promotions were not lucrative incentives for encouraging faculty to enrich their professional skills. However, collaborative projects with other faculty members, release time, and training sessions were well received by faculty as motivators. Intangible rewards such as professional respect, a good professional reputation, and the intrinsic satisfaction that one has achieved a level of excellence in his/her discipline have also been listed as types of rewards that appeal to faculty (Sterner, 1999). In an article that reported on faculty attitudes and practices Vaughan and Palmer shared the view that “…scholarly activity builds faculty morale and helps teachers keep up with their disciplines, some community college leaders have argued for the establishment of
procedures that encourage, recognize, and reward out-of-classroom scholarly work" (as cited in Palmer, 1989, p. 433).

Faculty, in general, seem to want to rise to a position that commands respect and recognition for their professional accomplishments and superior teaching abilities. This sentiment was supported by the results of a survey in which only seven percent of 900 University of California faculty felt that good teaching was rewarded (Edgerton, 1993). After one faculty member was awarded tenure based on a "balanced portfolio", an observer noted that “…institutional ambivalence about the value of teaching was registered in his pay check and other less-tangible signs of respect and regard" (Huber, 2001, Taking Risks section, ¶ 4). Murray’s (1990) stance was that there were other rewards that appealed to faculty besides money; he felt it was important that support, appreciation, and praise not be overlooked.

Milosheff (1990) cited a study by Hutton and Jobe in which community college faculty expressed that engagement in professional development activities was the least rewarding aspect of their jobs. Maxwell and Kazlauskas noted that “…although faculty development programs were widespread, faculty participation was low; teachers most in need of development were least likely to participate…” (as cited in Murray, 1999, Activities and Programs Offered section, ¶ 1). Murray (1999) had stated that it was imperative for faculty members to receive some form of recognition in return for their participation in activities to improve their instruction in the classroom. He believed that institutions should have a reward structure in place by which this can be accomplished.

Some post-secondary institutions honor a Teacher of the Year; other schools select one or more educators (but usually no more than a handful) to receive Teaching
Excellence Awards. Wergin (1993) reported on three institutions that bestowed departmental teaching awards. These awards inspired groups of faculty to work together to either improve teaching across their departments or programs or to design and implement practices that could be adopted for successful use by other departments at their institution. Teamwork in education, just as in other fields, can be energizing, provide more ideas and activities for the classroom, and promote collegiality. "Faculty members cannot operate as isolated individuals and be effective teachers in higher education" (Sunal et al., 2001, Summary and Conclusions section, ¶ 2).

A faculty WebCT discussion group talked about a reward system that had been established to compensate faculty in developing online courses (Etheridge, 2002). General compensations were also debated. These included stipends, formal recognition, credit towards tenure, office equipment, office furniture, computer software, advancement, a larger office, an upgraded job title, professional advancement, paid membership in a professional organization, an additional contribution to a retirement account, and gift certificates.

Other suggestions for possible reward options included one made by a task force during one campus review; the suggestion was to have faculty workloads include collaborative activities centered on teaching issues (Edgerton, 1993). Another was van Note Chism's (2002) idea that a faculty member's travel expenses to professional conferences and meetings be paid.

Sunal's (2001) study, in which a workshop assessment questionnaire was given, found that faculty ranked workshops, developing grant proposals, working as a collaborative team member, and mentoring highly. With respect to the latter two
activities, perhaps faculty who felt differently perceived professional development as more of an isolated activity and did not look toward integrating new information and skills into one or more aspects of their work.

Administrators’ Perspectives on Faculty Professional Development

When an employee’s work was valued, the employee was generally motivated to keep making improvements in his/her work. If superior teaching was valued by administrators, then faculty would have an incentive to engage in professional development activities in order to improve their teaching skills.

Ronald Williams, the President of Prince George’s Community College (PGCC) in Maryland, had a vision in which community colleges were accepted by their communities and utilized as “intellectual hubs.” Williams initiated activities that spotlighted PGCC faculty. He also made additional money for professional development available to any professor who secured the rank of an officer on a national association connected with his/her teaching discipline (Evelyn, 2002).

In a study that determined the status of faculty professional development across the United States, Murray (1999) found that administrators valued, supported, and encouraged faculty to participate in such types of activities. However, faculty development offerings generally seemed deficient of purpose, vision and/or leadership. This contradiction between the survey results and practice could easily suggest that faculty professional development is not valued, which could negatively impact faculty motivation to participate in such activities. It is also possible that administrators answered
the survey as to how they thought it should be answered in order for their institutions to appear progressive... in essence, to “look good”. Many faculty members believe that administrators say what they (the administrators) think the faculty and constituents want to hear. In reality, administrators may not regard faculty professional development as a priority (Sterner, 1999). One explanation for this sentiment is that administrators do not regard faculty professional development as having a direct impact on the issues and concerns that they deal with on a daily basis.

Reviews of Pertinent Studies

The following three studies have been identified as pertinent to the aspects of faculty professional development that are the focus of this study.

The first two studies summarized below provided information related to the research questionnaire items that were intended to identify the pattern of attendance and reasons for and for not attending faculty professional development activities. The third study supported implementation of a reward structure to encourage faculty to participate in professional development opportunities.

A Study by Mahaffey and Welsh (1993). In this study on faculty professional development Mahaffey and Welsh surveyed faculty at Midlands Technical College. Their objective was to determine the positive effects of participation in scholarship in regard to faculty vitality.

Their study was actually a search to answer the following three questions about the faculty at their institution: 1. Will faculty who engage in scholarship self-report positive benefits to their teaching? 2. Will faculty who are involved in scholarship self-report more
job satisfaction than faculty who are not involved in scholarship? 3. Will faculty who engage in scholarship self-report more value-added, skill-development, influence-sharing, and community-building measures of vitality than faculty who do not engage in scholarship (Design and Procedure section, ¶ 2)?

The sample for this study was comprised of 120 faculty members. Forty of these individuals were classified as scholar-teachers (those who pursued scholarship from 1986-1989 with scholarship being defined as critically analyzing a subject or an inquiry that resulted in a product such as a lecture, a speech, a book review, or an annotated bibliography). The other 80 faculty members were classified as teachers (individuals who did not participate in scholarship activities of the type just listed previously).

Each member of the sample group completed a survey in May, 1990. The survey was composed of eighteen items; these items determined the types of scholarship activities in which each participated as well as the impact on it had on his/her own scholarship. Eight of the participants additionally answered open-ended questions during a personal interview. The fourteen interview questions elicited the reasons that these instructors participated in scholarship activities.

All participants indicated that they were satisfied with their jobs. Participation in scholarship activities - as defined for this study - helped faculty to improve their teaching methods for the classroom. Both groups viewed teaching and working with students as one of their top responsibilities. However, scholar-teachers also regarded scholarship and institutional service very highly. Both groups indicated that a combination of teaching and scholarship in their subject areas - not in andragogy - was, by far, the most rewarding activity for the goal of professional development.
Although faculty generally valued scholarship, few were actively pursuing it. Ninety-five percent of scholar-teachers believed that scholarship revitalized them and had a positive influence on their teaching. Thirty percent of scholar-teachers held doctorate degrees whereas only 6% of teachers did. The scholar-teachers appeared to view ongoing scholarship as vital to their professionalism; participation in scholarship helped to avoid staleness and falling into a routine.

Forty-one percent of the respondents were not pleased with their level of achievement in relation to scholarship. Those who pursued scholarship generally felt intellectually stimulated, saw positive benefits manifested in their teaching, and felt that their morale had been raised.

*A Study by Montgomery (1990).* The purpose of this dissertation study was to find out whether or not faculty felt that professional development programs were helpful in improving their effectiveness in teaching, enhancing their careers, and providing an edge in achieving tenure and promotion.

This study was explorative rather than testing a theory. The questions that were explored were: 1. What types of faculty development opportunities are available to faculty in the College of Applied Professional Sciences and the College of Business Administration at the University of South Carolina (USC)? (p. 64). 2. Do faculty members perceive faculty development programs as a means to improve teaching effectiveness (p. 93)? 3. Do faculty members perceive faculty development programs as a means to achieve promotion and tenure (p. 117)? 4. How do the perceptions of faculty regarding faculty development programs differ from the perceptions of administrators (p. 140)?
Two hundred and four individuals (188 faculty and 16 administrators) were each mailed a survey. Of the 135 who responded, 126 were full-time faculty and nine were adjunct; 67 were tenured and 68 were not; 26 were female and 106 were male; 103 possessed a doctoral degree and 32 had a master degree.

The instrument consisted of three parts. Part one asked for demographic information. Part two asked participants to respond to questions related to the research questions, which were presented on a Likert-type scale. Part three consisted of open-ended questions.

A pretest of the instrument was conducted with ten faculty members at different campuses of USC. The instrument’s validity was checked by a reviewing panel of five faculty members. Internal consistency reliability was checked through the use of Cronbach’s alpha.

An explanatory letter was sent to targeted participants along with a survey on January 9, 1990. A second mailing was done in an effort to increase the number of responses. The second mailing increased the response rate from 59% to 66%.

The first analysis was performed on the demographic information; the frequency of each type of response was tabulated, and percentages were determined. In regard to the ongoing professional development activities in part two, the data was summarized with means and standard deviations.

The second analysis consisted of the use of t-tests and one-way analysis of variance to determine correlation of demographic data and other questions, if any. A one-way analysis of variance was used on certain questions to see if a correlation existed between them.
The results indicated that 68 of the respondents participated in faculty development opportunities and 67 did not. Faculty indicated that they participated in eighteen forms of faculty development programming with the most prevalent one being teaching seminars, which were attended by 18% of the respondents. All but one respondent believed that faculty development should include ideas and tips for improved teaching. Those with eleven-month contracts placed more value on professional development. Twenty-seven disagreed and 46 were undecided when responding to the statement that faculty development is a means to enhance promotion and tenure. There was a significant difference in the response of faculty versus administrators on several items. Administrators saw professional development as informative in regard to publication trends and opportunities as well as to career development.

Montgomery arrived at the following interpretations and conclusions. Members of the faculty attended/participated in various forms of professional development, but these opportunities were not well attended. Faculty believed that seminars on teaching effectiveness directly influenced overall career enhancement; seminar topics included improving teaching skills, increasing pedagogical knowledge, and assisting with service to the community. Members of the faculty who were nontenured saw little benefit in faculty development programs whereas the opposite was true for tenured faculty. Those who participated in faculty development sessions to improve their teaching reported that those sessions were beneficial to them.

Administrators put a higher emphasis on faculty development than faculty did. Only 50% of respondents ever participated in professional development activities. Administrators believed that professional development programs were a means to
improve teaching effectiveness as well as improve participating faculty members’ tenure
and promotion opportunities.

Montgomery recommended that the administrators be polled for suggestions on
improving the faculty’s views on professional development programs. She also suggested
that entire universities be surveyed and then their responses could be compared across
disciplines.

A Study by Murray (1999). Murray distributed a survey to 250 community colleges in
1998. The surveys were completed by individuals charged with faculty development for
their institutions. The purpose of the study was to determine if community colleges were
making an effort in regard to faculty professional development, and, if so, how their
efforts were viewed by both faculty and administrators. Issues that were targeted were:
formal, structured professional development programming; an encouraging and
supportive environment; faculty involvement in program design; and faculty
support/recognition from colleagues for professional development achievement and
undertakings.

Two hundred and fifty publicly funded community colleges were randomly selected
to receive the survey. One hundred and thirty of the returned surveys were usable. The
survey, consisting of 65 items, was comprised of four sections: demographics;
institutional support; a related reward system; and beliefs about the effects of such
programming.

Ninety-three percent of the responding institutions had a mechanism in place to
financially assist faculty who wanted to attend conferences. On-campus workshops were
facilitated by professional teaching consultants/experts at almost 88% of the community
colleges whereas not quite 69% utilized their own faculty as presenters. In the instances of contracting with an outside professional teaching consultant, half of the institutions made faculty attendance mandatory.

Almost 36% of the community colleges had a rank system for promotion built into their reward structure, and just less than 18% had instituted a merit system. Forty-six percent, however, had a tenure process in place for their faculty members. Faculty development was seen as a means to improve teaching, which was evaluated by students and/or administrators and/or peers in order to justify promotion, merit pay, and tenure.

Survey respondents felt that their respective institutions: were above average in administrative support of faculty development; were average in regard to recognizing and rewarding professional development; and disagreed with the notion that extrinsic rewards are better incentives for faculty than intrinsic ones.

In spite of the finding that administrators generally supported faculty development, it was noted that faculty development activities were often assigned to an employee(s) who executed these in addition to the duties and responsibilities of his/her (their) regular job, thus leaving little time to plan for necessary and effective training activities.

Murray’s results supported those of previous studies that: 1. found attendance at faculty professional activities lacking and 2. found that those who could benefit the most rarely participated in such activities.

After compiling and reviewing the data, Murray concluded that faculty development activities have had little influence in American community colleges over the last three decades.
Summary

The purposes of scholarship are for faculty to keep current with new developments in their respective fields/subject areas, to improve teaching effectiveness in the classroom, and to achieve revitalization. Professional development activities along with the intrinsic satisfaction one experiences when learning something that proves to be useful and directly or indirectly affect students in a positive way can contribute to revitalization.

Studies of professional development in higher education have concluded that relatively few faculty members participated in scholarship outside of the classroom even though they felt scholarship was valuable to their professionalism. Other results found that college faculty have precious little free time that could be used for participation in professional development; that reward systems tend to boost faculty attitudes and morale, and that administrators seldom voice support for faculty professional development activities.

Many articles offered suggestions for incentives/rewards to motivate faculty to participate in professional development opportunities. The majority of these were awarded to individual faculty members. Conversely, some institutions rewarded collaborative projects or entire departments for group endeavors.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Once the idea for this study was formulated, the researcher met with the advisory committee of the FCLT; it was comprised of ten members. The seven teaching faculty members represented both the vocational/occupational and academic divisions of CCSN. The two deans represented the vocational/occupational divisions of the college. The committee was rounded out with an administrator from the Office of Grants and Educational Administration. This advisory committee was used as a focus group; its comments and suggestions guided the design of this research study.

Composite data on the number of FCLT workshops that had been offered over the last two academic years along with the average number of workshop participants were presented to the FCLT Advisory Committee. In the 1998-1999 academic year 88 workshops were offered with an average of 15 participants at each session. The 61 workshops provided by the FCLT in 1999-2000 resulted in an average attendance of 12.

A discussion followed the presentation of these and other data. The ensuing concerns, perceptions, and ideas were used as the basis for designing this research study, for formulating the research questions, and in developing and customizing the items for the survey instrument.
This research study was an exploratory study since no comprehensive theory of professional development dispositions was found in the literature. It sought the attitudes and perceptions of CCSN faculty in regard to specific faculty dispositions toward professional development. Targeted information was: the frequency by which CCSN faculty members attended FCLT-sponsored, in-house events and sessions as well as their reasons for non-attendance; and suggestions for incentives/inducements/a faculty reward system - if these were even viewed lucratively as motivators.

Research Questions

The FCLT coordinates over 60 internal professional development activities specifically for CCSN faculty each academic year. Training sessions rarely have over 20 faculty members in attendance. It is apparent that many faculty members choose not to attend. It is unclear, however, as to whether the reason is apathy toward session topics, scheduled training dates and times, unavailability of potential participants, too many professional obligation, morale, or a combination of these and other reasons. Regardless of the reasons, consideration should be given to the use of incentives to attend such sessions since inducements have been found to have positive effects at other institutions.

The research questions for this study were:

1. What patterns of attendance have been exhibited by CCSN faculty members at internal professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT?

2. What incentives, based on findings in a literature review, have been used elsewhere to motivate faculty to attend more often?
3. What incentives do CCSN faculty identify as attractive to them in return for their participation in internal professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT?

Participants

During the academic semesters CCSN regularly employs 1400 to 1800 professionals. This figure includes the administrative faculty as well as the part-time faculty members who teach on one of the three main campuses or at a location off-campus within the four counties that comprise CCSN's service area. The opinions of the part-time and administrative faculty members were not the subject of the present study. Therefore, the target population for this research study was the 376 full-time, permanent faculty members who were teaching during the Fall 2002 semester. A sample of the population could have been surveyed with the results being used to estimate the proportion of the entire full-time teaching faculty body that would answer a certain way. However, it was deemed important that all full-time teaching faculty, whether tenure-track or non-tenure track, vocational or academic, be included in this study for maximum effect (Salant and Dillman, 1994).

Design of the Instrument

A review of literature on faculty development revealed that many studies had been conducted on this general topic; however, not one study could be located that had focused exclusively on faculty attitudes and perceptions related to faculty professional development and motivation. This was the intent of the present research study.
Additionally, *The Handbook of Tests and Measurements in Education and the Social Sciences* (Lester and Bishop, 2000) did not contain an appropriate survey instrument although isolated questions from sample surveys displayed in the book were used with slight adaptations to fit the purposes of this study.

The instrument that was developed specifically for and used in this study was intended to efficiently gather information regarding faculty attendance at FCLT-sponsored activities, reasons for non-attendance, and perceptions concerning a reward system related to participation in FCLT activities (see Appendix I). The instrument was formatted in three sections. It was pretested with a small group comprised of education and research professionals to detect any flaws of language, format, or intent of meaning. It was then polished and finalized.

In Part One of the survey faculty were requested to indicate demographic information. These items asked each faculty member to indicate the college division/area in which s/he taught along with tenure status, highest degree earned, years of teaching at CCSN, years of teaching full-time at other post-secondary institutions, gender, age, awareness of the FCLT, and three questions regarding attendance at professional development sessions. The intent was to collect and use this demographic data to determine any tendencies or patterns of attendance and/or nonattendance by the various defining characteristics, either in combination or isolation. It was expected that these characteristics would be useful in addressing the research questions.

Part Two of the survey solicited each faculty member's candid self-ratings on survey using Likert-type scales. Each item addressed a specific feeling, view, attitude, perception, or means of stimulating attendance at FCLT events.
Part Three consisted of an open-ended question. It provided faculty with the opportunity to indicate their views and give their suggestions as far as developing and implementing a reward system for participation in faculty professional development activities.

The researcher involved her Doctoral Examination Committee during the development stage of the instrument. When its four members indicated their approvals to proceed, the researcher conducted a pretest of the instrument and then followed protocol to validate it.

The final survey instrument was submitted to the Office of Human Subjects, UNLV. This office oversees all research affiliated with UNLV that involves the use of human subjects. Its responsibility is to ensure the protection of those who serve as research subjects and to make sure that researchers are well acquainted with the concept of research and the use of human subjects. Online instructional modules that address the requirements and concerns in using human subjects when conducting research were completed at a satisfactory level (see Appendix II) before the Office of Human Subjects reviewed and gave its approval (see Appendix II) for use of the instrument for this study.

After the survey instrument was approved by the Office of Human Subjects, it was formatted and printed by the Cannon Center for Survey Research at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), which used a software package that would allow returned responses to be scanned. Services of the Cannon Center were purchased to supervise and manage the data collection, scan surveys, build the resultant database, and serve as consultant to the researcher to guarantee that a high standard of ethics and proper procedures were maintained during the study.
Pretest of the Instrument

Two CCSN faculty members and two professional staff members at the Cannon Center for Survey Research were given the survey for the purpose of a pretest. This review panel was asked to read, write their responses, and time themselves as they completed the survey and to candidly convey if the items were appropriate to the intent of this study. They were also requested to evaluate the design of the instrument itself by asking questions such as: Is it easy to follow? Is any item confusing? Is there any bias? Is the wording clear and succinct? Is the instrument fair? How many minutes did it take to complete all of the items?

The feedback that was received from the review panel was used in the final customization of the instrument. The information garnered during the pretest was not included in the analysis of the data that was officially collected by the final instrument for this study.

Validity of the Instrument

After the instrument was pretested and revised, it was given to four individuals at CCSN who were very knowledgeable in regard to research design and faculty professional development. All four of them were full-time administrative faculty members who were also part-time instructors at CCSN as well as recent doctoral students; additionally, one of them had previously taught full-time at CCSN. This group
reviewed the survey items to corroborate the items’ appropriateness to the research questions and, therefore, the face validity of the instrument.

Collection of Data

Each of the full-time teaching faculty members on the three main campuses of CCSN was sent an envelope via campus mail on December 2, 2002. A list of full-time teaching faculty who were teaching during the Fall 2002 semester was obtained from CCSN’s Human Resources Office after a written request for the list was approved through appropriate channels. Each name on the list was assigned a number which was written on the survey being sent to that particular faculty member. The sole purpose of the numbers was to allow the Cannon Center to track incoming surveys and, in the case of a second mailing being a necessity, to avoid duplicate surveys being sent to those who had already responded; this procedure was employed so as to ensure confidentiality of the survey results.

On the morning of the mailing of the envelopes containing the surveys, the investigator sent an e-mail to all faculty members informing them of the study and asking for their support (see Appendix III). Since the investigator was an employee of CCSN, she was comfortable with sending the e-mail through regular communication channels of the institution.

Each envelope contained three items. A cover letter (see Appendix IV) explained the purpose of the study, informed each recipient that participation in the study was voluntary, and that responses would be confidential and reported in the aggregate. The cover letter also listed a deadline for the surveys’ return and gave directions for returning
the survey. Beneath the cover letter was a copy of the Informed Consent (see Appendix IV), which further explained the study and each survey respondent's rights. The content of the Informed Consent notice had been approved by the Office of Human Subjects. The third item in each envelope was the survey instrument. The initial mailing resulted in a 38% response rate deemed to be too low by the investigator. Therefore, a follow-up letter and second copies of the Informed Consent letter and the survey were sent to those who did not respond before the original deadline or within the two weeks following that deadline. This second mailing occurred on January 16, 2003. The same procedures were followed as with the first mailing, but the cover letter that was included in the second mailing was worded differently (see Appendix IV).

Respondents mailed their completed surveys to the Cannon Center for Survey Research at UNLV through the intra-institution mail system. February 5, 2003, was predetermined to be the last day to accept surveys as part of this study, and the return rate had increased to 58%. Therefore, it was determined that a third mailing or follow-up phone calls were not necessary.

Analysis of Data

On February 6, 2003, the Cannon Center scanned the returned, completed surveys and collated all results. The resulting database was then transferred to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Software for analysis. The actual surveys were sealed in a container and placed into storage where they will remain for three years. They are earmarked for destruction after that time.
This comparative-descriptive study sought variables associated with nonattendance. The analysis included demographic characteristics, expressed in the form of descriptive statistics, of the subjects (Section One of the survey). Comparisons within the existing faculty membership on selected variables (Section Two of the survey) including reasons for nonattendance at professional development opportunities, delivery preferences of training sessions, and possible incentives/rewards for participation in such activities were achieved through cross-tabulations. Chi-square tests were used to look at the relationships between selected variables that were considered to be significant at the .05 level of probability.

Section Three was an open-ended question that invited opinions on and suggestions for a reward system that is directly related – either partly or totally – to the professional development activities of CCSN faculty. All of the responses to this question were addressed through a data collapsing process and then grouped into categories that became evident as the responses were read. Some of those categories were reflective of those found in the literature. Some responses were not appropriate to the question or were unique, so they did not fit neatly into a category.

Significance of the Study

The extent of a CCSN faculty member’s pursuit of scholarship is left to his/her personal discretion. It is not required for advancement of any kind. The observation that many scholarly activities at the college were lightly attended led to questions that could only be answered by the faculty members themselves.
The present exploratory study sought information and insight into the incidence of low faculty attendance at in-house professional development activities that were coordinated, hosted, or sponsored by the FCLT. The survey instrument elicited the most common reasons that CCSN faculty did not participate in these activities. The study additionally sought to determine if anything could be done by way of incentives or rewards that could encourage or motivate faculty to take advantage of internal professional development opportunities. Most importantly, the study aimed to find out what, if anything, could be done to increase faculty participation in FCLT workshops and activities, all of which were designed to help faculty members increase their knowledge, improve their skills, and enhance their teaching in order to be more effective in working with students.

Limitations of the Study

The information gained through this study may be helpful in guiding the FCLT to take action that would result in an increase of faculty participation in internal professional development opportunities. These results may not be helpful to other colleges that may be experiencing the same phenomenon. Additionally, the whole target population was given the opportunity to participate in the study.

The results were valuable to the co-directors of the FCLT and its advisory committee since the FCLT has limitations of budget, space, and types of activities for which it is responsible.
Summary

This study was descriptive and exploratory in nature. The FCLT advisory committee discussed current concerns regarding low faculty participation in professional development activities. It gave suggestions as to what types of information could be gathered by the study that would ultimately help to guide the future activities of the FCLT.

After the survey was designed and necessary approvals were obtained, surveys were sent to the 376 full-time teaching faculty members of CCSN during the Fall 2002 semester. Part I of the survey was designed to gather faculty demographics to get a clear understanding of the mixture and proportions of faculty characteristics and to solicit their opinions and suggestions which could help in answering the research questions.

Part II of the survey requested faculty input on their reasons for nonattendance at internal professional development activities offered through the FCLT. It also asked them to indicate their levels of agreement to statements that suggested incentives to attend such activities.

Finally, Part III gave faculty the opportunity to write-in any responses that the survey, which was based on a literature review, may have omitted.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The FCLT staff was concerned about the relatively small number of faculty participants at workshops, seminars, and other professional development opportunities that it hosted, sponsored, or coordinated. This was the concern that prompted the design and conduct of this study.

The intent of this descriptive study was to explore the attendance patterns of CCSN’s full-time teaching faculty and to gain insight into their reasons for nonattendance as well as learn their views on the use of incentives to encourage participation in internal professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT. It was also expected that the study would serve as a contribution to the professional literature on community college faculty development in an area of investigation that previously had been neglected. A paper/pencil survey instrument was designed specifically for this study. It was distributed to the 376 full-time teaching faculty members who were teaching during the Fall 2002 semester at CCSN.

The research questions that the survey instrument addressed were: 1. What patterns of attendance have been exhibited by CCSN faculty members at internal professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT? 2. What incentives do CCSN faculty
identify as attractive to them in return for their participation in internal professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT?

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The survey was distributed to CCSN’s 376 full-time teaching faculty during the Fall 2002 semester. It yielded 216 returned surveys, a 58% response rate. The data are presented in narrative form, rounded to the nearest whole number except where they are shown to the tenth decimal place.

The first eight questions on the instrument solicited demographic information from the survey respondents. The responses to these items were expected to be helpful in dividing respondents into groupings and then comparing results among and across these groupings.

Since each respondent was asked to indicate to which dean s/he reported, it was possible to see how many respondents were vocational faculty and how many were academic faculty (Table 1). The researcher included this demographic question because one of the FCLT’s operating budgets is grant funded specifically for activities involving vocational faculty; the researcher wanted to be able to obtain information about this particular faculty group to help justify use of these monies in future professional development initiatives.

Sixty-five percent of the faculty members indicated that they were tenured (see Table 1). Of this number, 60% (82) taught academic subjects, and 40% (54) taught in vocational programs.
### Table 1

**Faculty Demographics by Vocational or Academic Teaching Field**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>All Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Vocational Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Academic Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Number Missing %, (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Subject/Discipline</td>
<td>100.0 (212)</td>
<td>41.5 (88)</td>
<td>58.5 (124)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.5 (136)</td>
<td>39.7 (54)</td>
<td>60.3 (82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35.5 (75)</td>
<td>45.3 (34)</td>
<td>54.7 (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (211)</td>
<td>41.7 (88)</td>
<td>58.3 (123)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.5 (103)</td>
<td>38.8 (40)</td>
<td>61.2 (63)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.5 (97)</td>
<td>42.3 (41)</td>
<td>57.7 (56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (200)</td>
<td>40.5 (81)</td>
<td>59.9 (119)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>1.4 (3)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>2.5 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>19.2 (40)</td>
<td>32.5 (13)</td>
<td>67.5 (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>37.0 (77)</td>
<td>46.8 (36)</td>
<td>53.2 (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>42.3 (88)</td>
<td>44.3 (39)</td>
<td>55.7 (49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (208)</td>
<td>42.3 (88)</td>
<td>57.7 (120)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>28.4 (60)</td>
<td>20.0 (12)</td>
<td>80.0 (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>61.1 (129)</td>
<td>42.6 (55)</td>
<td>57.4 (74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>4.7 (10)</td>
<td>90.0 (9)</td>
<td>10.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1.4 (3)</td>
<td>100.0 (3)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>4.3 (9)</td>
<td>88.9 (8)</td>
<td>11.1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (211)</td>
<td>41.2 (87)</td>
<td>58.8 (124)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>All Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Vocational Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Academic Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Number Missing %, (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Years at CCSN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>6.1 (13)</td>
<td>23.1 (3)</td>
<td>76.9 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>41.0 (87)</td>
<td>42.5 (37)</td>
<td>57.5 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>27.4 (58)</td>
<td>37.9 (22)</td>
<td>62.1 (36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td>25.5 (54)</td>
<td>48.1 (26)</td>
<td>51.9 (28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (212)</td>
<td>41.5 (88)</td>
<td>58.5 (124)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Years at Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>55.0 (111)</td>
<td>45.9 (51)</td>
<td>54.1 (60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>21.3 (43)</td>
<td>37.2 (16)</td>
<td>62.8 (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>6.9 (14)</td>
<td>28.4 (4)</td>
<td>71.4 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td>16.8 (34)</td>
<td>38.2 (13)</td>
<td>61.8 (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (202)</td>
<td>41.6 (84)</td>
<td>58.4 (118)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Vocational Faculty and Academic Faculty columns were broken down per line item.
The proportions of respondents by gender were similar. Almost 52% (103) of those answering the survey were male, and slightly over 49% (97) were female. A breakout by teaching area showed that 39% (40) of the male faculty members were vocational and 61% (63) were academic instructors. Female faculty members were split as 42% (41) vocational and 58% (56) academic.

The survey instrument solicited the age of the participants (see Table 1). Only 1% (3) of them was under the age of 30, and all three were characterized as male and academic. Nineteen percent marked that they were in the 30-40 age group; in this group almost 33% (13) were vocational and almost 68% (27) were academic instructors. The two largest groups of faculty were over the age of 40; the 40-50 age group comprised 37% (77) of the respondents, and the 50+ age group made up the remaining 42% (88) of those who responded to the survey. Within each of these two latter age groups the percentages of vocational to academic were similar. Forty-six percent (36) of vocational faculty were in the 40-50 age group while 53% (41) of academic faculty were in that same group. In the 50+ age group, 44% (39) were vocational teachers, and 56% (49) were academic instructors.

The survey also asked each respondent to mark the highest degree s/he holds (see Table 1). Of the 60 faculty members who held a doctorate, 80% (48) taught academic subjects, and 20% (12) taught vocational courses. The master degree was held by the most faculty members with 43% of them teaching in vocational programs and 57% (74) teaching academic courses. Ten faculty members held a bachelor degree; 90% (9) were vocational, and 10% (1) was in the academic arena. The associate degree had the least holders at slightly over 1% (3) of the respondents; they were all in the vocational area.
Four percent (9) of the faculty indicated that they held certificates. Of the certificate holders, 88.9% (8) was vocational, and 11.1% (1) was in an academic area.

Two questions on the survey pertained to years of full-time teaching experience. The first item asked each respondent to indicate how many years s/he had taught at CCSN (see Table 1). Six percent (13) faculty members indicated that they were new to CCSN with 23% (3) of those in vocational teaching and 77% (10) in academic teaching. Forty-one percent (87) of respondents had already taught one through five years at CCSN with close to 43% (37) of them being vocational and almost 58% of them being academic according to teaching area. Twenty-seven percent (58) of the responding faculty members indicated that they had 6 through 10 years of teaching experience at CCSN; 38% (22) of those were vocational and 62% (36) were academic faculty. The group that indicated 10+ years of teaching at CCSN had similar data to the 6-10 years group. Almost 26% of the respondents had taught 10 or more years at CCSN; 48% (26) of them were in vocational programs, and 52% were in academic subjects.

The second question on full-time teaching experience referred to years at post-secondary institutions other than CCSN (see Table 1). Over half, 55% (111), of the respondents indicated that they had taught elsewhere for under one year; 46% of those were vocational faculty and 54% (60) were academic faculty. Thirty-seven percent (16) of vocational faculty marked that they had taught at other institutions from 1-5 years while 63% (27) of academic faculty indicated likewise, combining to comprise 21% (43) of the survey respondents. Approximately 7% marked 6-10 years of experience elsewhere; 28% (4) of those were vocational teachers, and 71% were academic instructors. Finally, almost 17% (34) indicated that they had over 10 years of college-
level teaching experience prior to coming to CCSN. Thirty-eight percent (13) who indicated this were vocational and 62% (21) were academic by teaching area/discipline.

A profile of the typical respondent to this survey yielded a faculty member who was male, tenured, over 50 years of age, who had a master degree and who had been teaching at CCSN for 1-5 years. This also represented the typical profile of both academic and vocational respondents with the exception of gender in the vocational category where female respondents outnumbered males at 41 and 40 respectively.

Survey Part I: Faculty

Attendance Patterns

Three questions appeared on the survey instrument which asked faculty to disclose their attendance at internal professional development sessions from August 2000 until the time that the survey was mailed.

Question #9 asked each faculty member how many times s/he had attended the college president’s “welcome back” session at the start of each new semester. Unfortunately, this question was not printed correctly on the survey instrument, nor was it clearly understandable. Nevertheless, most of the faculty marked an answer for it. Additionally, a second mailing of the survey was necessary to gather more faculty input; it coincidentally occurred just as the faculty returned to begin the Spring 2003 semester. The wording of the question would have allowed the researcher to discover how many had attended the Spring 2003 “welcome back” from only the second mailing. However, it was decided to eliminate analysis of all responses to this question since it was shrouded in confusion. The next two questions revealed good data that is displayed in Table 2.
Table 2

Faculty Attendance Patterns From August 2000-November 2002, Not Counting President’s Welcome Backs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance at Internal Sessions</th>
<th>All Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Vocational Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Academic Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Number Missing %, (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of In-Service Week Activities Attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17.0 (36)</td>
<td>50.0 (18)</td>
<td>50.0 (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>59.9 (127)</td>
<td>40.2 (51)</td>
<td>59.8 (76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>10.4 (22)</td>
<td>36.4 (8)</td>
<td>63.6 (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>10.8 (23)</td>
<td>43.5 (10)</td>
<td>56.5 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1.9 (4)</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td>75.0 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (212)</td>
<td>41.5 (88)</td>
<td>58.5 (124)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Activities Attended During In-Service Weeks and During the Semesters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Vocational Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Academic Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Number Missing %, (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>31.3 (66)</td>
<td>43.9 (29)</td>
<td>56.1 (37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>47.9 (101)</td>
<td>41.6 (42)</td>
<td>58.4 (59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>10.4 (22)</td>
<td>31.8 (7)</td>
<td>68.2 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>6.6 (14)</td>
<td>28.6 (4)</td>
<td>71.4 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2.4 (5)</td>
<td>40.0 (2)</td>
<td>60.0 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>1.4 (3)</td>
<td>100.0 (3)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0 (211)</td>
<td>41.2 (87)</td>
<td>58.8 (124)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Vocational Faculty and Academic Faculty columns were broken down per line item.
In question #10 each faculty member indicated how many times s/he had attended the professional development sessions that were scheduled during an in-service week, which preceded the first day of classes each semester (see Table 2). Four in-service weeks had occurred in the time frame from August 2000 until December, 2002, which is when the surveys were distributed. Respondents were to reveal their approximate attendance sessions during the in-service weeks, not counting any attendance at a presidential “welcome back” session; the total number of in-service week sessions that had been offered for the stated time period was 90. Seventeen percent (36) of the survey respondents marked that they did not attend any sessions during an in-service week. This datum was split evenly between vocational and academic faculty (18 each). The largest percentage of faculty, 60% (127), disclosed that they had each attended from 1-5 sessions. Forty percent (51) of those were vocational instructors, and 60% were academic faculty. Only 10% (22) respondents revealed that they had attended from 6-10 sessions; 36% (8) of these were vocational area faculty, and 64% (14) were academic faculty. Almost 11% (23) answered that they had attended from 11-20 sessions. Almost 44% (10) of this group was vocational, and the other 57% (13) was academic. Two percent (4) of the faculty members indicated that they had attended from 21-30 sessions with only 25% (1) of those being from the vocational programs arena and 75% (3) hailing from the academic area. Not one respondent had attended more than 30 of the 90 internal professional development sessions offered during the five in-service weeks that had occurred since August 2000.

Question #11 asked faculty to indicate their total attendance at internal professional development activities that did not include the “welcome back” but did additionally
include the ongoing training sessions that were scheduled between the first and last days of a semester (see Table 2). The total number of sessions coordinated or sponsored by the FCLT from August 2000 until the distribution of this survey was 194.

Thirty-one percent of the respondents indicated that they did not attend any sessions; 44% (29) was vocational, and 56% was academic faculty. One to five sessions were attended by 48% (101) of the respondents; vocational instructors comprised 42% (42) of them, and academic faculty constituted the other 58% (59). Ten percent (22) of the respondents marked that they had attended 6-10 sessions. Thirty-two percent (7) of this group taught vocational courses, and 68% taught academic courses. Approximately 7% (14) of the survey respondents conveyed that they had attended 11-20 sessions; 29% (4) of these individuals were vocational teachers, and 71% (10) were academic instructors. Only 2% (5) faculty members indicated attendance at 21-30 sessions. Vocational instructors comprised 40% (2) of this figure, and academic faculty made up the other 60% (3). Finally, only 1% (3) attended more than 30 sessions, and these faculty members were all instructors in vocational programs.

Survey Part II: Reasons for Nonattendance

Seven questions on the survey instrument (#s 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 24) were aimed at discovering the reasons for CCSN faculty nonattendance at FCLT-sponsored internal professional development activities. The response patterns to these questions must be viewed cautiously since they may not be directly related to the attendance
patterns of CCSN faculty as revealed by data based on Part I of the survey. A review of the literature aided in determining common reasons for nonattendance; these reasons were built into the survey items for the respondents to consider. These questions presented specific reasons that faculty at other colleges and universities had given for their nonattendance.

Crosstabulation of the questions with selected faculty demographics yielded several sets of data. Included in this analysis were comparisons between vocational and academic faculty. Also included are comparisons by gender and by tenure status. These crosstabulations results are shown in Table 3. Chi-square tests were applied to determine the relationships between different variables and to help determine which pieces of information were to be considered further due to their statistical significance. A discussion of the chi-square test data for survey items regarding reasons for nonattendance follows the presentation of the crosstabulation results.

Forty-eight percent (101) of the survey respondents felt that their teaching obligations were obstacles to attendance at FCLT professional development activities (see Table 3). Slightly over half of the faculty, 51% (107), who completed the survey marked that the training sessions and other activities were scheduled at times that were inconvenient for them. Approximately 31% (64) of the faculty felt that the topics that were offered would probably not improve their teaching; this same percentage also felt that the session topics were not related to their professional development. Only 3% (7) and 4% (30) of the faculty body as a whole indicated that they did not attend because it was a requirement or a consideration for tenure or promotion. Most of these respondents taught in academic subjects.
Table 3

Faculty Agreement With Common Reasons for Nonattendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Nonattendance</th>
<th>All Faculty %, (n)</th>
<th>Vocational %, (n)</th>
<th>Academic %, (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Obligations</td>
<td>48.1 (101)</td>
<td>59.1 (52)</td>
<td>40.1 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(210)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees/Assignments</td>
<td>41.4 (82)</td>
<td>41.4 (36)</td>
<td>38.1 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(208)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not for Promotion</td>
<td>3.3 (7)</td>
<td>1.1 (1)</td>
<td>4.9 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(210)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Scheduled</td>
<td>51.2 (107)</td>
<td>60.8 (53)</td>
<td>44.3 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(209)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics Not Improve Teaching</td>
<td>30.8 (64)</td>
<td>19.5 (17)</td>
<td>38.9 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(208)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics Not Relative</td>
<td>31.6 (66)</td>
<td>29.8 (26)</td>
<td>32.8 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(209)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Desire</td>
<td>3.9 (30)</td>
<td>7.1 (6)</td>
<td>20.0 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(205)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(120)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Nonattendance</th>
<th>Male %, (n)</th>
<th>Female %, (n)</th>
<th>Tenured %, (n)</th>
<th>Non tenured %, (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Obligations</td>
<td>47.6 (50)</td>
<td>48.5 (47)</td>
<td>45.9 (62)</td>
<td>50.0 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees/Assignments</td>
<td>33.4 (35)</td>
<td>43.8 (42)</td>
<td>42.1 (56)</td>
<td>33.4 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>(96)</td>
<td>(133)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not for Promotion</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>55.6 (75)</td>
<td>58.9 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Scheduled</td>
<td>47.6 (50)</td>
<td>53.1 (51)</td>
<td>50.0 (67)</td>
<td>52.5 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>(96)</td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics Not Improve Teaching</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.7 (39)</td>
<td>23.4 (22)</td>
<td>37.4 (50)</td>
<td>19.5 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics Not Relative</td>
<td>36.4 (39)</td>
<td>24.4 (23)</td>
<td>36.3 (49)</td>
<td>22.1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(107)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Desire</td>
<td>17.2 (18)</td>
<td>10.7 (10)</td>
<td>19.0 (25)</td>
<td>6.6 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total is the question's total responses by demographic characteristic specified in the column heading.
When other crosstabulations were examined, it was discovered that females did not feel the tenure/promotion issue had any discernable impact on attendance, but they did feel that the times the sessions were offered made it difficult for them to attend. Females comprised 11% (10) and males made up 17% (18) of those who had no desire to attend.

When a comparison of the responses of tenured and nontenured faculty was made, it was found that over half of both groups indicated that even though attendance was not necessary for tenure/promotion, it was not a primary reason for their nonattendance (see Table 3). Over three times as many males, 37% (50), than females, 20% (15), agreed that the training topics would probably not improve their teaching. Five times as many tenured faculty members 19% (25) than nontenured faculty members, 7% (5), revealed that they had no desire to attend the professional development opportunities offered by the FCLT.

Comparisons on the basis of years of teaching experience were also run in case this piece of demographic information resulted in being significant to this study. Respondents indicated their years at CCSN (item #6) and years of teaching elsewhere (item #7) on the survey by marking either less than 1 year, 1-5 years, 6-10 years, or over 10 years for each of these two items. Regardless of years of teaching experience at CCSN or at other post-secondary institutions, almost half of the faculty, 47% in each of these experience categories, responded that their teaching obligations impeded their attendance at professional development sessions. These two groups of faculty also closely matched each other at approximately 51% by indicating that the sessions were scheduled at times that were difficult for them to attend. Seventy-eight percent (159) of faculty who had taught elsewhere had no desire to attend such sessions, and 31% of them also felt that the
sessions' topics would probably not improve their teaching as well as probably not be relative to their professional development.

Chi-square tests were used to determine which of the relationships among the variables were significant. The tests were conducted using the information in Table 3 to determine if the differences were larger than what was expected to be found, regardless of whether the direction of the relationship was positive or negative (Blalock, 1972). The items listed in Table 3 deserved further examination since the chi-square tests suggested that the differences were significant at the .05 level (Bordens and Abbott, 1996). Significant relationships for responses that concerned reasons for nonattendance are displayed in Table 4.

When a comparison of vocational to academic faculty in regard to reasons for nonattendance at FCLT-sponsored professional development offerings was made, significance was determined for four of the reasons given as items in the survey.

First, agreement with survey item #12 (do not participate in professional development activities because of teaching obligations) was at 40% for vocational faculty and at 59% for academic faculty. The chi-square test showed a significant relationship between these two faculty groups and teaching obligations ($x^2 = 8.342, df3, p = <.05$). One explanation for this difference may be that many vocational instructors, especially if they are on a nontenure track, spend more time in the classroom because of their teaching load, which can be up to 8 credit hours heavier than the required 15 credit hour teaching load for academic faculty; this is largely due to the lab times required for the courses that they teach.
Table 4

Significant Chi-Square Relationships for Faculty Reasons for Nonattendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Nonattendance</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Academic</td>
<td>8.342</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not for Tenure/Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8.554</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Academic</td>
<td>13.392</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8.026</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Improve Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Academic</td>
<td>13.952</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8.470</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Non-tenured</td>
<td>9.036</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Related to my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Vocational/Academic</td>
<td>10.760</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Desire</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>11.177</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured/Non-tenured</td>
<td>8.819</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * represents significance at .05 level
Second, the two faculty groups were significantly different in regard to survey item #15 (the times that professional development activities were scheduled); vocational faculty agreed at almost 17 percentage points higher than academic faculty (61% and 40%, respectively) in regard to this survey question. As shown in Table 4, the chi-square test showed a significant relationship between faculty groups and scheduled times ($\chi^2 = 13.392$, df3, $p < .05$). The larger percentage of vocational faculty who felt this way might again be carrying a heavy teaching load, particularly when one considers the lab times that are included in many vocational courses. It is also a possibility that vocational faculty teach more often on Fridays than do academic faculty.

Third, Table 4 shows that chi-square testing indicated a significant difference between vocational and academic faculty in regard to survey item #16 (nonattendance because topics of the sessions will probably not improve their teaching). Academic instructors who were in agreement with this statement were almost triple in number (47) when compared to the vocational teachers (17) who agreed with this statement. The chi-square test showed a significant relationship between faculty groups and no improvement in teaching ($\chi^2 = 13.952$, df3, $p < .05$). Academic faculty may have agreed with this survey item so readily because they were educated in teaching methodologies when they were college students whereas most of the vocational faculty members leave their careers in business and industry in order to teach at CCSN.

Fourth, Table 4 also shows that there was a significant difference between faculty groups and survey item #17 (did not attend training sessions because they felt that the topics were not related to their professional development) according to the results of chi-square testing ($\chi^2 = 10.760$, df3, $p < .05$). Although academic faculty agreed with this
item at 53% and vocational at 30%, the frequency of vocational faculty to academic faculty was approximately 40% greater (40 and 26, respectively). One possible explanation is academic faculty do not need to get updated on their subject areas as frequently as vocational instructors must in order to keep abreast of advances and innovations in the workforce for which they are training their students.

Chi-square tests were also used to examine the relationship of gender to reasons for nonattendance in order to determine if the differences were larger than what was expected to be found, regardless of whether the direction of the relationship was positive or negative (Blalock, 1972). Significance was determined for four of the comparisons of variables; these are displayed in Table 4.

First, chi-square testing in regard to item #14 showed a significant relationship between gender and attendance at professional development activities not being a necessary activity to achieve tenure or advance ($\chi^2 = 8.554, df_2, p = <.05$). Only 3% (7) of the 212 respondents agreed with survey item #14 (nonattendance due to such behavior not being necessary for tenure or promotion). Not only was this a small number of respondents, but all of the seven were male, which may suggest that males prefer not to participate but would do so if it was a requirement for tenure or promotion.

Second, chi-square testing showed a significant relationship between gender and times scheduled ($\chi^2 = 8.026, df_3, p = <.05$). Survey item #15 (sessions are scheduled at times that are difficult to attend) had almost the same number of males and females agree with the statement (50 and 51, respectively). Male respondents to the survey were in agreement to this statement at 48%, and the females were over 53% in agreement. One explanation for the significant relationship between gender and scheduled training times
may be due to more males teaching, participating in meetings, or performing committee work on Fridays, which is the day of the week on which most training sessions are held.

As shown in Table 4, chi-square testing also indicated a significant relationship between gender and item #16, not improving teaching by attending professional development activities ($x^2 = 8.470$, df3, $p = <.05$). Slightly over 23% of the females agreed, and almost 37% of the males agreed; this suggested that some faculty members, more males than females, were doubtful about the andragogical benefits of training sessions.

Additionally, chi-square testing showed a significant relationship between professional status and improved teaching (item #16) as a product of attending internal professional development sessions (see Table 4). Tenured faculty agreed with this item by more than three times the number of nontenured faculty who agreed (50 and 15, respectively). Chi-square testing between professional status and improving teaching showed a significant relationship ($x^2 = 9.036$, df3, $p = <.05$).

Finally, chi-square testing indicated significant differences again for both gender and tenure status (see Table 4) in regard to survey item #24 (no desire to participate in professional development activities). First, chi-square testing indicated that there was a significant relationship between gender and no desire to participate ($x^2 = 11.177$, df3, $p = <.05$). Even though only 28 (14%) of the 198 faculty members who answered this item agreed with its statement, the number of males (18) who agreed was almost double the number of females (10) who did likewise. This could be due to teaching in areas that do not need updating, being confident with their teaching methods, being secure in their
career status, or preferring to spend their out-of-classroom time on nonprofessional development issues and activities.

Chi-square testing pointed out that “no desire to participate” was also an issue in regard to professional status ($x^2 = 8.819$, df = 3, $p < .05$). The frequency of tenured faculty was five times greater than nontenured instructors (25 and 5, respectively), yet these two figures combined showed that these 30 respondents were only 14% of the total number of faculty who responded to this item. It is likely that tenured faculty have a greater sense of job security and/or have so many years of professional experience behind them that they do not feel attendance at such activities is either necessary or worthwhile.

Thus, chi-square applications revealed significant relationships regarding six of the reasons for nonattendance given on the survey instrument; these can be found in Table 5, which serves as an overview of the significant findings. It was noted that time spent serving on institutional committees and performing administrative assignments (survey question #13) was not statistically significant as a reason for nonattendance when looking at the faculty demographics which were addressed; therefore, a category heading for committees/administrative assignments was not included in Table 5.

Survey Part II: Incentives/Rewards for Attendance at FCLT Activities

Questions #25-#29 of the survey instrument were aimed at finding how CCSN faculty viewed the use of incentives/rewards as motivators for attendance at FCLT professional development activities. These questions presented specific items used as
Table 5

Significant Results Of Chi-Square Tests For Faculty Reasons for Nonattendance at FCLT Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Nonattendance</th>
<th>Vocational &amp; Academic Faculty</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Obligations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not for Promotion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Scheduled</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics Not Improve Teaching</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics Not Relative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Desire</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

incentives/rewards at colleges and universities nationwide according to the literature on this topic.

Faculty demographics were crosstabulated with the Incentives/Rewards responses, resulting in several sets of data. Chi-square tests were used to look at the relationships between variables and to call attention to any information that was to be considered further due to statistical significance. The data on these crosstabulations is displayed in Table 6. A discussion of the chi-square test data for Incentives/Rewards questions follows the presentation of the crosstabulation results.

As shown in Table 6, college-wide recognition was the least attractive incentive to faculty in return for their attendance at internal professional development activities. The only exception noted with regard to subscriptions and membership dues as incentives was the three faculty members who were under the age of 30. However, 59% (63) of male faculty and 46% (44) of female faculty members found a subscription to a professional journal to be lucrative as an incentive. Overall, faculty members generally were attracted to the subscription. In regard to another potential incentive, over half of the faculty
Table 6  
Faculty Views on Incentives/Rewards for Attending FCLT Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive/Reward</th>
<th>Gender %, (n)</th>
<th>Age %, (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.4 (63)</td>
<td>46.4 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Dues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68.9 (73)</td>
<td>56.9 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77.3 (82)</td>
<td>79.8 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.8 (39)</td>
<td>51.0 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.5 (53)</td>
<td>60.6 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>(94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total is the question's total responses by the demographic characteristic specified in the column heading.
members (when broken out by male, female, and the four age groups listed in Table 6) indicated that they liked the idea of paid dues for membership in a professional organization. Paid travel to a professional conference was also positively viewed with over half of the faculty members in each breakout previously noted.

Over half of the faculty members, regardless of gender, agreed that participation in professional development activities should count towards tenure. The 40-50 age group was the only breakdown by age that did not agree by over 50% with this item; their agreement was at 48% (36).

The chi-square tests showed which relationships between variables were significant at p<.05 for responses that concerned incentives/rewards for attendance.

When a comparison of faculty by gender and age demographics was made in regard to which incentives/rewards were attractive to them in return for attendance at FCLT-sponsored professional development offerings, two significant relationships surfaced. These relationships are shown in Table 7.

First, chi-square testing showed a significant relationship between gender and item #25, a paid subscription to a professional journal (x^2 = 8.272, df3, p = <.05). Female agreement with this item was at 46% (44). This was the only incentive with which female respondents agreed at less than 50%.

Second, chi-square testing indicated a significant relationship between age and item #26, paid dues in a professional organization (x^2 = 74.859, df12, p = <.05). All four breakdowns of age groups were over 50%, ranging from 58% (52) of the 50+ age group to 70% (53) for the 40 to 50 age group. This suggested that over half of the faculty
Table 7

Significant Chi-Square Relationships for Faculty Responses to Incentives/Rewards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentives/Rewards</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid Subscription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8.272</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Dues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>74.859</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * represents significance at .05 level.

regarded paid dues in a professional organization as a lucrative incentive to attend internal professional development activities.

It was noted that paid travel expenses to a professional conference, college-wide recognition, and professional attendance counting towards tenure (survey questions #27, 28 and 29, respectively) were not found to have significant relationships to the faculty demographics of gender and age.

Survey Part II: Delivery Preferences

Items #18-23 solicited faculty views regarding delivery mode preferences for professional development sessions. These survey items did not directly address any one of the research questions, but they were included in the study as potential guideposts for future training sessions that the FCLT would sponsor, host, or coordinate. The most popular training format that was attractive to over half of the faculty in each group was
hands-on workshops. This was preferred by 73% of the academic faculty and 66% of the vocational faculty. A strong second place was taken by the seminar format which was regarded positively at 65% by academic and 60% by vocational faculty. Over half of the vocational faculty preferred less-structured settings and online learning at 54% and 53%, respectively. Academic faculty registered a 48% agreement with less structure but only a 28% agreement with online learning. Panel discussions and lectures were not popular with either faculty group; both academic and vocational groups had only a 36% agreement to panels as a preferred learning format, and 32% of academic teachers preferred lectures while only 28% of vocational faculty did.

Survey Part III: Open-Ended Question

Part III of the survey gave respondents a space in which to write their opinions, ideas and suggestions in regard to the question: In your opinion, what can be done to increase faculty participation in FCLT-sponsored professional development activities?

There were 216 individuals who responded to this item representing 100% of the completed surveys that were turned in by the deadline date (see Appendix V). Even though three respondents each provided two opinions/ideas/suggestions to this item, each of these responses was counted only once towards the count of the total number of individual responses. Some written comments did not directly pertain to the purpose of the question. For example, some asked a question back, others commented on the good work that the FCLT had been doing, and others reiterated reasons for nonattendance or suggestions for incentives that were already included in the various questions on the survey instrument.
Ninety-three of the 216 open-ended responses provided the types of information sought by the survey question. Ninety respondents provided the 93 answers that addressed different aspects of faculty professional development. The open-ended question was an attempt to solicit opinions and gather ideas that: 1. aided in providing information that may have been overlooked by survey questions or 2. added insight for the purpose of finding answers to the research questions that guided this study. The 93 pertinent responses were broken into five categories which emerged from the data. The categories as displayed in Figure 1 were: Incentives, Scheduling, Programming, Marketing, and Management.

**Figure 1.** Open-ended responses to what else could be done to improve attendance.

Twelve responses (13%) pertained to incentives. A stipend/money for attendance was suggested by 33% (4) of those who were surveyed, three of the four were academic faculty. Seventeen percent (2) wrote that food should be provided at the professional development sessions. Fifty percent (6) of the responses was classified as miscellaneous.
Twenty-seven (29%) of the 93 responses addressed the scheduling of internal professional development opportunities. The time of day or day of the week for training sessions was a concern of 26% (7) of the responding faculty. Location concerns were brought up by 22% (6) respondents, all of whom were academic faculty, and 15% (4) suggested online training activities; these four respondents were also academic faculty. The remaining 37% (10) of the comments was classified as miscellaneous.

Thirty-two comments that addressed program offerings comprised 34% of the responses to the open-ended question. Thirteen percent (4) of these responses indicated that more technology training should be given; it was 2 academic and 2 vocational faculty members who supported more technological training. Conversely, 19% (6) responses felt that there was already too much training time given to technological topics; five of these six responses were submitted by academic faculty. Twenty-eight percent (9) of the faculty members asked for the sessions to include new topics, possibly even very narrow training topics; five of these were academic faculty and four were vocational instructors. Sixteen percent (5) requested more sessions on teaching tips and ideas for the classroom. None of these comments, however, provided any new solutions to the concerns of program offerings. The remaining 25% (8) of the programming responses was classified as miscellaneous.

Marketing strategies for the FCLT were offered by 9% (8) of the write-in responses. Suggestions for advertising professional development sessions, which were all redundant to what was already occurring, were made by 25% (2) respondents who were both academic instructors while 63% (5) of the responses asked for clearer/more in-depth descriptions of the content of the training sessions. These 5 responses consisted of 3 from
academic and 2 from vocational faculty members. The remaining 12% (1) of the marketing responses was classified as miscellaneous.

Finally, 15% (14) of the 93 pertinent write-in responses for the open-ended question dealt with the issue of management. Thirty-six percent (5) of these responses suggested that the administration should make sure that members of the faculty have the time to attend professional development activities. Three of the individuals who conveyed this thought were vocational faculty. Two of these 5 responses suggested having days during the semester that would be designated as professional development days, similar to the in-service days for teachers of a public school district. Another hinted that one Friday a month should be totally free of any meetings of any kind in order to give faculty the opportunity to attend professional development activities, which would be scheduled on that meeting-free day. Twenty-one percent (3), all of whom were academic instructors, supported the establishment of a reward system; one faculty member specified a reward, “Link participation to merit pay for tenured faculty.” One respondent suggested implementing and maintaining an ongoing point system with specific rewards at predetermined intervals. Another 21% (3) felt that attendance should be required at a certain number of sessions per academic year; two of these were academic instructors, and one was a vocational teacher. The remaining 21% (3) was classified as miscellaneous.

Summary

Responses to the survey that was distributed to CCSN’s full-time teaching faculty in the fall of 2002 determined the following information regarding the composition of the
faculty body: there were 216 respondents to the survey; slightly over half of them was male; more males than females taught academic subjects; the largest number of respondents were 50+ years of age; the master degree was the most common credential; the largest faculty group by teaching time at CCSN was 1-5 years.

Attendance patterns of faculty at professional development offerings indicated that the largest group had only attended between one and five sessions out of a possible 90 during in-service weeks since August 2000; over half of those were academic faculty. The addition of ongoing workshops, which are offered during the 16 weeks of the semester, showed that more academic than vocational faculty members were in attendance. This was true for all designations of sessions offered except for 30+ sessions (highest number on the survey) out of a possible 194, which were attended by only three members of the CCSN faculty, and all three were vocational instructors.

Approximately half of the faculty members indicated their main reasons for nonattendance at internal professional development activities were due to the demands of their teaching obligations and the times/days that the workshops and training sessions were scheduled. Twenty-eight of the respondents admitted that they had no desire to participate in these activities. Regardless of tenure status, faculty did not attribute their nonattendance on the exclusion of professional development as a requirement for tenure.

Chi-square testing was conducted to determine which relationships between faculty demographic variables and reasons for nonattendance at professional development offerings were significant at \( p = <.05 \). Significant relationships were found between vocational/academic teaching area and 1. teaching obligations, 2. scheduled training times, 3. no improvement in teaching, and 4. topics not related to [one’s] professional
development. Significant relationships were indicated through chi-square testing between gender and 1. not a criterion for tenure/promotion, 2. scheduled training times, 3. no improvement in teaching, and 4. no desire to participate. Chi-square testing also indicated significant relationships between faculty demographics and lucrative rewards for attending professional development activities. These were 1. gender with a subscription to a professional journal, and 2. age with paid dues in a professional organization. Both of these highly rated potential incentives show that CCSN faculty value rewards that support their professional growth.

The data obtained from the survey was used to study the views, opinions, ideas and suggestions of CCSN faculty and to determine what actions were needed to make internal professional development activities more worthwhile to them.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Review of Purpose of the Study. The FCLT has been charged with facilitating faculty professional excellence. It encourages instructors to participate in scholarly activities for the purposes of enhancing their instructional skills, improving their technical skills, and enjoying the collegiality of their peers.

However, many faculty do not take advantage of the FCLT’s professional development opportunities offered on the three campuses of CCSN. Many reasons for their nonparticipation can be anticipated. They might be too involved with other professional responsibilities. They may already be satisfied with their current performance in the classroom. They may not rank professional development as a priority in either their careers or their lives.

The purposes of this study, therefore, were: to determine CCSN faculty attendance patterns at in-house professional development activities; to consult the literature to learn what others have found regarding faculty reasons for not participating as well as their viewpoints on the use of incentives/rewards; to uncover the CCSN faculty’s reasons for
nonattendance; and to determine which incentives/rewards, if any, would be welcomed by them.

*Overview of the Study.* This study was descriptive and exploratory in nature. The FCLT advisory committee discussed current concerns regarding low faculty participation in professional development activities. It gave suggestions as to what types of information could be gathered by the study that would ultimately help to guide the future activities of the FCLT.

After the survey instrument was designed and necessary approvals were obtained, surveys were sent to the 376 full-time teaching faculty personnel at CCSN during the Fall 2002 semester.

Part I of the survey was designed to gather data on faculty demographics in order to obtain a clear understanding of the characteristics of the faculty body and to get an indication of their attendance patterns at both in-service week activities and ongoing workshops and training sessions during the academic semesters.

Part II of the survey requested faculty input on their reasons for nonattendance at internal professional development activities offered through the FCLT. It also asked them to indicate their levels of agreement to Likert-type statements that suggested incentives for attendance at such activities.

Finally, Part III gave faculty the opportunity to write-in any responses that the survey, which was based on a literature review, may have omitted.

The analysis of the data included descriptive statistics of the subjects and made comparisons within the existing faculty membership as well as explored relationships in the data through cross-tabulations. Chi-square tests were used to further examine the
Conclusions

Research Question #1. What patterns of attendance have been exhibited by CCSN faculty members at internal professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT? More CCSN faculty members attend professional development workshop, seminars, and activities during the in-service week that precedes each semester than they do during the semesters. Seventeen percent (36) of the faculty members responded that they did not attend any professional development activities during in-service weeks, but 32% (66) admitted to not attending any such sessions during the semester. Sixty percent (127) of the survey respondents indicated that they attended from one to five activities during an in-service week whereas only 48% (101) attended from one to five sessions that were offered once the semesters had begun; almost 60% of the faculty in attendance at these sessions were teachers of academic subjects. Vocational instructors attended less sessions during semesters than they did during in-service weeks; one reason may be that vocational instructors teach more lab classes, which means more time in the classroom. Also, vocational teachers who are on a nontenure track comprise approximately 23% of CCSN’s vocational faculty members (C. P. Petrie and D. R. Christmas, personal communication, March 24, 2003); they are likely carrying a teaching load of more than 15 hours, which is the standard load for full-time academic faculty (T. M. Peacock, personal communication, March 14, 2003). Analysis of attendance at the other session
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breakouts attended showed much lower percentages of faculty participation which ranged from 0% to 11% (23).

Approximately half of the respondents cited heavy teaching obligations as a reason for nonattendance, and half of them also felt that the activities were not scheduled at convenient times. Outcalt (2000) and Sterner (1999) indicated that a general lack of time because of teaching obligations was a common reason for nonattendance given by faculty. Massy and Wilger (1995) found that post-secondary faculty are generally time efficient and wrote, "Faculty 'work smart' according to traditional criteria, and many work very long hours..." (Conclusion section, ¶ 5).

Even though professional development is not a requirement for tenure or promotion at CCSN, over half of the faculty did not feel that this was a primary reason for their nonattendance, yet Sterner (1999) found that it was an issue with the faculty in her study.

Sixty-five faculty members indicated that they did not participate in professional development activities because they felt it probably would not improve their teaching. Males who responded in this way outweighed the females' responses by over three to one. This result was congruent with conventional wisdom since males have a general reputation of not wanting to invest time in professional development because of their professional workload, a conflict with scheduled training days/times, or solely because they do not want to attend. This stereotype, although prejudgemental, reflects this attitude.

Research Question #2. What incentives, based on findings in a literature review, have been used elsewhere to motivate faculty to attend more often? The literature review that was conducted prior to the design of the survey instrument for this study resulted in the
identification of over a dozen different plausible incentives/rewards that were employed at other universities and colleges. Some of these were used in conjunction with professional development, and others were used for other reasons such as rewards for designing online courses.

The more common incentives/rewards that the review yielded were: paid dues in a professional organization (Etheridge, 2002; Outcalt, 2000); assistance toward travel expenses (van Note Chism, 2002; Outcalt, 2000; Mahaffey and Welsh, 1993); sabbaticals (Bowen and Schuster, 1986; Outcalt, 2000); released time (Cross, 1997; Mahaffey and Welsh, 1993); and recognition (Pendleton, 2002; Mahaffey and Welsh, 1993).

Research Question #3. What incentives do CCSN faculty members identify as attractive to them in return for their participation in internal professional development activities sponsored by the FCLT? Over half of the faculty respondents showed favor with paid dues to a professional organization and paid (conference) travel with limitations. A paid subscription to a professional journal was attractive to 46% (44) of the females who responded and to over 50% for males and for faculty by age. Over half of the faculty across the gender and age groups agreed with the statement that professional development participation should count towards tenure except for the 36 respondents who were in the 40 to 50 age group.

College-wide recognition as an incentive/reward for professional development was not as highly rated as the other incentives specified in the survey. This finding was contrary to the information found in the literature. Male faculty members were just over 35% in agreement to college-wide recognition for participation in professional development activities whereas just over half of the female faculty members were in
agreement. This may tie in with the male faculty thinking that participation in professional development sessions will not improve their teaching. Therefore, if they do not attend because of that belief, then they will have no basis for which to be recognized.

Comparisons by age showed that the three faculty members who were below age 30 all agreed with the statement concerning college-wide recognition as a reward while no other age group agreed by more than 48%. The younger faculty members more than likely have not yet been awarded tenure, so recognition for professional development activities may intrinsically motivate them as an item for their tenure portfolios. They may also feel that the recognition will help to establish them as faculty members who are committed to their profession, a reputation that would be advantageous when they are considered for tenure.

Open-ended responses that suggested alternative incentives/rewards to the ones listed in the survey included money, released time, and serving food at sessions. One faculty member viewed the use of incentives as going against the grain of professionalism when s/he wrote, “...full time faculty member[s] should make time and do not need to be bribed to attend.” Another write-in response relayed that collegiality was a benefit in the pursuit of scholarship, “I love to enhance my teaching abilities + [and] consult with other professionals.” This sentiment supports the healthy status that faculty professional development has obtained over the last three decades. It is no longer regarded as a negative, corrective, or punitive activity.

The open-ended responses that commented on incentives largely supported extrinsic rewards. Faculty responses to the survey showed support for extrinsic rewards. It may be that faculty members do seek self-actualization as Maslow theorized, but that involves
self direction and personal responsibility for one's own continued learning, and the faculty had already indicated their proportionately low attendance. Additionally, faculty in general admitted that they have teaching obligations which prohibit their attendance at professional development opportunities, and they have difficulty attending sessions at the times that the sessions are scheduled. Sergiovanni reported that teaching itself was highly motivating to instructors and could in itself be an opportunity for growth; this study did not seek to determine faculty intrinsic satisfaction with their jobs, but open-ended responses indicated that some members of the faculty were motivated by their work, which supports Herzberg’s theory (as cited in Owens, 1995).

CCSN is located in Las Vegas, Nevada. Las Vegas is often referred to as a city with its own culture. The characteristics of the CCSN student body appear very different from students at other community colleges across America. It may be the influence of the Las Vegas culture that also makes the community college faculty “different,” particularly in respect to not embracing college-wide recognition and other as an incentive.

**Discussion**

The two strongest roadblocks that were conveyed by faculty members to explain their reasons for nonparticipation in professional development opportunities offered by the FCLT were teaching obligations and times that training activities were scheduled. More faculty members admitted to attending sessions during in-service weeks than during the semester. Even though they are not teaching in the classroom during in-service week, they still have the obligations of preparing their syllabi and lessons for the first day of
classes. Nevertheless, it is apparent that they do find the time to manage to participate in sessions designed especially for the teaching faculty during in-service weeks.

In the past the FCLT had experimented with the times that training sessions were held. Every day of the week excluding Sunday had been tried, and morning, afternoon, evening, and online sessions each had their shares of trials. During the academic semesters, Friday morning activities seemed to have the most participants. Professional development activities had additionally been scheduled during the summertime and during the break between fall and spring semesters. One survey respondent wrote this remark, “Can’t please everyone! Variety of times, topics, and locations [are] presently in place.”

Perhaps that is where the FCLT has to loosen its grip. Perhaps it should be less proactive and start letting faculty come to it instead of the FCLT venturing out to please everyone all the time. In the past two years it had success with two college divisions as far as working with them to provide professional development activities that were designed specifically for their faculty. This plan of action appears to find support in some of the open-ended responses that were received: “Specialize workshops for specific department needs.” “More department/discipline oriented workshops.” “Focus on subjects rather than the entire college community.”

The respondents were not asked to rate or comment on the quality of workshops that have been offered to date. The oversight of such an item is now regretted by the researcher.

Another alternative emerged by combining three open-ended responses. These were categorized as management suggestions since they would have to involve the supportive
action of the college administration. This option would entail the establishment of one meeting-free Friday each month that would be a designated in-service day with several sessions offered each day. Department, programs, or divisions could indicate specialized topics for their faculty members that could be offered in the same time slot while two or three general topics could be offered during a preceding or following time slot so that each faculty member could select the one s/he wanted to attend. This type of set-up could, more or less, be regarded as a mini-conference.

The combination of the study’s results along with the information found in the literature advocates for redesigning different aspects of the FCLT and its functions. Even though the FCLT offers professional development sessions on all three campuses, one of those sites does not host as many sessions as the other two do because of a smaller number of faculty who teach there. It would be beneficial, though, for the FCLT to have a presence on this campus beyond the Faculty Resource Collection that is housed in its library.

Since the FCLT finds it difficult to offer WebCT and computer software workshops at prime times because of the lack of an available computer classroom, it would be ideal to have a dedicated space. This space, for instance, could be a large room that has at least a dozen computers in one half and a lecture area in the other half. This arrangement would give the FCLT more flexibility with scheduling both hands-on and seminar-type workshops and with inviting specific subject area faculty to attend requested, customized training sessions.

Since faculty in general indicated difficulty in participating in professional development opportunities due to scheduling conflicts, it would be wise to explore other
delivery modes for FCLT workshops. Self-paced online modules, webinars, and interactive online sessions may be possible options. Commercial computer software tutorials and self-instructional videos for software that faculty commonly use should be purchased and included in the Faculty Resource Collection on each campus.

The literature review had uncovered several types of activities that promoted collaboration among faculty. Some projects could be worked on within a department, and others may encourage interdisciplinary activity. A near-future workshop should feature a discussion led by instructors who have already collaborated on a project followed by faculty exploring ways that they can form teams to achieve instructional goals.

Recommendations for Further Research

There is an old saying, “Hindsight is the perfect science.” That saying applies to this research study.

It is apparent now that it would have been time efficient and doubly informative if a survey was sent to CCSN administrators at the same time that the full-time teaching faculty received their surveys. The administrators’ survey, however, would have asked them to respond to statements that elicited how they perceived faculty professional development and whether they felt it was valuable or not. According to Murray (1999), an institution’s administrators may influence faculty motivation for professional development, “If teachers believe that good teaching is not valued, they have no incentive to improve” (¶ 11).
Administrators would have been asked to convey their thoughts as to whether a reward system that was openly supported by the administration might encourage faculty to participate more frequently as well as help CCSN to keep the excellent faculty that it already has. The administrators would additionally have been asked to list the components of a reward system that they would consider to be fair and manageable (financially, across disciplines/department, toward tenure, toward promotion, etc.).

A second recommendation would be to determine the impact of faculty professional development on revitalization. The resultant information from this type of a study would be enlightening in general, no matter which community college conducted this particular study.

Finally, a third type of study could be conducted to determine the effects of a newly implemented reward system on faculty morale, attitude, teaching, and spirit of professionalism overall. Any community college that is at the development stage of a reward system may want to consciously plan on a follow-up survey to faculty once the system has been implemented and in operation for a time. The survey should seek to gather positive and negative reactions of both faculty and administration, address unanticipated glitches that occurred, and discuss the successes and drawbacks of the system that was instituted.

Summary

Teaching is regarded as the heart of the community college, and faculty are the personnel with the most direct connection to the classrooms and, most importantly, the students. The FCLT’s connection to faculty is that it exists for the purpose of promoting
professional excellence. It accomplishes this by keeping faculty informed and providing professional development opportunities to help them work more effectively with changes such as those regarding student culture, andragogy, subject area/discipline content, and valuable, pertinent student learning activities. Many CCSN faculty, however, do not participate in these offerings that are available to help them grow professionally and enhance their teaching skills.

The controversy lies in whether or not each individual faculty member’s personal definition of professionalism encompasses professional development on his/her own time outside of the classroom. Dedicated faculty work more than 40 hours each week. An institutional survey conducted during the Fall 2002 semester disclosed that members of the CCSN faculty spend an average of 60.9 hours per week on professional duties and responsibilities (less overload teaching contracts) and service to the college (F. J. DiPuma, personal communication, March 25, 2003).

It is no secret that faculty can take jobs in business and industry and increase their salaries by leaving the teaching profession. Perhaps they would feel more satisfied in their current careers if CCSN was to develop and implement a reward system just as many colleges and universities nationwide have already done. Such action would not necessarily make the salaries of college instructors more comparable with salaries in the private sector, but it may help to convey a feeling of support and appreciation by the administration. As one open-ended survey response stated, “Administration does not encourage participation.”

The results of this research study will be used by the FCLT to evaluate what it is currently doing and determine what changes or new features it must add to its operation
in order to be a vehicle that CCSN faculty will use to help them as they seek professional
excellence. The words of Pendleton (2002) may provide direction for the next step, “A
good faculty development program is a process designed to create a climate where
recognition, institutional support and professional development are addressed” (¶ 4). The
FCLT can work with the Faculty Senate or other appropriate faculty groups and the
administration to tailor its professional development activities to best assist faculty
members to improve their teaching skills and enhance their teaching careers.
Faculty Survey

Please use BLUE or BLACK ink to complete form

Shade Circles Like This --> •

Not Like This --> X

Part I

1. To which dean do you report?
   - Diane Pannell
   - Chris Kelly
   - Don Smith
   - Sue Blizard
   - Charles Okeke
   - Paul Pate
   - Fran Brown

2. I am tenured: • Yes • No

3. I am:
   - Female
   - Male

4. My age is:
   - Under 30
   - 30 - 40
   - 40 - 50
   - Over 50

5. The highest degree I hold is:
   - Doctorate
   - Associate
   - Master
   - Certificate
   - Bachelor

6. How many years have you taught at CC SN as a full-time faculty member?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1 - 5 years
   - 6 - 10 years
   - Over 10 years

7. How many years have you taught at other colleges/universities as a FULL-TIME faculty member?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1 - 5 years
   - 6 - 10 years
   - Over 10 years

8. Are you aware of the Faculty Center for Learning & Teaching (FCLT) at CC SN?
   - Yes • No

9. Have you attended a CC SN President's Welcome Back session since August 2002?
   - Yes • No

10. How many FCLT-sponsored workshops/panels/training sessions have you attended DURING AN IN-SERVICE WEEK prior to the first day of classes since August 20007?(This does NOT include the CC SN President's Welcome Back Sessions)

   - None
   - 1 - 20
   - 21 - 30
   - 31 - 40
   - 41 - 50
   - 51 - 60

11. How many FCLT-sponsored workshops/panels/training sessions have you attended not counting question #9?

   - None
   - 1 - 20
   - 21 - 30
   - 31 - 40
   - 41 - 50
   - 51 - 60
   - 61 - 70
   - 71 - 80
   - 81 - 90
   - 91 - 100

PLEASE CONTINUE SURVEY ON REVERSE SIDE.
Part II:
Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. I do not have time to participate because of my teaching obligations.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I do not have time to participate because of committee/administrative assignments.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I do not attend FCLT sessions because participation in professional development activities is not considered for tenure or promotion at CCSN.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The FCLT sessions are scheduled at times that are difficult for me to attend.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The session topics will probably not improve my teaching.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The session topics are not related to my professional development.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I prefer hands-on workshops/sessions.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I prefer panel discussions.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I prefer lecture sessions.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I prefer seminars.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I prefer a less-structured setting.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I prefer online professional development offerings.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I have no desire to participate.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you agree or disagree that any of the following incentives would encourage you personally to participate in internal professional development activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. A paid subscription to a professional journal.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Paid dues for a membership in a professional organization.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Paid travel expenses to a conference (with limitations)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. College-wide recognition.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Participation in these sessions should be considered in the tenure process.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III:
In your opinion, what can be done to increase faculty participation in FCLT-sponsored professional development activities?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN PROVIDING THIS VALUABLE INFORMATION
APPENDIX II

HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVALS
Notice of Approval to Conduct Research Involving Human Subjects

DATE: November 22, 2002

TO: Patricia LaFlamme, Educational Leadership
    Dale Anderson
    M/S 5030

FROM: Dr. Fred Preston, Chair
    UNLV Social Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board

RE: Status of Human Subject Protocol Entitled: Participation in Professional Development: CCSN Faculty Attitudes Regarding In-House Activities Sponsored by the Faculty Center for Learning & Teaching
    OPRS# 303F1102-542

This memorandum is official notification that the protocol for the project referenced above has been reviewed by the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) and has been determined as having met the criteria for exemption from full review by the UNLV Social Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board (IRB) as indicated in regulatory statutes 45CFR 46.101. The protocol has been submitted through the expedited review process and has been approved for a period of one year from the date of this notification. Work on the project may proceed.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol continue beyond November 22, 2003, it will be necessary to request an extension. **Should there be ANY changes to the protocol, it will be necessary to submit those changes to the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects.**

If you have questions or require any assistance, please contact the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 895-2794.

Cc: OPRS File
Completion Certificate

This is to certify that

Trish (Patricia) LaFlamme

has completed the Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), on 11/05/2002.

This course included the following:

- key historical events and current issues that impact guidelines and legislation on human participant protection in research.
- ethical principles and guidelines that should assist in resolving the ethical issues inherent in the conduct of research with human participants.
- the use of key ethical principles and federal regulations to protect human participants at various stages in the research process.
- a description of guidelines for the protection of special populations in research.
- a definition of informed consent and components necessary for a valid consent.
- a description of the role of the IRB in the research process.
- the roles, responsibilities, and interactions of federal agencies, institutions, and researchers in conducting research with human participants.
This is to certify that

Dale Andersen

has completed the Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), on 12/31/2002.

This course included the following:

- key historical events and current issues that impact guidelines and legislation on human participant protection in research.
- ethical principles and guidelines that should assist in resolving the ethical issues inherent in the conduct of research with human participants.
- the use of key ethical principles and federal regulations to protect human participants at various stages in the research process.
- a description of guidelines for the protection of special populations in research.
- a definition of informed consent and components necessary for a valid consent.
- a description of the role of the IRB in the research process.
- the roles, responsibilities, and interactions of federal agencies, institutions, and researchers in conducting research with human participants.
This is to certify that

Cecilia Maldonado

has completed the Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), on 11/17/2002.

This course included the following:

- key historical events and current issues that impact guidelines and legislation on human participant protection in research.
- ethical principles and guidelines that should assist in resolving the ethical issues inherent in the conduct of research with human participants.
- the use of key ethical principles and federal regulations to protect human participants at various stages in the research process.
- a description of guidelines for the protection of special populations in research.
- a definition of informed consent and components necessary for a valid consent.
- a description of the role of the IRB in the research process.
- the roles, responsibilities, and interactions of federal agencies, institutions, and researchers in conducting research with human participants.

National Institutes of Health
http://www.nih.gov
Subject: for Teaching Faculty
Date: Mon, 02 Dec 2002 07:32:15 -0800
From: Trish LaFlamme <trish_laflamme@ccsn.nevada.edu>
To: Everyone List <everyone@ccsn.nevada.edu>

Dear Colleagues,

If you are a teaching faculty during the Fall '02 semester, you will receive a short survey from me this week regarding professional development. It will most likely take under 5 minutes to complete. The code on each survey is for mailing purposes only; your anonymity is assured. Please complete it and return it to the Cannon Center—not me—where all of the surveys will be scanned.

The survey is part of my dissertation for my next degree, but I chose its topic purposely so that CCSN's Faculty Center for Learning & Teaching could get some valuable information for its activities. I hope you will help me out and take a few minutes to complete the survey.

Thank you so much for taking the time to read this. I sincerely appreciate your assistance with this academic project.

Please call me at x2640 if you have any questions or concerns.

Best Wishes,
Trish
APPENDIX IV

INFORMATION TO RESPONDENTS
November 21, 2002

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to seek your input with a study of faculty development programs at CCSN. The purpose is to gather information regarding activities that are sponsored by the Faculty Center for Learning & Teaching (FCLT).

Your input will provide me with valuable information that may point out where the FCLT can make improvements in activities, topics, delivery times and modes, and incentives. No individually identifiable responses will be reported; all responses are anonymous and will be aggregated.

The enclosed questionnaire should take you 5 to 10 minutes to complete. Please return it via campus mail to the Cannon Center in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Please return it by December 12, 2002.

If you have comments or questions about the study, I would be happy to talk with you. I can be contacted by phone at 651-2640 or by e-mail at trish_laflamme@ccsn.nevada.edu or by mail at sort code J2A.

I genuinely appreciate your assistance with this study and giving me the opportunity to gain valuable insight about your professional development. I value your opinion, cooperation, and support. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Trish LaFlamme
UNLV Graduate Student
INFORMED CONSENT

General Information:
I am Trish LaFlamme from the UNLV Department of Higher Education-Educational Leadership. I am the researcher on this project; I am a doctoral student. You are invited to participate in a research study. The study involves a questionnaire that will be sent to the Fall 2002 full-time teaching faculty at the Community College of Southern Nevada (CCSN). The purpose of this study is to gather information regarding activities that are sponsored by the Faculty Center for Learning & Teaching (FCLT) in order to better understand faculty professional development at CCSN.

Procedure:
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire by completing a Scantron of 30 questions that include open and closed-ended answers.

Benefits of Participation:
By participating you will provide information that will contribute to the results of the study, which would be used in a constructive fashion to provide additional direction for the improvement of professional development for faculty at CCSN. You will also receive additional understanding of issues that impact professional development activities.

Risk of Participation in:
With all research there may be risk. With this study there may be the minimal risk of discomfort with the content of some of the questions. If you are uncomfortable answering some of the questions asked, I encourage you to discuss this with me; I will explain the questions to you in more detail.

Contact Information:
If you have any questions about the study or if you believe you may have experienced harmful effects as a result of participation in this study, please contact the researcher at 651-2640 or Dr. Cecilia Maldonado at 895-3410.

For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 895-2794.
Voluntary Participation:
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.

Confidentiality:
All information gathered in this study will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility for at least three years after the completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be destroyed.

Participant Consent:
I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I am at least 18 years of age. A copy of this form has been given to me.

Please keep this copy for your records.
January 15, 2003

Dear Colleague,

I know that college faculty have precious little “free time”, but please be so kind as to complete the enclosed survey (it should take between 3 and 4 minutes) and mail it in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. I intend to use the aggregated information to make suggestions that will enhance faculty professional development at CCSN, and I genuinely appreciate your input.

I am still short of the minimum number of completed surveys that are needed for my research study. This second mailing is being sent only to those who had not returned their surveys to the Cannon Center, which is assisting me in this project. Please complete and return your survey by January 31, 2003.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Sincerely,

Trish LaFlamme
UNLV Graduate Student
X2640
APPENDIX V

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What can be done to increase faculty participation in FCLT-sponsored activities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 and 29 would help participation.</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A closer understanding of technology offerings and course prep assistance.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A full time faculty member should make time and do not need to be bribed to attend.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good thorough orientation for new employes is desperately needed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little less computer stuff.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A point system where points would be given to those who participate then a reward of some type will be given with the points.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A widely varied range of topics.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add incentive, as well as a more varied array of sessions. Many or the sessions offered in the fall were repeated in the spring.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate timing compensation, cyber-interaction, advertisements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on the classes made available well in advance.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't please everyone! Variety of times, topics, and locations presently in place.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with classtime.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create some workshops directed towards improving learning in applied tech. lab settings.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease session time.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department retreats</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments may have special needs, make workshops accordingly to need.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design them with a focus on innovation creative ideas for the teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different days or evenings so that those of us with teaching conflicts can attend.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement at the opening meetings with a small sample of what maybe covered importance to us. In other words a little marketing way before hand.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra cash</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty will.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCLT cannot address everyone's needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCLT is an important college entity. Schmer attention was given to &quot;technology workshops&quot; Schmer could create more department/discipline oriented workshops.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure out a way to entice the motivated group who are busy will teaching and students.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find more locations.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Valid

focus on other issues instead of excel, webct, not everyone interested in technology
Focus on subjects rather than the entire college community.
Food, if possible.
Free up demands on faculty so that they have time to attend.
Have more on-line.
Have some activities at the Henderson campus
Hold more sessions on-line.
hold some of them in Henderson.
I've read this survey and I'm not even sure what a FCLT etc. is.
I believe these p-d activities are doing a wonderful job, I cant imagine what else they could do.
If conference expenses were paid, I'd put up with more of the activities.
Implementing less technical, more nurturing activities such as formation.
Improved communication of upcoming event with adequate lead-time.
Keep up the good work!!!!
Less emphasis on on-line information.
link participation to merit pay for tenured faculty. Use FCLT to train adjunct faculty to meet ccnn professional standards. Expand disciplinary range of workshop offerings beyond technological development.
Make a participation mandatory for all faculty. About 2 per year.
make faculty aware of FCLT's purpose and goals.
Make it part of the contract - 4 programs each year.
Make them at a time I don't have other responsibilities.
Make them more fun and relaxing, give like activities which we then can rise with our students.
Make them required
Maybe a better question might be? Why does participation need to increase?
meet one-on-one with faculty
Money will almost always increase participation.
More activities at various campuses.
More activities scheduled during off-peak classroom hours. online availability of information or popular training topics.
More advanced topics.
more advertising
More current issues beyond the technology track ones.
More dynamic programs.
More flexible times.
more mac themed workshops
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>More sessions in Henderson.</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More work related sessions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My time does not allow me to participate.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My time is so demanded currently that attending is just not a priority.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>need more time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New topics.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not enough helpful sessions.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not much, too many committee assignment and scheduling conflicts.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not that many interesting topics.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer at different times, including Saturdays and Sundays.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offer at each 3 campuses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer at flexible times, at all campuses.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offer at more than 1 time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer classes on days other than Fridays.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer more on-line and possibly Friday mornings.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer more times for workshops.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer sessions at a convenient time.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer these Development Sessions on Friday, early in the semester.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the major problems is the travel to a distant campus.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay faculty $50 per session to attend.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pay for attendance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People attend these sessions only when they feel the need to.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps some kind of certification process that would qualify you as educated in that field. I really like the idea of paying dues in a professional organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presentations better prepared, useful.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevent or request administration not to schedule program mandatory meetings. admin does not encourage participation.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide fewer DE FCLTS sponsored professional development activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provide paid time off and put them at times we are on campus more.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide some incentive for faculty participation.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce work load hours.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relevant materials at good times with some incentive.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rotation of offerings at all campuses.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same course offered each semester, credit toward tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule in-service days once or twice a semester with several sessions offered.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduling.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serve food and locate some activities in Henderson.  
Short + information packet needed.  
Smaller, more targeted sessions.  
Something simple, to the point.  
Specialize workshops for specific department needs.  
Subjects relating to improving and making things easier (tips) on teaching tools.  
Take attendance.  
Take roll.  
The last Friday of each month should be designated as development day so that we can attend the workshops that they offer.  
The pref. dev. act. that I would be interested in are rather narrowly focused and have never been a part of FCLT activities, nor would I really expect them to be  
They could be more specific to the teacher's needs because many are more general for faculty who teach general courses.  
This survey has some blanks due to my preferences which are neutral. I love to enhance my teaching abilities + consult with other professionals.  
Time seems to be a major set back, when courses are offered.  
under variety of topic course or discipline for some areas.  
Variety of subjects combined with hands on or colleague panels for participation.  
Vary the topics.  
Workshops very valuable, but I don't have time.  
Worthwhile information, such as teaching tips, is what motivates me to attend.  
Total 216
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