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The purpose of this study was to determine faculty participation in and approval of professional growth and renewal activities in the Dallas County Community College District. The population consisted of 526 full-time faculty employed by the district. The DCCCD Survey instrument, which was used in the study, included activities grouped into seven categories: career development, leaves, international activities, instructional renewal, grants, reward, and a miscellaneous category. Faculty members identified participation in activities; they also identified their approval or disapproval of all activities on a five point Likert-type scale.

The population was grouped by teaching field, age, years-of-experience and campus for statistical analyses. A Chi-square test of goodness of fit was conducted to determine if significant differences existed between expected and observed participation among groups in each of the seven categories. An analysis of variance was completed to determine significant differences of opinion.
The findings of the study indicated significant differences between expected and observed participation in the following categories: international and instructional activities when faculty were grouped by teaching fields; reward activities among years-of-experience groups. Significant differences of opinion were reported in all but the miscellaneous category when faculty were grouped by teaching field. Other significant differences were reported in career development among age groups, in leaves and grants among years-of-experience groups and in career development, reward and the miscellaneous category among campus groups.

Based on the findings in the study, the following recommendations were made. The career development program should be broadened to appeal to faculty. Leaves and travel funds must be provided for faculty. International and instructional activities must be expanded to include appropriate activities for all teaching fields. Further study should be conducted in specific areas of professional growth to determine if these activities influence the effectiveness of faculty.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The community college emerged as a major force in the United States following World War II. In 1950, 527 two-year colleges existed in this country. By 1970 the number had grown to 800, and by 1982 the number had increased to 1,181 (14, p. 106). Total enrollment in these institutions jumped from 2.7 million to 11.2 million from 1950 to 1970 (15), but this growth in total enrollment as well as the expansion of community colleges has halted.

The present status of two-year colleges as well as the general status of higher education is one of financial hardship (31, p. 5) and declining enrollment, or in some instances steady-state enrollment. Projections for the years from 1985 through 1988 indicate that enrollment at two-year institutions will decline by 287,000 and full-time instructional staff will decline in this three year period by 13,000 (14, p. 115). The declining enrollment and the financial constraints will eliminate much faculty mobility and threaten the security of many faculty members in community colleges as well as all of higher education.

Most faculty members were hired during the boom period in the quarter-century from 1950 through 1975; many of those
faculty member are now fighting stagnation and struggling with job insecurity. Revitalization provided by new colleagues in the past must now be supplied by other means (6, p. 69).

In addition to the above mentioned difficulties, the general population has expressed dismay with the quality of education offered in this country (6, p. 69) and is demanding that problems be solved and difficulties rectified quickly. A variety of studies conducted in the past few years have pointed out some problems with the educational system. "The problems facing higher education today are making academic life far from idyllic," according to Austin and Gamson (3, p. 44). Not only are institutions facing dilemmas with lack of financial resources exacerbated by declining enrollment, but the institutions as well as faculty members' status is being questioned by the general population. Some faculty member are also expected to teach more varied courses for which they may not feel qualified in order to meet the demands of current student populations. "This devaluation of the educational enterprise has brought with it a concomitant reduction in the status of the teaching profession" (10, p. 1). According to Bowen, "Faculty and staff are insecure and discouraged" (8, p. 10).
The scenario outlined above is not the optimistic scenario envisioned by the leaders in higher education during the quarter-century of growth from 1950 until 1975. But the scenario need not call for the demise of higher education. Colleges faced declining enrollment when thousands of American men left college to fight in World War II. Even during the years of expansion colleges and universities were searching for sufficient funds for expansion of programs and facilities. The leaders in higher education and particularly community colleges must be realistic, however. As Alfred and Nash indicate, "It is increasingly apparent that community college programs will be in a state of flux throughout the decade of the 80s" (1, p. 4). New markets and strategies are being utilized to tap different groups in search of potential students for higher education (24). Although state legislatures and federal grant monies are more limited, productivity measures can be taken to carry out responsibilities with fewer financial resources. Hiring energy management consultants, for example, may help institutions save thousands of dollars in energy costs. More stringent management of financial resources can also be demanded.

The most valued resource in higher education, the faculty, must, however, be given special attention during these difficult times. Kanter states, "Only when an organization exists in stable circumstances, when its
operations resemble clockwork, unvarying in their practices, can individuals be taken for granted or ignored without peril" (18, p. 18). The community college today is not existing in stable circumstances but is facing the greatest difficulties it has encountered since its inception. It is essential that faculty needs and concerns be addressed.

O'Banion makes the following observations about the human resources at institutions of higher learning:

The staff of a college is its single greatest resource. In economic terms, the staff is the college’s most significant and largest capital investment. In these terms alone we affirm that it is only good sense that the investment should be helped to appreciate in value and not be allowed to wear itself out or slide into obsolescence by inattention or neglect (28, p. vii).

Faculty members' renewal and professional development is not being ignored if current literature is any indication. Studies by Baldwin (5) in 1979 and the project on faculty development by the Association of American Colleges (27) in 1979 give credence to the topic of professional growth and renewal for faculty members in higher education as a worthwhile area for study. More recent attention to this topic includes a study of "faculty career changes" at the Rochester Institute of Technology reported in 1983 (17) and a speech about faculty renewal at the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges at the national convention in 1984 (20). Waterman, author of In Search of Excellence, in an address at the national convention of the American Association of Higher Education
in 1984 (33), warned those in higher education to listen to the people throughout their colleges and universities.

Faculty members are being recognized as an important resource in higher education. According to Shulman, "One fact about higher education has remained constant through many years of change. The faculty is still the institution. And a college's effectiveness still depends on how successfully its faculty carries out its education mission" (32, p. 11).

At a time when institutions are faced with retrenchment of faculty, reduction in enrollment and a decline in financial resources, the opportunity for refueling and revitalizing must be taken. Blackburn and Baldwin state, "In the lean years ahead, academic institutions must use all their resources—including their human resources—more flexibly and more creatively if they wish to ensure long-term survival" (7, P. 7). Herman concurs, "Ultimately the viability of colleges and universities will rest not only on efficient use of their human resources, but also on the ability of each professor to present with vitality up-to-date relevant material to other human beings" (17, p. 60).

The eighties as well as the decade of the nineties will present difficult times for higher education and particularly for community colleges, but if institutions take the advice of the educational leaders and look to their
human resources as a source for revitalization, the challenges will be met and the difficulties controlled.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine the extent to which faculty participate in and approve of existing professional development activities supported by a multi-campus community college district.

Purpose of the Study

1. To determine the number who participate in seven types of professional growth and renewal activities.
2. To determine if significant differences exist in the number who participate in the seven types of selected professional growth and renewal activities:
   A. Among ten teaching areas
   B. Among five chronological age groups
   C. Among five years-of-service groups
   D. Among the seven campuses in the multi-campus community college district
3. To determine if significant differences exist in the degree of approval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities:
   A. Among ten teaching areas
   B. Among five chronological age groups
   C. Among five years-of-service groups
D. Among the seven campuses in the multi-campus community college district

Research Questions

In order to complete the purposes of the study, the following research questions will be answered:

1. Are there differences in the number who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities?

2. Are there significant differences in the number who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities
   A. Among ten teaching areas?
   B. Among five chronological age groups?
   C. Among five years-of-service groups?
   D. Among seven campuses in the multi-campus community college district?

3. Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities
   A. Among ten teaching fields?
   B. Among five age groups?
   C. Among five years-of-experience groups?
   D. Among seven campuses?
Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it will identify the professional growth and renewal activities valued by the faculty members participating in the study. If the experts are correct in their indications that the human resources, including faculty, are to be the problem solvers and the impetus for revitalization of the institutions of higher learning from the present until the end of the century, then it is imperative that information be gathered that will help those institutions "maintain an enthusiastic and productive academic work force" (5, p. 26).

Too often in academe as programs are developed or eliminated and as budgets are pared or cut, institutions lose sight of the most important resource, the faculty. According to Brookes and German:

Higher education is a labor-intensive enterprise, and as such, it depends greatly on the quality of learning that its faculty provides. These individuals, both singly and collectively, play a central role in developing and maintaining a collegiate image and reputation, the two factors that speak most directly to institutional vitality. Given the challenges of the contemporary educational marketplace, it is essential that educators reassess not only the educational context, but also the needs of those who will in large measure, determine the success or failure of the enterprise (10, p. 6).

Statistics indicate that the number of faculty members in this country will not be increasing the next few years and that the average age of the faculty will continue to increase (21, p. 22). Mobility of faculty members during the period of growth has disappeared. The Carnegie Council
on Policy Studies in Higher Education indicated in 1980, "The current level of net additions is about zero and will remain at that level or below it for much of the rest of this century" (11, p. 80).

As institutions struggle to revitalize they must not lose sight of the fact that the faculty they have now will be, in many instances, the faculty they will have for the next twenty years (10, p. 4). Many of these faculty members could be teaching basically the same two or three courses for the next twenty years. It is essential that institutions provide development for these faculty members. A Human Resource Development study sponsored by Change magazine states, "During the era of mobility, neglect of faculty development was harmful, but the loss was concealed; in a time of retrenchment continued neglect could become profoundly depressing" (16, p. 16). With so many faculty members remaining in their present positions for the next several years, it is imperative that these faculty members' needs for growth and revitalization be met. Mathis states, "Keeping older faculty enthusiastic about their careers represents one of the greatest challenges to higher education during the decade of the 80s. This enthusiasm has a direct cost in terms of productivity and the quality of education efforts. . ." (21, p. 22).

This study will not only identify the degree of approval faculty members have of professional growth and
renewal activities, but the study may also serve to inform some faculty members of renewal activities available to them.

Colleges are charged to regularly compile data on indicators of faculty well-being including faculty development activities (5, p. 25). Much of the previous research on faculty development activities has dealt with instructional improvement, but faculty development may include a broad variety of activities that make an individual faculty member a more valued contributor to the vitality of an institution. The American Association on Higher Education Task Force on Professional Growth states:

For the remainder of the 1980s, and probably through the 1990s, the challenge will be how to foster a climate of opportunity for personal and professional growth for faculties who are aging and whose self-images and career aspirations have become dated even before they were fully realized (2, p. 4).

In a period of financial constraints there is the danger that professional development and renewal programs may be eliminated. As Ruch states, "One fears that especially in times of limited resources, ill-defined programs may become easy targets for fiscal reversions and low priority" (30, p. 18). One college president, however, states, "Faculty development funds are the most cost effective dollars we have" (25, p. 81).

This study among the faculty of this multi-campus community college district will identify those programs for
growth that are most valued by the faculty. If budgetary support for some professional growth and renewal activities must be decreased at some future date in this district, the decisions about which activities to eliminate can be done more intelligently with the information gathered in this study. The study may also inform faculty of activities available. One study on faculty development in New York indicated that faculty wanted more explicit information about developmental activities which the institution supported (17, p. 59).

The study in this multi-campus community college district will identify professional growth and renewal activities that are valued by faculty members. McKeachie states:

One of the reasons that faculty development programs are particularly important in these critical times for higher education is that if we are to nurture intrinsic satisfactions in teaching we need to help teachers develop a greater sense of self-competency and self-efficacy (23, p. 11).

The future of higher education in general and the future of community colleges may present some difficult times in the next few years, but the greatest catastrophe would be to ignore the faculty and their development. Over fifty per cent of the subjects in this study have invested ten years or more in service to this multi-campus community college district (29). It is essential that this district not ignore the voice of the faculty. In an Association of
American Colleges study conducted in the late seventies, faculty members expressed a strong degree of satisfaction with professional growth and renewal activities:

Many of the faculty . . . expressed feelings of revitalization, indicating that their lives had actually changed as a result of faculty development activities. Instead of settling for the despair which seems so ubiquitous today, these faculty seek to breathe new life into the academy and to pass it on, renewed and revivified, to the next generation of teacher-scholars (27, p. 3).

This study among the faculty at the multi-campus community college district will identify those professional growth and renewal activities that faculty members value and will inform the faculty members of the many possible growth opportunities. Hopefully, this study will breathe renewed and revivified life into the human resources at this large multi-campus community college district in the Southwest. This renewal and revitalization among the human resources in this district will be carried into the classroom and ultimately it will be students, higher education's most important commodity, who will benefit.

Definition of Terms

The terms that will be used in this study are defined as follows:

1. A **community college district** is an educational unit usually established to support the needs of a particular community. Programs in a community college include the
first two years of a traditional education as well as one and two-year technical and occupational programs (13, p. 114).

2. A multi-campus community college district offers educational programs at two or more campuses or locations. The multi-campus community college district in this study is the Dallas County Community College District which includes seven campuses and employs approximately 725 full-time faculty members (29).

3. Faculty development is a term used to identify a variety of activities, programs, and strategies "that aim both to maintain and to improve the professional competency of individual faculty members . . ." (12, p. 646).

4. Professional growth is a term that implies increase in knowledge of a subject matter, increase in teaching skills, a better understanding of educational problems, and with a "concomitant increase in success as a teacher" (13, p. 270).

5. Full-time faculty are those individuals who are contracted to teach for nine months and for approximately fifteen classroom hours each week. They are to be on the campus a total of thirty to thirty-five hours each week. Full-time faculty in this study will include counselors and some Learning Resource Center personnel who also have nine month faculty contracts but who have fewer classroom contact
hours. Learning Resource Center personnel and counselors have varied duties in the instructional programs.

6. **Faculty renewal** is a term which implies that all faculty should be in a continuing state of change and growth (26).

7. **Sabbatical leaves** for one year or one semester are granted to a select group of faculty members after a period of seven years of service to the institution. Faculty may receive one-half salary for a one year sabbatical or full salary for a one semester sabbatical. The leave is granted to enrich the professional development of the faculty member or to strengthen the institution which grants the leave (12, p. 451). A mini-sabbatical is awarded for a period of five or six weeks; faculty members receiving a mini-sabbatical receive a salary equal to the amount they would receive if they taught two courses in a summer session.

8. A **developmental leave** is for a specified period of time, usually one year, during which a faculty member is away from a campus and is involved in a professional growth activity. This leave is without reimbursement from the institution.

9. An **internship** is an extended "field experience." The purpose of the internship is "to provide the trainee with on-the-job training under the tutelage of an experienced practitioner or a university supervisor" (12, p. 275).
10. **Career development** is a term which originated in the military and involved the process of assignment and reassignment within a given career field (13, p. 80). The purpose of the career development project referred to in this study involves the reassignment of a staff member to a new area for a limited period of time in order to gain experience in this area.

11. A **special project** is a term used to identify activities of special interest to faculty members or to the organization. Individuals devote time and creative thought to such activities and work under the supervision of a staff mentor (9).

12. The **College Consortium for International Study** is composed of a group of higher education institutions that provide the opportunity for international travel to a select number of faculty members. The purpose of the travel is to provide faculty members with the opportunity to gain knowledge about an international education topic from a group of specialists who make presentations (12, p. 130).

13. The **tripartite conferences** are sponsored by the Dallas County Community College District in Dallas, Humber College in Toronto and Nelson and Colne College in Manchester England. Approximately fifteen staff members are selected to participate from each of the campuses, and travel expenses are partially funded by the Dallas County Community College District for its participants. The
conference provides participants with an international perspective to problems facing higher education.

14. The international exchange of teachers is a program of interchange of teachers between countries under the sponsorship of governmental and private agencies (13, p. 224).

15. An instructional development grant is a specific amount of money given to a faculty member for a special project related to classroom instruction. The period of time during which the project is completed is specified (13, p. 265).

16. Employee development funds (EDF) are generated by contributions for employees. Grants from the employee development fund are provided to employees for professional travel or other development projects, which are evaluated by campus committees as worthy (9).

17. President's mini-grants are used for professional growth activities and may be combined with an employee development fund grant.

18. An outstanding teaching award is presented to an outstanding faculty member at each campus and includes a cash award. The award is intended for books, materials or travel to further the faculty member's professional growth (9).

19. The productivity award is granted each year to an individual or group of individuals who have designed a
program or completed a project which exhibits a greater output of a product than the input of the resource would indicate (13, p. 440).

20. **Project Renewal Week** is a summer conference for one hundred employees and with the following purpose: "to enrich and renew the lives of a cross-section of DCCCD personnel through a week of educational rewarding short courses, field trips, workshops, discussions, nature studies and recreational activities" (9).

21. **District conference day** is a day, usually in February, for all administrators and faculty members to gather at one location to discuss common areas of concern and interest. Speeches are presented on topics of interest by the chancellor and by a nationally recognized leader in education.

22. The **wellness program** provides employees with one and one-half hour of release time each week to participate in a physical fitness activity on campus. "The program is designed to increase job satisfaction and productivity and to reduce health-care costs" (9).

Limitations of the Study

This study will be limited to full-time faculty members employed by the Dallas County Community College District in the spring semester 1986. The District includes seven campuses: Brookhaven, Cedar Valley, Eastfield, El Centro,
Mountain View, North Lake and Richland. The faculty on all seven campuses will be surveyed. No attempt will be made to generalize this study to all multi-campus community college districts or other colleges and universities.

Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made for the purpose of this study:

1. It is assumed that the participants will respond honestly to the survey instrument.

2. It is assumed that full-time faculty possess varying degrees of approval of professional growth and renewal activities.

3. It is assumed that because the Dallas County Community College District offers many professional growth and renewal activities that the central administration values such activities.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which faculty participate in and approve of selected professional growth and renewal activities. The need for professional growth and renewal in higher education cannot be denied. Institutions of higher education faced with financial constraints, with the diminishing status attached to the professoriate by the general public (8, p. 69), and with declining or, at best, steady-state enrollment are faced with several serious challenges. These challenges coupled with a tenured faculty that may be suffering from stagnation may suggest a dismal existence for colleges and universities and for their faculty. According to Schwartz:

Retrenchment. Tenure. Burn-out. MBO. Budget Cuts. Competencies. Like the Egyptians of old, college faculty find themselves beset by plague. . . . Ideally, faculty should respond to these problems in ways that will make them assets to the institutions, too valuable to be lost and too enthusiastic to cease their renewed efforts. The goal is clear, but it is necessary now to find means to achieve it (55, p. 65).

The problem for college faculty is compounded by the lack of mobility for those in higher education. Many faculty were hired during the dynamic expansion period in the fifties and sixties when many opportunities for change were available. The possibility of moving to another
institution to teach was not only a possibility, but an expectation. The faculty hired during the period of expansion expected the future to be better, or at least different. According to Baldwin, "Faculty, however, are now part of what is becoming an immobilized profession. . . . A large percentage of the faculty are middle-aged and tenured; and older faculty have an option to stay longer, given the federal prohibition against mandatory retirement until age 70" (6).

Faced with the existing situation in which higher education finds itself: financial constraints, declining enrollment, loss of status among the general public and aging faculty, it is imperative that institutions look at many available opportunities for renewal for their faculty. Collin states, "Staff development is one of the most important resources that a community college has to cope with change in its environment, to remain viable and function, and to grow, develop, and revitalize" (20). There are many solutions to the problems faced by faculty in community colleges and other institutions of higher learning. Bennett states, "As the profession settles into immobility, every opportunity for overcoming its disadvantages should be explored. The stimulation and revitalization earlier provided by new colleagues and new surroundings must now be supplied by other means" (8, p. 69).
This chapter will provide an overview of the history of faculty development from 1970 to the present including a review of selected studies that have been conducted on this topic. The chapter will also identify a variety of professional growth and renewal programs that are currently being offered by colleges.

Historical Overview
1970-Present

The review of the history of professional growth and renewal is limited to the period since 1970. A literature search of writings on the topic from 1955-1975 produced only sixty-six citations and most of these were published during the period from 1970-75 (32). A dissertation in 1967 did survey 403 public community colleges to determine the scope of in-service education programs (33). In 1969 the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges conducted a national survey on the topic, but most of the studies and emphasis placed on faculty development occurred after 1970.

The period previous to 1970 was a time of expansion for community colleges; the emphasis was on growth of facilities and faculties and not on professional growth. Community colleges were not concerned with renewing faculty members, but with finding sufficient numbers of faculty to meet the demands of increasing enrollment. During the ten year period from 1960 through 1970, the number of two-year colleges increased by 61 per cent, the number of students
increased by 271 per cent, and the number of staff increased by 327 per cent (50, p. 1).

During this "golden age" of expansion, professional growth for faculty meant preparation to teach the subject matter to the thousands of additional students at college campuses throughout the nation. Some individual faculty members interpreted professional growth as an opportunity to move from one college to another, one with more students or a more prestigious reputation. In other universities and colleges much emphasis was placed on research particularly in the areas of science as a result of the Sputnik challenge.

By the middle of the 1970s community colleges, as well as other universities and colleges, were taking a closer look at the delivery systems of the education being offered to students, and institutions were reviewing how well the faculty members were presenting information. This was prompted in part by an attitude of "consumerism" among students; students were demanding courses that would better prepare them for the job market. Many of the traditional educational programs offered by colleges were not preparing students for the competition they faced once they left college. The student demands for practical courses which would prepare them for the job markets were in part the impetus for the growth of community colleges.

During the 1970s an expansion of faculty development programs in community colleges, liberal arts colleges and
universities did occur. Many of the programs were at least partially funded by philanthropic foundations and federal agencies. According to Mathis, "Many of the reports of faculty development efforts that abound in the literature are the results of the need to report to funding agencies about the results of grants given for a specific faculty development program" (44, p. 649).

Foundation support had been available before the 1970s, but much of the previous support was in the form of funds for leaves or special grants for research. One of the first faculty development programs was sponsored by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges along with the Carnegie Foundation. This program "attempted to ascertain the dimensions of effective, and ineffective, teaching as practiced in colleges and universities" (44, p. 649). One of the reports which resulted from this study discussed the career development of effective college teachers.

Eble states in the report,

Change is one of the necessary responses one has to midlife. Teaching, by virtue of its institutional practice, falls into accustomed routines. For the faculty member . . . changing the routines of scholarship and teaching may be a way of furthering his career (25, p. 61).
Eble also states that institutions "should provide ways for a large number of faculty members in mid-career to emphasize different aspects of their professional development for limited and specified periods of time" (25, p. 65).

In 1972 a special project was undertaken by O'Banion for the President's Advisory Council on Educational Professional Development. The resulting report, *People for a People's College*, was submitted to Congress and later published for distribution under the title *Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in Community–Junior College* (50, p. iii). This report primarily outlines the efforts in staff development at community colleges and also is important in identifying needs and encouraging staff development programs (33).

A study by Gaff (3), funded by the Exxon Corporation, was conducted in the early seventies. Gaff states, "From being virtually unheard of before 1970, the idea of professional development for the sake of better teaching and learning has become a social force within higher education that in many ways has a life of its own" (30, p. 175). Gaff recommends that involvement in faculty development activities be rewarded, that budget allocations for the improvement of teaching be expanded and that colleges broaden the participation of faculty in programs that emphasize teaching improvement (30).
During 1974 the Group for Human Development in Higher Education published *Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment* (31). The group was composed of leaders in higher education who were concerned about the professional development of faculty. The monograph includes a discussion of ways to improve teaching and revitalize faculty members. Some key recommendations made by the group included teaching projects, providing insurance for those mid-career teachers who may wish to explore the possibility of a career change, and loosening the present monopoly departments have on instructional time and the "fields" of knowledge (31, p. 83). The group also recommended that faculty development programs be included in the normal working day and not be added to an already busy schedule. The group concluded their recommendations by stating, "To the extent that faculty development thrives, colleges and universities will have more to offer the public and professors will at the same time find greater satisfaction in their work" (31, p. 86).

Centra's study in 1976 focused on faculty development practices in colleges and universities in the United States. Of the 756 colleges that responded in Centra's study, 326 were two-year colleges (59, p. 1). This study identified four types of faculty development programs. The four included programs with high involvement, those programs with instructional improvement emphasis, those with traditional
practices, and programs with emphasis on assessment (44, p. 650).

The activities with high faculty involvement included workshops, seminars, and faculty working as consultants with other faculty. The use of specialists and of instructional technology were rated high among instructional assistant practices. Faculty exchange programs with other institutions received high ratings, and travel funds were considered an effective way to promote professional growth (44, p. 650).

Professional growth and development continued to be identified as a important issue among colleges and universities in other studies. In a 1977 survey to determine major priorities of administrators in League for Innovation community colleges, staff development emerged as the highest priority (51, p. vii). Not only was there continued interest and study related to faculty development, but during the mid-seventies interest in adult development also became popular. According to Baldwin, "The degree of popular interest in adult development is indicated by the recent spate of books on the topic. Sheey's Passages (1976), Levenson's Seasons of a Man's Life (1978) and Gould's Transformations (1978) are three major examples" (5, p. 13).

The additional interest in adult development as it relates to faculty development is reported in a project
initiated by the American Association of American Colleges and supported by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon foundation (48). The study evaluated the impact of faculty development grants at twenty liberal arts colleges. Types of faculty development were divided into four categories: professional development, instructional development, curricular change and organizational development.

The findings of the study indicated that "professional development" was the most popular approach to faculty development. Activities in this category included study leaves, attendance at professional meetings, leaves for work outside the faculty's major discipline, as well as other collective approaches to professional development, such as campus-wide workshops on computer literacy (48). The study also discovered that instructional development projects were most successful if organized around specific, practical skills but were not as successful as those projects which related to curricular change. Organizational development was considered "a woefully neglected area" (48, p. 143) by those participating in the study. According to several administrative leaders in this study, "Faculty at mid-career will require special attention in coming years. . . . This means designing programs that encourage renewal as teachers and scholars within the academy or in certain cases having them consider more radical mid-career changes" (48, p. 147).
Faculty development continued to gain momentum and according to Blackburn, "By 1978 the concept had become an umbrella term to incorporate a wide range of activities aimed at instructional, personal, and organizational development" (10, pp. 32-33). A comprehensive project to evaluate some of these faculty development programs was conducted by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan in 1978 with support from a grant by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (10). The project included three major areas of emphasis:

1. Developing assessment instruments for judging the success of faculty development programs;
2. Providing formative and summative evaluation for the programs of 24 participating institutions;
3. Exploring the effectiveness of a number of strategies aimed at faculty growth in a variety of institutional settings (10, p. 33).

In this study at the University of Michigan, experts who responded to a variety of faculty development goals identified instructional improvement activities to be the most valuable in professional growth programs (10). The twenty-four participating institutions included community colleges, liberal arts colleges and both private and public universities. Faculty from all types of institutions surveyed identified teaching as the most important part of their academic role, and most respondents considered themselves as above average teachers. Participations in the study were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of faculty development programs. Leaves were identified as the most
effective type of program but on-campus workshops were the most frequented activity. According to Blackburn, "It may well be that their [faculty development program's] tendency to concentrate on the faculty member's instructional role has been over-emphasized or perhaps misdirected" (10, p. 47). Faculty are concerned about teaching, but the study indicates that they are more concerned about being current in their field than with pedagogical theory. The study discovered that faculty consider keeping abreast in one's discipline "to be the single most important ingredient of superior teaching" (10, p. 47).

Community college faculty expressed a desire to spend more time with research and somewhat less time teaching and in service to the college (10). Blackburn concludes:

Facility perceive their professional development needs to be far broader than those accommodated by most faculty development programs. . . . From the perspective of faculty, then, it is on the other professional development needs--as well as some personal ones--that faculty development programs need to focus (10, p. 48).

A study conducted by Smith (59) to identify faculty development practices among community colleges indicates that teaching is highly valued by community college staff. This study was supported by the American Association of Community and Junior College's National Council for Staff, Program and Organization Development. The study in many ways replicated Centra's study in 1976. In Smith's study staff is defined as all employees of the college, but Smith
indicates that most programs emphasize faculty needs (59, p. 2). The three most frequently mentioned staff development goals in the study included the following: (1) increase responsiveness to students; (2) increase knowledge of teaching process; and (3) increase faculty's skill in instruction (59, p. 70). The study showed that 72 per cent of the colleges sought to "enhance the staff's personal growth and self-actualization" (59, p. 7). Smith's study also indicated that younger faculty, those with less than fifteen years of experience participated in activities more frequently than those with fifteen to twenty years of teaching experience (59).

The effectiveness of several activities was also considered in Smith's study. The effectiveness ratings for workshops were lower than other activities. Smith indicates, "Perhaps the most effective programs in the future will be those that place more emphasis on faculty grants, independent study or travel, and less emphasis on workshops or the use of outside specialists" (59, p. 23). The following four activities were rated most effective by participants in this staff development study: (1) travel funds to attend professional conferences; (2) use of grants by faculty for developing new or different approaches to courses; (3) summer grants for projects to improve teaching; and (4) faculty visitation to other institutions or other
areas within the institution to review educational programs and innovative projects (59, p. 57).

Only 42 per cent of those institutions responding in this study indicated they had evaluated their staff development programs (59, p. 52). The study states that during the decade of the seventies the emphasis was on program development, but suggests that the decade of the eighties be a time to evaluate staff development programs.

This decade is a time to evaluate faculty development programs, but also a time when faculty development programs will include not only information related to instructional improvement but also career and life planning. Kanter in a keynote address at the American Association of Higher Education conference in 1979 argued that a fundamental rethinking of our assumptions about the structure of academic careers and the nature of academic work was needed (6).

Following this conference a study was conducted for the American Association of Higher Education (6) to identify campus based projects that focused on generating new career possibilities for college faculty. Community colleges as well as four-year colleges and universities were included in the study, which was conducted over a five month period from September 1980 to January 1981 (6).

The study identified a variety of campus programs which were helping faculty members renew their careers in
education or helping them make a transition to a career outside of the educational setting. One such program was sponsored by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and Associated Schools of the Pacific Northwest for seventeen private colleges. This program focused on the concerns of faculty who probably would not receive tenure, faculty in mid-career who probably would be forced to teach at the same location for twenty or more years, and senior faculty who would soon be retiring (6).

The study for the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) also identified several respecialization or retraining projects. Institutions involved in such projects include California State University at Long Beach, The College of Saint Scholastica in Duluth, Minnesota, and Mary College in Bismark, North Dakota. The University of Wisconsin system, consisting of thirteen universities and fourteen university centers throughout the state, provides matching funds for various types of program initiatives as well as funds for sabbaticals and faculty retraining.

Some institutions have developed experimental projects which involve off-campus internships. According to the AAHE study, "Placement in related non-academic settings permits them [faculty] to view their discipline from a different perspective, to acquire new knowledge, and develop skills that can be used in the classroom" (6, p. 31). Off-campus
internships also enable faculty members to test career options.

The study also identified comprehensive career services at Concordia College in Moorhead, Minnesota, Illinois State University, Loyola University of Chicago, Rochester area colleges and Western Michigan University (6). Comprehensive programs provide a sequence of activities that often include assessment, career decision making, planning strategy to achieve career goals, more training, and sometimes transition to a new career. Although not as comprehensive, Regis College in Denver has an Academic Career Transition Project which is aimed specifically at those faculty wishing to leave the academic setting (6).

This American Association of Higher Education study also took a special look at community colleges and their faculty career development programs. Several projects were identified, but, according to Baldwin, "Our effort to tap into community college information network yielded very few formal initiates" (6, p. 72). This may be because community colleges do not readily identify with the American Association of Higher Education as an organization supporting community colleges. National conferences of the AAHE provide only a few sessions aimed specifically to the needs of community colleges. One community college program identified in this AAHE study is located at Prince George's Community College in Maryland and offers a twelve week
course in life and work planning and career development (6). Lansing Community College offers programs on burnout and stress and uses videotape and small group sessions as well as journal writing in this program. Mira Copa Community College in Phoenix, Arizona, uses a televised course, "New Perspectives on mid-Life" developed by the University of Florida, which includes theories of mid-life changes, family patterns and financial considerations (6). Faculty members gather to view the programs and discuss the issues raised. Miami-Dade Community College and the Dallas County Community College District offer programs that prepare faculty to either teach in a new field or learn more about a different area of the campus. At Miami-Dade faculty attend seminars to get this information; in the Dallas County District, faculty may participate in an intern program.

The value of providing an opportunity for faculty to look at career options is sometimes questioned. Some administrators fear that encouraging faculty to review career options will lead to the exodus of the best faculty members. Hogberg states, "Experiencing assessment usually makes individuals more realistic and often leads, not to dramatic departures, but to necessary personal and professional adjustments" (36, p. 80). Reexamining career options also can boost the morale of faculty and this may lead to better teaching and learning for students. As Hogberg states, "Colleges with a humane tradition of caring
The national studies regarding faculty development do indicate that institutions are concerned about the growth of faculty. Some of the earliest emphasis on professional development for faculty was related to improvement of instruction, which is an important part of faculty development. However, as more faculty members gain tenure and reach mid-life, and as mobility decreases, a new emphasis on career development is found in faculty development programs.

In addition to various national studies conducted, several states and regions have completed studies or organized faculty development programs. Preus and William's study identifies a statewide faculty development program for eighteen community colleges in Alabama (52). Representative faculty members from each of the community colleges were selected as "catalytic agents" and participated in an intensive program in the summer at Auburn University. Faculty members shared their experience with faculty back at their home campuses with the intent of inspiring improved teaching and learning. The program was funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare under the provisions of the Education Professional Development Act and was administered by Auburn University (52, p. 2).
Another project was sponsored by the Southern Regional Board. Area workshops were conducted in 1975 to increase faculty development on community college campuses (19). The workshop participants included four-member teams from twelve community colleges in the South. The teams were to develop programs for their own individual institutions. The campuses were then visited by Southern Regional Education Board members three months after the workshop in order to assist the team members from the respective institutions implement faculty development programs. Two community colleges from Texas participated in the program as well as other community colleges from Georgia, Louisiana, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Florida, Tennessee and Arkansas. Charles Claxton who reported on this project states:

There is not one model of staff development that is appropriate for all colleges. But it is important that the approach, whether comprehensive or for faculty only, be based upon a thorough understanding of what staff development is, where the institution is in its evolution, and what the needs of the college are (19, p. 36).

A study by Caffey among eight junior colleges in Texas in 1978 "disclosed a preference for goals relating to the ongoing teaching performance of faculty and markedly less enthusiasm for goals relating to overall concerns" (14, p. 311). The goals most preferred by faculty in Caffey's study included the following: improvement of teaching skills, enhancement of knowledge in the teaching field; and motivation
of faculty to strive for excellence (14, p. 313). Activity items receiving high ratings included developmental leaves, travel to professional meetings, graduate courses for credit on home campuses, a professional library collection, orientation for new faculty and released time for instructional development (14, p. 316). One of Caffey's findings in the study indicated that faculty prefer those activities that can be pursued independently and individually. Caffey states, "This finding . . . would seem to indicate that the individual teacher is the unit that must be addressed in an effective program of professional development" (14, p. 322).

A regional study in the Northeast and Ohio conducted among both private and public two-year colleges identified needs for faculty growth as well as growth for administrators. This study by Hammons and Wallace made a comprehensive assessment of in-service training needs at these institutions (33). Questionnaire were sent to 294 two-year colleges. The information received from the colleges indicated that there was a need for development related to the unique role of community colleges, to instruction and to needs of administrative staff.

According to the study, "Better staff development of the community college's purpose in remedial and developmental programs appears to be the most serious need related to the unique role of two-year institutions, with nearly three-
fifths of the respondents voicing demand in this area" (33, p. 35). Other needs related to the unique role of community colleges included understanding the part of continuing education and community service in community college programs. Other concerns were expressed regarding the understanding of the clientele served. Instructional staff development needs identified in the study included a better understanding of individualized instruction and aspects of non-traditional instruction such as interdisciplinary studies.

The study concludes by indicating:

Through the concept of staff development is rapidly "coming of age" as a first-rank priority of two-year institutions, it can hardly be expected to pass into its majority without the hard data that colleges, universities, foundations, government agencies, and professional organizations require to determine their contribution to the improvement of the availability, relevance, and quality of community college professional growth programs (33, p. 40).

Florida and Illinois are two states that for years have had an interest in staff development (49). Staff and program development in Florida provides professional and personal development activities to all employees; the plan was established by an act of the Florida legislature in 1968 (34). Because of the long standing interest in professional development in the two states, a combined study was made in 1977 and reported by Novak and Barnes (49). The study involved faculty and administrators; the differences in the perceived needs identified by these two groups is of interest. Faculty members expressed more interest in
activities related to teaching, while administrators felt more emphasis must be placed on the nature and mission of community colleges (49, p. 17). Faculty members indicated in this study less need for structure in professional development programs. For administrators, "Measuring instructional improvement and evaluating program effectiveness had high priority" (49, p. 18).

In a later study for the Illinois State Board of Higher Education (24), Eash indicated that the promotion of faculty development may be achieved by sharing faculty resources among Illinois' private and public institutions. "Sharing faculty resources holds potential for more efficient use of faculty and for meeting the goal of maintaining a stimulating educational, intellectual environment in institutions of higher education . . ." (24, p. 2).

In Florida the Institute of Higher Education is a research and service agency which provides reports and studies to promote improvement in community colleges. One such report, "Criteria for the Institutional Evaluation of Community College Staff Development Programs," indicates that staff and program development has received more attention during the 1980s than any other area, but that little focus has yet been provided for evaluating programs (34). Apparently the high priority for evaluation of program effectiveness identified by administrators in the Novak and Barnes' study has not been resolved. As several
studies have indicated, the evaluation of professional development programs, whether it be a comprehensive staff development program or a faculty development and renewal program, is needed.

Not only does a review of the studies indicate that evaluation has become an important issue in faculty development programs, but a look at national conferences related to professional development and to higher education in general indicate a move toward academic excellence, productivity and accountability. There have been conferences dedicated entirely to professional development and other conferences that have included several sessions devoted to this area of interest.

A national conference on professional development was sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in the summer of 1970 (32). This association also sponsored the 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in Virginia with the topic of this conference being "Educational Opportunity for All: New Staff for New Students" (32). In the summer of 1974, the Center for the Study of Higher Education sponsored a conference at Pennsylvania State University which defined professional development and stressed its importance. Other conferences were held in Columbia, Missouri and St. Louis, Missouri (32). Participants at the St. Louis conference discussed
implementation of a professional development program, maintaining an existing program, and evaluating such programs (32).

A conference related to professional development in May of 1977 at Burlington Community College in Atlanta highlighted critical elements in the success and failure of programs, funding, and the effects of collective bargaining (32, p. 4). The concept of professional development was broadened, and the foundation was laid for a national organization which was developed a year later, the National Council of Staff, Program and Organizational Development (32).

A national conference on teaching excellence was held in Texas in 1979. This conference continued for several years with the purpose of recognizing current issues of national concern and their relationship to higher education as well as identifying support necessary to encouraging and sustaining excellence in teaching (22). Other evidence that professional development was gaining in importance and also changing in scope is found in the themes of the 1979 and 1980 American Association of Higher Education Conferences. In 1979 the theme was "The Academic Workforce: Opportunities for Renewal" (26), and the 1980 conference theme was "Improving Quality During Hard Times: An Action Agenda" (23). No attempt has been made in this study to identify all conferences related to professional
development, but those conferences identified do provide
evidence that the subject has received much attention in the
last fifteen years.

In addition to the conferences related to development of
faculty, much attention has been given to public demands for
excellence in education. This demand for excellence
includes accountability for faculty, which in some
situations will involve development of these individuals.
With the challenges facing higher education: financial
constraints, immobility of faculty, declining or steady-
state enrollment, and the public's demand for
accountability, a change is occurring in faculty development
programs. According to Brooks and German, "In response to
the new circumstances, faculty development went through . . .
a major change. The focus shifted back to the individual
faculty member, but the motivation for this shift was once
again institutional rather than individual need" (12, p.
31).

The current attention on faculty development does
emphasize career development, but this development can
complement the development of the organization. The
vitality of the faculty in large part determines the
effectiveness and success of an institution. The National
Institute for Staff and Organizational Development publishes
two newsletters, Linkages and Innovative Abstract. Each of
these publications cover a variety of topics that refer to faculty development and organizational development.

Berquist and Stevens' three volumes of *A Handbook for Faculty Development* include a variety of activities and topics that relate to faculty development. The authors state, "Organizational development is an important component of the modern theory and practice of faculty development . . . the purpose of organizational development is to improve organization effectiveness" (9, p. 182). Faculty development is a matter of restoring an individual faculty member. It is an activity that can come only from the inner desire of the faculty member (9). Berquist and Stevens go on to state:

This is not, however, to say that nothing can be done, that a college or university must sit in dismay hoping that salvation may strike some few of the many treading the escalator downward. . . . What it can do is to create conditions which will assist the individual faculty member to further the process of restoration once it has started (9, p. 337).

Other publications give attention to the needs of faculty development. The newsletter of the American Council on Education, *Higher Education and National Affairs*, has recently added a segment to the publication devoted to faculty. According to the President of the American Council on Education:

The quality of education, the vitality of faculty, and the overall strength of a college or university are inexorably linked. Campuses must address existing and emerging conditions that can erode faculty vitality and educational excellence. With "Focus on Faculty," a new feature in *Higher Education & National Affairs*, the
American Council on Education's (ACE) Division of Policy Analysis and Research will share with you information on successful approaches to faculty staffing—approaches that have benefited an institution and its faculty, effectively promoting vitality and excellence.

By fostering greater awareness of successful initiatives, ACE hopes to help spur the search for better approaches to faculty—and institutional—renewal throughout the next decade (4, p. 4).

With a majority of faculty members with tenure, institutions will be unable to recruit new faculty.

According to Mayhew:

The only way such institutions can be self-renewing is through a conscious effort to help faculty members renew themselves. Advocates of this point of view range from the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education to the University of California system to the Lilly Foundation... So popular has the concept become that there has evolved something that might be called the faculty development movement (45, p. 233).

As institutions of higher learning work to enhance the vitality of their faculty, it is imperative that the leaders of the institutions respect faculty members for their individuality. According to Berquest and Stevens:

Virtually any faculty member can become a valuable campus resource if time is taken to discover his strengths. The ultimate purpose of any procedure for the collection and use of information about faculty should be to make more effective use of and enhance the current resources of the campus, while preparing for inevitable renewal and change in these resources (9, p. 313).

Professional Growth and Renewal Activities at Colleges Today

Many institutions of higher education are providing a variety of professional growth and renewal activities. This
portion of the study will identify some of those activities. A review of the literature indicates that many institutions are heeding Eble's challenge, "All institutions . . . should provide ways for a large number of faculty members in mid-career to emphasize different aspects of their professional development for limited and specified periods of time" (25, p. 65). The review of professional growth and renewal activities for faculty is grouped into the following areas: college sponsored career development and renewal programs; leaves of absence; faculty exchanges; instructional or curriculum renewal programs; grants and awards; and miscellaneous professional growth and renewal activities. Some of the activities identified will relate to more than one area, and nearly all the activities will ultimately lead to instructional renewal. The intent in grouping the activities is to give a semblance of organization to the many activities rather than to categorize the activities specifically.

**Career and Development Programs**

Several institutions have established career development and renewal activities. Loyola University of Chicago has developed a faculty development program that supports alternate careers, as well as professional, personal and family growth (7). Various workshops are provided for faculty members and their spouses at Loyola. Topics include "Integrating Professional and Personal
Growth," "Skills Analysis," "Dual Career," "Financial Management," "Time Management," "Stress Prevention," "Intimacy and Interpersonal Relations," and "Working/Living with Aging Parents." The sessions are not for individuals who have need of psychological counseling, but for mentally healthy people who are faced with challenges requiring some assistance and direction (7). Loyola has a generous developmental leave program which allows faculty members the opportunity to try different careers for a period of one or two years and then, if a faculty member wishes, he or she may return to Loyola. Some faculty do not return, but according to Barry (7), those faculty who do not return feel very positive about the institution because it helped them discover a new career.

The Career Development Program at Loyola in Chicago was established primarily to serve faculty at Loyola, but the project now includes some sessions available to others in higher education. Mira Copa Community College has developed a similar program in Phoenix. The Mira Copa Community College District also provides early retirement options, extended leave options and flexible benefits (2, p. 36). The extended leave option allows faculty members leaves for the purpose of exploring other career options, of updating expertise in a teaching area, or of simply resting.

Regis College in Denver also provides a "Career Redirection Program" among a multiple-option faculty
development program (37). The Regis plan allows faculty with at least ten years of service to voluntarily give up tenure in order to enter a new profession outside of academe. If the faculty member qualifies, he may receive his regular salary and benefits for one year or "three years of compensatory salary to make up the difference in income between one's former academic past and a new, lower paying position" (37, p. 33).

The multiple-option faculty development program valued at Regis is also supported at the College of Charleston in South Carolina. The program at this institution provides assistance to those faculty wishing to make a career change. Although monetary funds are not provided, the college provides assistance with resume preparation and employment contacts (2, p. 33). This South Carolina institution does provide an administrative internship program for faculty seeking a career in administration in higher education.

The internship option is also a part of the Dallas County Community College's Career and Renewal Program. This program, according to Caswell, "is an opportunity for creative rejuvenation with the least amount of cost for the benefit achieved. The program is flexible, yet structured; creative, yet practical; challenging, yet attainable" (18). The Career and Renewal Program in the Dallas Community College system provides faculty, as well as other staff members, the opportunity to work in another position in the
district a specified period of time. The internship option is often available when one individual vacates a position for a sabbatical, a developmental leave or for a special assignment. A second staff member moves into the vacated position and fulfills the responsibility for a specified time.

The Career Development and Renewal program also provides an opportunity for an employee of the Dallas district to understudy in a position for a specified time. A faculty member may spend one day a week with a vice president of instruction or a division chair to better understand and learn the functions of the administrative post. Another option available in this program is for faculty or staff to have some release time from their assigned duties in order to work on a special project of interest to the individual and of value to the institution. Although options for career development and renewal opportunities with agencies outside of education have been explored and carried out on a small scale, the primary emphasis in the Dallas County Community College District has been on career development opportunities within the institution.

Whether an institution provides opportunities for career development and renewal within the institution or outside the academic arena, questions may arise about whether those participating in a career development project may decide to
leave the institution. According to the Group for Human Development in Higher Education:

Only a fraction of faculty would ever seriously consider giving up a secure job . . . Nonetheless, that fraction could make a big difference to the climate of an institution, and possibly even save money. It is both humane and practical to provide support that opens a new career to a professor who can no longer do his or her best work in the academic world (31, p. 78).

**Leaves**

Some professors will choose to take a developmental leave or a sabbatical leave when they feel a need for rejuvenation or they wish to experiment with a possible change in careers. A study conducted by Andersen and Atelsey in 1982 at the request of the National Endowment of the Humanities indicated that the sabbatical is a well-established part of the higher education system in this country (3). The study indicated that 60 per cent of two-year colleges offer sabbaticals and that nearly all colleges, 97 per cent, offer developmental leaves without pay. The majority of the two-year colleges allowed developmental leaves for faculty development, research or other academic employment (3, p. 13).

Eligibility for a sabbatical leave is often every seven years, although variations do exist. Marker reports, "At Ohio Wesleyan University, for example, a faculty member is eligible for a one-term leave with pay during every fourth year" (42, p. 39). Many institutions require some service
after the sabbatical leave is completed. Compensation for a sabbatical leave may be full pay for one semester or one-half pay for a year leave. Many of the sabbatical leaves are study leaves. Voelkel reports that Pomona College provides a limited number of student leaves for faculty members (62). One assistant professor of art at Pomona, for example, was awarded a leave to study the phenomenon of color with a psychologist specializing in visual perception.

Special leaves are provided by institutions for a variety of purposes. The University of Missouri at Kansas City provides a community service leave which allows faculty members to serve the community in some area of individual interest or talent (61). A similar type of leave was taken by an assistant dean for a school of business in Michigan in order to work in a factory for a specified period of time (17).

With less mobility among faculty, more opportunities for sabbaticals and other special leaves would be ideal. However, with constraints on financial resources among institutions of higher learning at this time, the availability of such leaves in the future may be limited. Marker states:

It would be foolish to suggest a dramatic expansion of the use and frequency of leaves in these days. Nonetheless, we should be careful not to unduly limit possibilities, and should try to recognize and respond to the individual needs of faculty members for special consideration at critical times in their careers (42, p. 45).
Teacher Exchanges

One renewal activity that may prove more cost-effective than sabbaticals or leaves of absence during periods of financial constraint is a teacher exchange. Delaware Technical and Community College staff members have conducted a variety of seminars in the Republic of China (29, p. 2). The college has also been selected by the United States Agency for International Development to assist in developing a technological college in Lima, Peru. Delaware Technical and Community College is a member of Community Colleges for International Development, "an organization that promotes faculty exchanges and/or visits among staff of member colleges and educators in foreign countries" (29, p. 2). The benefits gained from international teacher exchanges or assignments include foreign travel and opportunities to teach in a new environment.

Other teacher exchanges are possible through the Fulbright Exchange program. This organization matches requests for exchange from United States teachers and requests from instructors in several foreign countries including France, Germany and the United Kingdom. This exchange program is available for secondary school teachers as well as those at colleges and universities. The United States teacher's salary is paid by his or her home school in the U.S. The foreign teacher is paid by his own
institution. The Fulbright foundation also provides a stipend for exchange teachers and pays some travel expenses.

Teachers must apply for the exchanges, be recommended by supervisors and must be interviewed by representatives of the Fulbright Exchange program before being approved as a candidate. Once a possible match has been arranged, institutions have the responsibility of approving a visiting instructor. If the United States institution and the foreign institution approve the match, details regarding housing and transportation are arranged between the two exchange teachers.

This is a valuable renewal program for faculty and can be beneficial for institutions who have the opportunity to bring a new faculty member on campus for a semester or for a year with no additional cost to the institution. Faculty exchanges provide a means to recharge an institution and avoid academic calcification. Rodes indicates the value of a faculty exchange:

It is a means for "renewal" without sacrificing income or sabbatical time. Although one remains a teacher during the exchange, so much is bound to be different at the host institution that it is somewhat like starting a new career. A different city, a different environment, new colleagues, new procedures, a different type of student body. The differences tend to overshadow the unchanged fact that one is still the same college professor (53, p. 111).

In addition to national exchange programs, individual colleges may arrange teacher exchanges. The Dallas County Community College District has arranged for teacher
exchanges with Colombian instructors who may teach in Dallas for a semester or may visit and lecture for as short a time as three weeks. Instructors from the Dallas County Community College District may participate as a one-way exchange for one semester and a Colombian may participate in a one-way exchange program in a different semester.

The teacher exchange concept is not new in higher education, but such programs have not been used extensively. With faculty member's decreased mobility, teacher exchanges may become an attractive option for rejuvenation. Rodes states, "Teaching at another university on a temporary basis . . . either as an exchange or as a one-way guest professor . . . is a highly rewarding experience. It encompasses many benefits for the professors involved as well as for both institutions" (53, p. 111).

As a result of interest in the teacher exchange concept, the National Faculty Exchange program was established in 1983 (46). This exchange network is funded by the Exxon Educational Foundation. This program allows faculty to exchange from 130 affiliated organizations (46, p. 6). The exchange program does not require a one-to-one exchange and the length of the exchanges varies depending on the type of exchange and the needs of the institutions involved. According to a recent newsletter of the American Council on Education, "More than 70 faculty and staff placements have been made since the program began" (46,
The nonprofit network is administered from Indiana University and Purdue University; colleges or universities can become members by paying an annual fee. Most members are educational institutions, but two federal agencies have joined the network and possible exchanges with business and industry are being explored.

Because of family commitments or financial obligations, some faculty may be unable to leave the country for a six-month or a one-year teacher exchange. To combat this problem some institutions are providing intra-college exchanges, a creative variation of the traditional faculty exchange. The University of Kansas has implemented such a program, which "enables mid-career faculty members to spend one year teaching and taking courses outside of their home department or school" (2, p. 37). Such a program provides fewer logistical problems for faculty members, and it can provide renewal to faculty members who work with different professionals as they expand their knowledge and skills.

**Instructional and Curriculum Renewal Programs**

Other opportunities for faculty to expand their knowledge and skills are provided by curriculum revision, by teaching interdisciplinary courses or by faculty retraining for new courses. Several types of professional growth activities provide information and knowledge that can be applied to curriculum revision, for example, travel to national and state conferences in specific disciplines. But
with the financial constraints facing higher education, the funds for such travel may be limited. To counter this problem the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education arranges a variety of activities that support faculty development. One such activity is academic discipline group meetings. Instructors in the same teaching field from the seventeen member institutions meet periodically to discuss research, teaching strategies and other concerns (2, p. 35). By sharing information and discussing strategies, instructors are exposed to a variety of teaching techniques and new information which can be used in their individual classrooms.

San Antonio College in Texas has established a new faculty development program, QUEST, which is similar to the Kansas City Regional Council's Academic group meeting. "QUEST is a team of instructors organized to improve teaching by researching and sharing educational methods. Regular workshops are held and all faculty are encouraged to join the QUEST team at periodic seminars" (28, p. 3).

Humber College in Toronto was also concerned with professional development for their 545 full-time faculty, nearly half of whom had been employed for ten years or more. A model for professional development was established which allowed faculty the opportunity to develop their own personal professional development plan. The faculty member was required to participate in a two-month professional
growth experience sometime during a three year period. The activity could be completed in a two-month block or could be spread over a longer period of time (54). A learning contract was prepared by the faculty member and approved by the supervisor. At the end of the year the contract was reviewed and revised if necessary. At the end of the three-year period the project was evaluated and a new three-year learning contract was prepared by faculty members. When Humber College evaluated their professional growth model, faculty members indicated that this opportunity allowed them to expand their professional skill and knowledge and they felt the activity was very worthwhile (54).

Other activities deemed worthy by faculty at institutions throughout the nation include interdisciplinary activities. The University of Kansas has established a program which is called "Intra-University Visiting Professorship for Faculty Renewal and Development" (38). In order to participate in this program, a professor must outline a plan for a year. "The typical plan is established so that a professor will audit courses in another department or school, will team-teach a course with a professor in the host department, and will publish articles or a book on an appropriate topic" (38). As a part of this program, a German professor with a specialty in German theatre spent a year in the theatre department; a historian, doing a study
of children in wartime, spent a year in the Human Development Department.

The program at the University of Kansas has provided some significant outcomes, one of which is the addition of new interdisciplinary courses that are team-taught.

But the most significant outcomes of this program are the improvement of morale and the opportunity for renewal that has been provided to faculty. It came along when many faculty members needed a renewal experience, when they had reached a dead-end, when they had settled into a routine that had become deadening, and when they needed a new and different opportunity for restoring self-confidence and vitality (38).

Although community colleges may not have the luxury of allowing a faculty member to make a complete move to a different department, faculty members can be encouraged to audit courses in different departments. In an honors program at Richland College in Texas, an interdisciplinary humanities course has been taught by a team of instructors from the English Department, the mathematics department and the music department. The team in other semesters has included the president of the college, as well as the president's assistant.

Other colleges supporting cross-departmental teaching or interdisciplinary team-taught courses include the College of Charleston in South Carolina (2, p. 33) and Berea College in Kentucky. Some colleges are providing other formats to expose faculty members to varying viewpoints from different disciplines. St. Olaf College in Minnesota has a teaching/learning center where faculty from a variety of disciplines
meet on a voluntary basis to discuss educational concerns (35). A conference for six Claremont Colleges in California involved faculties from varied disciplines to discuss topics such as sociobiology, science and literature of the seventeenth century and artificial intelligence (63). Discussion of these interdisciplinary themes provided faculty with information that enabled them to approach their own class discussions with a new perspective (63).

Some institutions are experiencing a shift in student enrollment in a variety of programs which necessitates adding faculty in some programs and decreasing the number of instructors in other programs. In order to accommodate these educational needs, some institutions are supporting the retraining of faculty for teaching in those programs that are growing. Retraining is also required for faculty teaching in programs where technology is changing rapidly. Alfred and Nash present "a model for faculty retraining in community college career programs keyed to the process of exchange of staff between industry and education to improve the quality of instruction in two-year colleges" (1, p. 4). The model for faculty retraining requires the community college to outline goals and activities for training in specific time frames. The college and industry personnel share the responsibility of program planning and development. To enact the retraining program, faculty from the community colleges spend from six months to twelve
months in a business or industry setting on a full-time basis for the purpose of upgrading skills and gaining knowledge. Personnel from business and industry are assigned to teach in the community college. The community college students benefit from the experience by having instructors from business and industry who have been working in the field, and who can bring an added dimension to the learning in the classroom. Faculty from community colleges once trained in new skills can "contribute to the production capacity of industry through performance of skill functions on a full-time basis" (l, p. 7).

The exchange program is an efficient way of retraining faculty; the program also provides an opportunity for personnel from industry to identify any shortcomings in the college training programs. According to Alfred and Nash, "Understanding of respective industry and education roles in career training should improve as should industry's appreciation of the problems and limitations experienced by community colleges in career education" (l, p. 8).

The success of faculty retraining programs depends on several factors: (1) a clear understanding by faculty of the financial situation which led to the need for retraining; (2) a quality of congeniality and collegiality at the college; (3) funds specifically for retraining faculty; and (4) retraining closely aligned with the
instructional proficiency and/or special interests of faculty (l, p. 11).

Cut backs at Beloit College in Wisconsin necessitated retraining (ll). The programing established for retraining followed a guideline that paralleled the factors identified above. According to Bowen:

A final factor of significance to the success of the program was the focus placed on reasonable retraining. No attempt was made to retrain faculty members in fields totally unrelated to their previous experience . . . When the scope of retraining is limited and goals concrete and specific, success is more likely to be attained, and the benefits to the individual and the college directly measurable (ll, p. 24).

Retraining for faculty can provide an opportunity for professional growth and renewal. Curriculum revision, including the development of interdisciplinary courses may also provide faculty with a renewed interest in teaching.

Grants

Curriculum revision, retraining of faculty and the development of interdisciplinary courses as well as a myriad of other professional growth and renewal activities are sometimes supported by grants or funds from foundations. Although grants and foundation funds provide only a small percentage of a college's budget, there is competition for this support. According to Sleeper, "Private foundations contribute barely one per cent of the income of universities and colleges in the United States" (58, p. 12). Much of the money provided by private foundations goes to the prestigious
research universities, but the Ford Foundation does provide three million annually to community colleges. Statistics compiled by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching indicate that two-year colleges receive only about 1.1 per cent of foundation funds and only 5.3 per cent of the federal government's financial support for higher education (16, p. 34).

The federal program providing much of the funding is the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). According to Bunting, the original intentions of the fund were "to seek to benefit learners and learning; to accomplish lasting improvements; to achieve wider impact; to affect the climate of institutions and the field; to identify new leadership" (13, p. 2). This fund has been the major federal source for faculty development programs (44, p. 652). Shortly after its inception the agency received more than 2,800 proposals in one year (60, p. 20). According to Toft, ". . . as a result of some fine projects and a very enlightened staff, FIPSE has had a major impact on higher education. A recent evaluation of its projects has shown that a very high percentage of the programs started with FIPSE funds are still in existence" (60, p. 20).

In addition to national foundations and federal agencies, which provide funds for higher education, regional and local foundations also provide some funding. Some institutions of higher learning have established foundations
for activities within the institution. Richland Community College in Texas provides instructional development grants to individual faculty members who are preparing new course material. Faculty members' requests are screened and approved by a committee as well as the vice president of instruction. Hope College in Holland, Michigan, provides small grants to faculty (43). The benefits include enhancement of faculty morale and the general upgrading of scholarship at the college.

Berea College in Kentucky has received foundation funds to support faculty who wish to study outside their regular disciplines. After completing the study, faculty members return to Berea to teach interdisciplinary courses in the core curriculum (47, p. 98). The development of less traditional courses at Bowdoin College in Maine is also supported by grants. These courses may not have been developed without the stimulation of the specific grants, according to faculty members (47, p. 99). Bowdoin has also received funds from the Charles A. Dana Foundation which has enabled this institution to hire four young faculty members as Dana Faculty Fellows (27, p. 8).

The availability of grants in a time of financial constraints is limited, but grants do provide a possible source of funds for professional growth for faculty members. The funds provided by foundations and corporations are
usually provided for the college rather than individual faculty members, but individuals reap the benefits.

Some institutions and foundations provide rewards to individuals who have excelled in their field. The Minnie Stevens Piper Foundation, established in 1950, supports many charitable, scientific, and education programs. In 1958 the Piper Professor Award was established and currently ten professors in higher education are honored annually in Texas (41, p. 2). The honor includes a cash award to those professors who are recognized. With the financial constraints facing many institutions of higher education, the availability of cash rewards to many faculty is unlikely. However, as Shawl reports, "There needs to be reward for faculty in staff development programs" (56, p. 6). This reward may take many forms, cash awards being only one option.

Miscellaneous Professional Growth Activities

A myriad of possibilities and options for professional growth and renewal exist as reported in the above examples. Other suggestions include the study of adult development theory, which provides information about the ages and stages through which individuals progress. According to Brookes and German:

By knowing what academics can expect to experience as they grow older, adult development theory helps provide a better understanding of predictable faculty needs. Similarly, career development theory can help demythologize the academic profession and can
provide new perspectives on the problems inherent in contemporary faculty careers (12, p. 11).

Krupp concurs, "Research from adult development . . . gives us information on the concerns and needs of older teachers. By knowing and addressing these needs, we stand a better chance of sparking an aging staff and gaining commitment to school goals" (40, p. 9).

Another possible option for faculty renewal includes support groups. According to Deming, this approach "has considerable potential for improving morale, decreasing burnout, and improving personal and professional effectiveness" (21, p. 54). Faculty effectiveness groups, although providing many benefits, may be resisted by faculty members. For this reason the establishment and support for such groups probably should come from faculty rather than from administrators.

Some colleges provide for faculty a counseling service which is independent of any institutional control. This service is provided as a part of the benefits package for employees at Cuyahoga Community College and the Dallas County Community College District.

Other means of growth can be accomplished by an individual action plan prepared by faculty members which outlines areas for study, renewal and change. Gordon College in Wenham, Massachusetts, has encouraged faculty to design and implement his or her own plan which includes development of a variety of skills. According to Carlberg,
"Plans were always tied to individual needs first; institutional priorities were second" (15, p. 28). If such plans are developed in consultation with department heads or supervisors, a better understanding may develop and more support for professional development and renewal may be possible for individual faculty members. According to Krupp:

Sometimes one suggestion will fit and solve a problem and at other times a different idea will excite personnel. Individualized any solution used to spark an aging staff member. In order to individualize, teachers and administrators must know each and every staff member as well as possible (39, p. 45).

Professional growth and renewal activities must be flexible. According to Shaw, "All faculty are not ready to have their needs met at the same point in time ... . Like a classroom, the staff development program must have varied activities if it is to lead to successful improvement for all learners" (57). It is also imperative that professional growth programs recognize the importance of personal development and its affect on professional success. According to the American Association of Higher Education Task Force on Professional Growth, "Institutional policies must allow for personal development of faculty members, for such development is inseparable from professional growth and career development. And all three are necessary to institutional vitality" (12, p. 6).
Summary

Professional growth and renewal has continued to gain attention and status in community colleges as well as other institutions of higher learning since 1970. The studies, conferences and publications discussed in this chapter attest to this. The emphasis and variety of activities has shifted since 1970. Initially the emphasis in professional growth activities was on instructional improvement. This is still an important component of professional growth and renewal, but as conditions facing higher education change so must professional growth and renewal activities.

An aging faculty with little mobility does not demand professional growth activities related to pedagogical theory but activities that spark interest perhaps in a new field or interdisciplinary studies. Some faculty feel a strong need to change careers either within education or a change to a career outside of the educational setting. Professional growth and renewal activities are now including some emphasis in career changes.

A review of the literature indicates that a wide variety of activities are being provided for faculty in higher education. With the financial constraints facing institutions of higher learning, there is a danger that limits may be placed on professional growth opportunities. However, several institutions have established cost-efficient professional growth activities. It is imperative...
that institutions continue to recognize the significance of renewal for faculty members and the variety of activities that provide such renewal. Faculty members' professional growth and renewal is essential if institutions of higher education are to maintain their vitality into the twenty-first century.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The Dallas County Community College District Professional Growth and Renewal Survey developed by the researcher, henceforth referred to as the DCCCD Survey, was used to identify faculty member's degree of approval of seven types of professional growth and renewal activities and to identify numbers who participate in these types of activities provided by the Dallas County Community College District. The DCCCD Survey was used to fulfill the purposes of the study. These purposes include the following:

1. To determine the number who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities

2. To determine if significant differences exist in the number who participate in the seven types of selected professional growth and renewal activities:
   A. Among ten teaching areas
   B. Among five chronological age groups
   C. Among the five years-of-service groups
   D. Among the seven campuses in the multi-campus community college district
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3. To determine if significant differences exist in the degree of approval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities:
   A. Among ten teaching areas
   B. Among five chronological age groups
   C. Among the five years-of-service groups
   D. Among the seven campuses in the multi-campus community college district.

Research Population

The population selected for this study included all full-time faculty members in the Dallas County Community College District in Texas. The seven campuses in this district are located in Dallas County and include the following: Brookhaven College, Cedar Valley College, Eastfield College, El Centro College, Mountain View College, North Lake College and Richland College. The student enrollment in the District varies somewhat by semester, but the credit programs usually enroll approximately 45,000 students each semester (2). Approximately seven hundred twenty-five full-time faculty members are employed by the Dallas County Community College District (3). More than one-half of the faculty have been employed for more than ten years in the district (3). The DCCCD Survey was distributed to all full-time faculty members in the Dallas County Community College District.
The Instrument

The instrument used was developed specifically for this study. The twenty-five professional growth and renewal activities identified in the survey were selected after reviewing a sample of Dallas County Community College District's faculty individual action plans, which list professional growth and renewal activities, by reviewing the District's Policy and Procedure Manual, and by consulting with a representative from the Assistant Chancellor of Planning and Development's office. Information was also gathered from memos which identified professional growth and renewal activities supported by the District.

The activities were grouped into seven categories for clarification. One such category identifies a district sponsored Career Development and Renewal Program and includes the internship, the understudy and special projects. A second major category in the survey includes three types of leaves: a sabbatical leave, a mini-sabbatical leave, and a developmental leave. A third major category on the instrument includes international faculty exchange and international travel; the activities in this category include international faculty exchange programs, College Consortium for International Study, and a tripartite conference. Instructional renewal programs is the fourth major category and activities include the following:

instructional development grant, district teacher exchange
program, and participation in special teaching formats. The fifth category includes grants: employee development grant, president's mini-grant, grant from an outside agency, and renewal grants available for faculty members with fifteen years of service to the district. The sixth category on the survey instrument is reward and recognition; activities in this category include outstanding teaching award, productivity award and years of service recognition. A final miscellaneous category includes the following additional activities: a summer renewal conference for selected faculty and staff, a district conference day, a wellness program sponsored by the district, and travel funds for professional conferences. Two additional open-ended activities, other campus-wide professional growth activities and division professional growth activities, are included. This provided those completing the survey the opportunity to identify any additional activities which had not been listed previously in the survey. Those completing the survey also had the opportunity to suggest additional activities which the Dallas County Community College District should provide for faculty members.

Those completing the survey indicated whether they had participated in the activities. They also identified their degree of approval of the professional growth and renewal activities on a five point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly approve to strongly disapprove.
The survey asked for demographic information which was used to complete the study. This information included years of service to the Dallas County Community College District, age of respondent, and primary teaching area of respondent.

The survey instrument was validated by a panel of experts. A document design expert reviewed the instrument's format and content and her suggestions were incorporated. The Director of Research, Planning and Development of the Dallas County Community College District reviewed the instrument. The Assistant to the Assistant Chancellor for Planning and Development who functions as the director of district-wide staff development for the Dallas County Community College District also reviewed the instrument. The Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the presidents of the seven campuses also made suggestions which were incorporated into the survey instrument.

Procedures for Collection of Data

The professional growth and renewal study involved the collection of data using the DCCCD Survey instrument. Completion of the survey took no longer than fifteen minutes. The following steps were followed in this study:

1. A survey instrument identifying professional growth and renewal activities which were grouped into seven categories was prepared.
2. The instrument was validated by a group of experts.
3. Permission to conduct the study was granted by the
Executive Cabinet of the multi-campus community college district.

4. A cover letter outlining the purpose of the study and encouraging participants to complete the instrument was prepared.

5. Packets were prepared and distributed to all full-time faculty members on seven campuses, seven hundred and twelve full-time faculty members.

6. Preparation of the packets included coding the instruments by campus. The survey instruments were coded by individual faculty member's name so that follow up contacts could be made with those not returning the instrument and for interviews of a sample of faculty members who returned the survey instrument.

7. The packets were distributed to all full-time faculty members on seven campuses with a request that the survey instrument be returned in ten days.

8. The goal for return was 60 per cent. Since this percentage was not reached within a two week period, a follow-up letter was sent to those faculty members not returning the survey. A second copy of the survey was sent to faculty who had not responded after a four week period.

9. Interviews were conducted with two faculty members from each of the seven campuses, to gain more
detailed information about faculty's approval of types of professional growth and renewal activities. Those selected for the sample were chosen from faculty returning the DCCCD Survey.

10. Once instruments were returned, preparation was made to perform a statistical analysis of the collected data.

11. Analyses were conducted to answer the research questions.

12. The data are discussed in Chapter IV to reflect the findings.

Research Question One

Are there differences in the number who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities?

In order to answer the first research question the following data was collected in this study. Each faculty member in the multi-campus community college district completing this survey identified whether or not he or she had participated in the twenty-five selected professional growth and renewal activities, which were grouped into seven major categories for statistical analysis.

The first major category includes activities in the district's "Career Development and Renewal Program," which provides opportunities for personnel within the district to
participate in activities to enhance their effectiveness as employees in the district. One such activity is an internship program in which an employee in the district may work in another area or campus for a specified period of time and then return to his or her original position. Another activity is the understudy program in which an employee may spend one day a week or some other designated time to work along with another to learn more about the responsibilities of the second employee. A third activity in the Career Development and Renewal Program is a special project option in which an employee with an interest in some special activity may select a mentor who will work with the individual to assist him or her in completing the special project.

The second category in the survey includes leaves of absence. The regular sabbatical leave, for which employees with seven years of service to the district are eligible, may be for a semester with full pay or for a year with one-half salary. A variation of the regular sabbatical is the mini-sabbatical which is available for six weeks in the summer and for which faculty receive over 13 per cent of his or her salary. A third type of leave is a developmental leave which is for professional growth but for which employees receive no pay.

"International Faculty Exchanges and International Travel" is the third category in the survey. Activities
include faculty exchanges sponsored by the Fulbright Foundation as well as exchanges arranged between the district and other agencies. International travel is also provided by the College Consortium for International Study in the form of conferences in Europe. Other travel is available for selected faculty members to a tripartite conference which is held in the summer in England or Canada.

The fourth major category in the survey includes "Instructional Renewal Activities"; one of which is an instructional development grant which provides funds to faculty members who wish to develop materials for a special classroom project. Another instructional renewal activity is provided in faculty exchanges between campuses in this multi-campus district. These exchanges may be for a semester or a year. A third activity for instructional renewal is available through special teaching situations, for example, team-teaching, teaching an interdisciplinary course or an honors course.

Another major category in the survey includes "Grants" which are provided either by a district foundation or by an outside agency. One grant provided by the district is an Employee Development Fund Grant; funds from this grant may be used for professional travel. A second source of funds for which faculty may apply is the President's Mini-Grant which also supplies funds for travel. Renewal grants are
available for faculty members with fifteen years of service
to the district; these grants may be used for study or travel. Grants from an outside agency are also a possible
source of funds for special projects which provide professional growth and renewal.

The sixth major category in the survey includes "Rewards and Recognition." One such activity in this
category is an outstanding teaching award. Each campus in the multi-campus district selects an outstanding teacher who
is provided with a cash award. Each outstanding campus instructor then competes with other campus winners for
additional recognition and a cash award. Another activity which provides recognition is a productivity award given to
an individual or a group on each campus for a project that has in some way increased productivity on the campus. A
third type of recognition is an award for years of service to the district. Individuals with extended service to the
district are recognized at banquets and campus-wide meetings and are given gifts of appreciation.

The final category in the survey includes several miscellaneous professional growth and renewal activities. One such activity is a "Project Renewal Week" held each summer in New Mexico for selected district personnel. Another activity includes a district conference day held each year; guest speakers and campus leaders discuss topics of interest to those in higher education at this conference.
A third renewal activity identified in this category is a wellness program, which includes exercise classes, information about health and tests provided by an area health agency and paid for by the district. Travel funds for state and national conferences is another item identified in the miscellaneous category. Two open-ended activities complete the list of activities; these are campus-wide professional growth and renewal activities not previously identified and division professional growth and renewal activities.

Faculty completing the instrument identified in which activities they had participated. This data was tabulated regarding frequency of participation in the selected categories described above. The product of this compilation is a table consisting of seven categories with the number of faculty participating in each category.

Research Question Two

A. Are there significant differences in the number who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among ten teaching areas?

In order to answer part A of the second research question the following data was collected. Each faculty member completing the survey identified whether he or she had participated in each of the selected professional growth and renewal activities explained above in question one.
Faculty members also identified their teaching area when completing the survey. Teaching areas listed on the survey instrument were selected by instructional divisions. Although on some campuses one instructional division may include communication courses as well as humanities courses and on another campus physical education and humanities may be in the same division, the teaching areas identified on the survey instrument are traditionally accepted and are areas with which the faculty members readily identify.

The first teaching area listed on the instrument is business. This includes programs such as business management, office machines and accounting, among others. Communications is the second teaching area identified. In this multi-campus community college district, this area includes English, journalism, speech and foreign languages. The third category includes counseling and the learning resource center, commonly referred to as the LRC. The two are combined because many of the employees assigned to these areas have faculty status, but their teaching responsibilities are less than fifty per cent of their total responsibility. Developmental studies is the next teaching area identified. This area is a separate division at only one of the seven campuses; it has been combined with other instructional divisions at the other campuses. Historically, the developmental studies program in this study has been considered a separate teaching area by the
district. The fifth category includes health science and physical education, two areas related to physical health. The sixth teaching area identified is humanities. This area includes art, drama, music and philosophy. The next teaching area includes the mathematics and science teaching areas. The social science teaching area is the eighth area identified in the survey. This teaching area includes history, government, sociology and psychology. The technology teaching area is another teaching area identified in the survey instrument. This area, because of restrictions on duplication of programs on different campuses, includes a broad range of technical and occupational programs. The survey also provides one final choice of teaching area for faculty members responding to the survey. This is an "other" category for those faculty in specialized teaching areas who do not identify with the traditional teaching fields. Faculty identifying the "other" teaching area as their primary teaching field indicated the title of their specific teaching area.

Faculty from the ten teaching areas identified participation in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities. The data for each of the ten teaching areas were tabulated for each of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities. A Chi-square test of goodness of fit was conducted on the frequency data to determine if there was a significant difference between
the expected frequency and the observed frequency for each of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among the ten teaching areas. The .05 level was used to determine the statistical significance of any obtained differences.

B. Are there significant differences in the number who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among five chronological age groups of faculty?

Faculty members completing the survey identified their age in the demographic portion of the survey instrument as well as identifying in which professional growth and renewal activities they had participated. The instrument did not list age ranges but asked those responding to list their age. However, for the statistical study it was necessary to take the ages provided by faculty members and group those ages into several categories.

Since more than 50 per cent of faculty members had contributed more than ten years of service to the district (3), the youngest chronological age category was initially intended to be twenty-nine years and younger. The second category was to include faculty members who are thirty through thirty-nine chronological years; the third category was to include those forty through forty-nine chronological years. The fourth category was to include faculty members fifty through fifty-nine, and the final age category was to
include those sixty years or older. After the data were collected, the five age categories were changed to the following: thirty-five or younger, thirty-six through forty, forty-one through forty-five, forty-six through fifty, and fifty-one or older.

The data regarding numbers who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities were tabulated for each of the five chronological age groups. A Chi-square test of goodness of fit was conducted on the frequency data to determine if there was a significant difference between the expected frequency and the observed frequency for each of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among the five chronological age groups of faculty. The .05 level was used to determine the statistical significance of any obtained difference.

C. Are there significant differences in the number who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among the five years-of-service groups?

Faculty members completing the survey identified their years of service to the multi-campus community college district. The first campus enrolled students and had classes in September of 1966 (1), so the maximum years of service identified by faculty responding to the survey was twenty years. Although ranges for years of service were not identified in the survey instrument, the data was grouped in order to complete the appropriate statistical analysis. For
purposes of this study, the following years-of-service categories were established: fifteen or more years of service, from ten through fourteen years of service, from seven through nine years of service, from four through six years of service and from three or fewer years of experience. The research office of the district in this study has grouped faculty members' years of service into these categories (3). Therefore, these categories may provide opportunities for post hoc comparisons.

The data regarding numbers who participated in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities were tabulated for each of the years-of-experience groups in the district. A Chi-square test of goodness of fit was conducted on the data to determine if there was a significant difference between the observed frequency and the expected frequency for each of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among the five years-of-experience groups. The .05 level was used to determine the statistical significance of any obtained differences.

D. Are there significant differences in the number who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among the seven campuses in the multi-campus district?

In order to answer this question, data regarding frequency of participation in the seven categories of
professional growth and renewal activities were gathered from those responding to the survey. In addition to identifying in which professional growth and renewal activities they have participated, faculty members were identified by the campus to which they are assigned.

The community college district in this study includes seven campuses. The first campus opened in 1966 and employ one hundred seventy-four faculty members (3); the second and third campuses opened in 1970 and currently employ one hundred thirteen and eight-four faculty members respectively (3). The fourth campus began operation in 1972 and currently employs one hundred sixty-five faculty members (3). The fifth and sixth campuses opened in the fall of 1976; the fifth campus employs forty-six faculty; the sixth campus employs sixty-four full-time faculty (3). The seventh campus opened in 1978 and employs seventy-nine faculty members (3).

The data regarding numbers who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities were tabulated for each of the seven campuses. A Chi-square test of goodness of fit was conducted on the data to determine if there was a significant difference between the expected frequency and the observed frequency for each of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among the seven campuses. The .05 level was used to determine the statistical significance of any obtained difference.
Research Question Three

A. Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of selected professional growth and renewal activities among ten teaching areas?

In order to answer the above question, data regarding the attitude of faculty members toward the selected professional growth and renewal activities were collected. A five-point Likert-type attitude scale was used to gather the data. Responses included the following: strongly approve, approve, neither approve nor disapprove, disapprove, and strongly disapprove; the scores ranged from five to one. The scale was listed with each of the twenty-five professional growth and renewal activities which were grouped into seven categories. The scores of the items were summed to yield each individual's score for each of the seven professional growth and renewal categories.

The first major category, Career Development and Renewal Program, includes three separate activities. These include the internship, the understudy program and special projects. Assume that John Doe from teaching field A indicated strong approval, a score of five, for the internship program. His attitude regarding the understudy program is one of approval, a score of four on the Likert-type attitude scale. He indicated disapproval, a score of two, for special projects. The scores for the three activities would be summed to obtain John Doe's sum of mean
score of 11.0 for the district sponsored career development and renewal category. The same process was completed for each faculty member completing the survey.

Those responding to the survey also identified their primary teaching area as one of the following: business, communications, counseling and the learning resource center, health sciences and physical education, humanities, mathematics and science, social science, technology, developmental studies, and one "other" category.

All the data regarding the attitude scores on the selected professional growth and renewal activities according to teaching area were tabulated. The product of this compilation is a table for each of the seven professional growth and renewal activities. An analysis of variance was conducted on the score data to determine if significant differences in scores for each of the seven categories of professional growth and renewal activities existed among the teaching areas. The .05 level was used to determine the statistical significance of differences obtained from the analysis of variance procedure. An appropriate specific comparison statistical test was conducted when significant differences were identified.

B. Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of selected professional growth and renewal activities according to chronological age of faculty members?
Faculty members completing the survey identified their degree of approval of the twenty-five selected professional growth and renewal activities which had been grouped into seven categories as well as their chronological age on the survey instrument. For purposes of statistical analysis the chronological ages were grouped into five categories.

All the data regarding the attitude scores of the selected professional growth and renewal activities according to chronological ages were tabulated. The product of this compilation is a table for each of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities; the five rows on each table represent the five chronological age groups. An analysis of variance test was conducted on the score data to determine if significant differences in scores for each of the seven categories of professional growth and renewal activities existed among the five age groups. The .05 level was used to determine the statistical significance of any obtained differences. When statistical significance of differences was obtained from the analysis of variance procedure, a Newman-Keul's test, which provides a statistical analysis procedure for post-hoc comparison among means, was conducted.

C. Are there significant differences in the degree of approval in selected professional growth and renewal activities according to years of service to the multi-campus community college district?
Faculty members responding to the DCCCD Professional Growth and Renewal Survey indicated on a five-point Likert-type scale their degree of approval with twenty-five professional growth and renewal activities which had been grouped into seven categories. The scores of the activity items were summed to yield each individual's category score.

Those completing the survey also identified their years of service to the multi-campus community college district. Although faculty identified specific years of service, ranges for years of service were incorporated in order to complete the statistical study. The ranges for years of service include fifteen or more years of service, from ten through fourteen years of service, from seven through nine years of service, from four through six years of service, and three or fewer years of service. The research office of the district in this study has grouped faculty members' years of service into these categories (3); establishing the same categories for this study may provide opportunities for post hoc comparison.

All the attitude scores on the selected professional growth and renewal activities were tabulated according to years of service. The product of this compilation is a table for each of the seven categories of professional growth and renewal activities. The five rows on each table represent the years-of-service ranges. An analysis of variance was conducted on the score data to determine if a
significant difference in scores for each of the seven categories of professional growth and renewal activities existed among the years of service groups. The .05 level was used to determine the statistical significance of any obtained difference. When a statistical significance of differences was obtained from the analysis of variance procedure, a Newman-Keul’s test was conducted.

D. Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of selected professional growth and renewal activities according to campus?

Individuals completing the DCCCD Professional Growth and Renewal Survey indicated their degree of approval of the twenty-five selected professional growth and renewal activities. Survey instruments were also coded by campuses. The product of this compilation is a table for each of the seven categories of professional growth and renewal activities. An analysis of variance was conducted on the score data to determine if a significant difference in scores for the seven categories of professional growth and renewal activities existed among the seven campuses. The .05 level was used to determine the statistical significance of any obtained differences. When a statistical significance of differences was obtained from the analysis of variance procedure, the appropriate specific comparison statistical test was conducted.
Additional Information

In addition to information gathered to answer the above research questions, the survey asked for suggestions from faculty for professional growth and renewal activities that this multi-campus community college district may offer in the future. These suggestions may provide valuable information for those planning professional growth and renewal activities for faculty in the future. At a time when financial constraints are a reality and when faculty mobility is minimal, it is imperative that appropriate professional growth and renewal activities be provided for faculty members. This survey identifies the kinds of professional growth and renewal activities faculty members are recommending. Although suggestions for professional growth activities have been sought from full-time faculty members in the past, not all faculty in the multi-campus community college district in this study have had the opportunity which this study provided.

An interview was conducted with two faculty members from each of the seven campuses in order to gain more detailed information regarding faculty attitude toward the professional growth and renewal activities supported by the district. Those faculty members who were interviewed were selected randomly from those who completed the survey. Those interviewed were asked which professional growth and renewal activity was most valuable for their own
professional growth and renewal. They were also asked which professional growth and renewal activity supported by the district was most valuable for the educational programs in the district. Faculty were also asked to give reasons for the activities they selected as well as their perceptions of the district's support of professional growth and renewal.

The additional suggestions gathered from those completing the survey and information from the interviews were descriptive and no statistical analyses were conducted on this information. The findings are, however, discussed in Chapter IV.

Summary

The **Dallas County Community College District Professional Growth and Renewal Survey** provided all full-time faculty members in this community college district an opportunity to express their approval and/or disapproval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities identified in the survey instrument. Faculty members were also given the opportunity to suggest additional professional growth and renewal activities that the Dallas County Community College District may offer in the future. The study also determined the number who participate in the professional growth and renewal activities. The data collected in this study are tabulated, analyzed, and discussed in detail in the following chapter. This information will be valuable to the Dallas County
Community College District as it sets goals and establishes plans for faculty's future professional growth and renewal.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Five hundred twenty-six Dallas County Community College District faculty members completed the DCCCD Survey which provided data for this study. Approximately 75 per cent of those who were asked to complete the survey responded. Each participant provided demographic information which included primary teaching area, years of service in the Dallas County Community College District, and age. The participants indicated in which of the twenty-five professional growth and renewal activities they had participated during their years of service in the Dallas County Community College District. The twenty-five activities were grouped into seven categories for this study.

In addition to the demographic information and the identification of participation in the selected professional growth activities, participants indicated on a five point Likert-type scale their approval or disapproval of the activities in the seven categories. The scale ranged from strongly disapprove of the Dallas County Community College's support of the activity to strongly approve; The choices on the scale included the following: strongly disapprove, disapprove, neither disapprove nor approve, approve, and strongly approve.
Of the 526 faculty members participating in the study, seventy were classified as business instructors, seventy-two as communications instructors, sixty-nine as counselors or learning resource personnel with faculty contracts, twenty-six developmental studies instructors, forty as health science or physical education instructors, forty-six as humanities or fine arts instructors, fifty-four as mathematics or science instructors, fifty-six as social science instructors, fifty-three as technology instructors, and forty as instructors in other fields. For statistical analyses purposes, the years of service identified by the participants in the study were classified into five categories. These included three or fewer years of service, four through six years of service, seven through nine years of service, ten through fourteen years of service and fifteen or more years of service. Of those completing the survey forty-three or 8.2 per cent had three or fewer years of experience; fifty-one or 9.7 per cent had four through six years; ninety-one or 17.3 per cent had seven through nine years; 178 or 33.8 per cent had ten through fourteen years; and 163 or 31 per cent had fifteen or more years of experience.

For purposes of statistical analyses the age of all respondents was classified into five categories: twenties, thirties, forties, fifties and sixty or more. These categories provided frequencies that were not balanced.
Only four respondents were in the "twenties" category or .8 per cent; 139 or 26.4 per cent were in their thirties; 251 or 47.7 per cent or those completing the survey were in their forties: 115 or 21.9 per cent were in their fifties; and only seventeen or 3.2 per cent were in the sixty or over category. Since 47.7 per cent of respondents were in the forties category, the decision was made to establish different age categories. Therefore, the age categories were changed to the following: thirty-five and under, thirty-six through forty, forty-one through forty-five, forty-six through fifty, and fifty-one and more. This realignment of categories resulted in a better balance among the five age groups. The thirty-five and under category included fifty-five faculty members or 10.5 per cent; the thirty-six through forty category included 113 respondents or 21.5 per cent; the forty-one through forty-five category included 138 faculty or 26.2 per cent; the forty-six through fifty category included 112 or 21.3 percent; and the fifty-one and older category included 108 respondents or 20.5 per cent.

Participants in the study were not required to identify the campus with which they were affiliated, but survey instruments were coded so that the campus variable became a part of the study. The Dallas County Community College District is composed of seven campuses. Of those completing the survey instrument fifty-four or 10.3 per cent are
affiliated with the Brookhaven campus, thirty-seven or 7.0 per cent are affiliated with Cedar Valley, sixty-five or 12.4 per cent are at Eastfield; 124 or 23.4 per cent are at El Centro; fifty-two or 9.9 per cent are at Mountain View, fifty-two or 9.9 per cent are affiliated with the North Lake campus, and 142 or 27 per cent are affiliated with Richland.

The research questions presented in Chapter I of this study were answered after compilation of data received from the 526 faculty members who completed the survey. The first research question made the following inquiry: Are there differences in the number who participate in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities? The numbers of faculty members who participated in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities were calculated using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. An indication of participation in any one of the activities within one of the seven major categories was tallied as participation. If a faculty member identified participation in two activities within a major category, the participation was still tallied as simply participation in the major category. Table I identifies the number of faculty members who have participated in the seven categories of professional growth and renewal activities. (See Table I.) A second table identifying participation in individual activities within the seven categories is also included. (See Table II.)
TABLE I

PARTICIPANTS IN SEVEN CATEGORIES OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND RENEWAL ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Development and Renewal</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Faculty Exchange and Travel</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Renewal</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred ten or 20.9 per cent of the faculty members completing the survey indicated that they had participated in the "Career Development and Renewal" category, which includes internships, understudy arrangements and special projects in which faculty work with a mentor. Eighty-nine or 16.9 per cent of faculty completing the survey instrument indicated participation in the "Leaves" category which includes two types of sabbatical leaves and a developmental leave. Eighty-one or 15.4 per cent of the respondents in the survey identified participation in the "International Faculty Exchange and Travel" category. This category includes international faculty exchange programs, a College Consortium for International Study (CCIS), and a tripartite conference for district personnel and representatives from
### TABLE II
PARTICIPANTS IN INDIVIDUAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND RENEWAL ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Development and Renewal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understudy</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaves</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Sabbatical</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Leave</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Faculty Exchange and Travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Faculty Exchange</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Consortium for International Study</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripartite Conference</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Renewal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Development Grant</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-District Teacher Exchange</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Teaching Format</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Development Fund</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Mini-Grant</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Agency Grant</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Program Grant</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Teaching Award</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity Award</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service Recognition</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Renewal</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Conference Day</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Wellness Program</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Travel Funds</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
two other colleges. Three hundred twenty or 60.8 per cent of the 526 faculty members completing the survey had participated in instructional renewal projects offered by the district. The activities in instructional renewal programs include instructional development grants, in-district faculty exchanges and participation in special teaching formats.

Two hundred seventy-seven faculty members or 60.8 per cent completing the survey instrument had been awarded a grant. This includes an employee development fund and a president's mini-grant, both of which can be used for professional travel, as well as grants from an outside agency, and renewal program grants for those faculty with fifteen years of experience in the district. Three hundred forty-one faculty members indicated participation in the "Reward" category. This figure is 64.8 per cent of those completing the survey. Rewards include outstanding teaching awards, productivity awards and years of service recognition. The final category in the survey was a miscellaneous category which included a special Project Renewal Week which is available to faculty, an annual district conference day, a wellness program supported by the district, and division travel funds. Five hundred five or 96 per cent of faculty completing the survey identified participation in the miscellaneous category. Because of this high participation, a participation frequency was
tabulated for each of the activities within the miscellaneous category. Forty-four or 8.4 per cent of those completing the survey had participated in the Project Renewal Week; 458 had participated in the district conference day, an event that requires attendance by faculty members; 295 or 56.1 per cent had participated in the district's wellness program which includes exercise programs and diagnostic testing at no cost to faculty members; 427 faculty or 81.2 per cent completing the survey had received division travel funds for professional activities. Two open-ended activities were listed on the survey instrument in order to give faculty members the opportunity to identify participation in professional growth and renewal activities not identified previously. These are not considered a major category, but 144 or 27.4 per cent of those completing the survey identified participation in another professional growth or renewal activity. These activities were categorized into groups and included workshops, retreats, fine arts activities, committee work, grants, community activities, division staff development conferences, seminars, professional organizations, teaching activities, speakers, as well as individual professional growth projects. A complete list of other professional growth and renewal activities identified by respondents in the DCCCD Survey is found in the appendices.
The second research question asked the following: Are there significant differences in the number of faculty participating in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities A. among ten teaching fields? B. among five age groups? C. among five years-of-service categories? D. among seven campuses? An SSPS cross-tabulation procedure was used to determine the expected frequency of participation in each of the seven categories among the ten teaching areas, the five years-of-service categories, the five age categories, and the seven campuses. An NPAR Chi-square test of goodness of fit was then performed on the data to determine if significant differences in participation existed at the .05 level for each of the seven types of activities among the teaching fields, among the years-of-experience categories, among the age categories, and among the seven campuses. This test showed discrepancies between the number who participated in the seven types of activities and the number who were expected to participate. The .05 level means that a result that is significant could occur by chance only five times in one hundred.

Table III identifies the number of expected cases and the number of observed cases in the "Career Development and Renewal" category for each of the ten teaching areas. The NPAR Chi-square test of goodness of fit indicated no significant difference at the .05 level in the participation in career development activities among the ten teaching
TABLE III

CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE TEN TEACHING FIELD GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>-3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>-4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 13.46; Sig. = 0.143).
fields (Chi-square = 13.46; significance = 0.143). This means that no significant differences existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. Any differences could be attributed to chance. The Learning Resource Center faculty and the counseling faculty, however, showed the highest observed participation with a residual of 9.60. The social science faculty's participation in career development and renewal activities was closest to the expected frequency with a residual of .30.

In the "Leaves" category no significant difference at the .05 level was identified among the ten teaching fields (Chi-square = 9.64; significance = .380). This means that no significant differences existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. Any differences between the observed and expected frequency can be attributed to chance. This information appears in Table IV. The highest residual of 6.81 was reported in the communications teaching field with nineteen observed cases and 12.19 expected cases. Social science faculty had the lowest residual of .51.

The number of expected cases and the number of observed cases for international exchanges and travel among the ten teaching fields is cited in Table V. The NPAR Chi-square test of goodness of fit indicated a high level of significance at the .05 in this category (Chi-square = 34.99; significance = .000). This means there were
TABLE IV

LEAVES PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE TEN TEACHING FIELD GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>-4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>-3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 9.64; Sig. = 0.380).
significant differences between expected participation and observed participation among the ten teaching areas. This difference is greater than that attributed to chance, which at the .05 level is five times in one hundred. The highest residual of 14.41 is found in the social science teaching field with the expected cases being 8.59 and the observed cases being twenty-three. The mathematics/science teaching field had the lowest residual of .71.

In instructional renewal activities the NPAR Chi-square test of goodness of fit indicated a level of significance among the ten teaching fields (Chi-square = 17.62; significance = .040). There were discrepancies between expected participation and observed participation among the ten teaching areas which could not be attributed to chance. A high residual was discovered in the communications teaching field with fifty-seven observed cases and 43.8 expected cases. The technology field had a strong negative residual of 10.20 with twenty-two observed cases and 32.2 expected cases. The lowest residual of 1.10 was reported in the mathematics/science teaching field. These findings appear in Table VI.

The number of expected cases and observed cases among the ten teaching fields for grants is cited in Table VII. The NPAR Chi-square test of goodness of fit indicated no significance at the .05 level (Chi-square = 11.58; significance = 0.239). This means that no significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>-4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>-3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>14.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>-4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>-4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 34.99; Sig. = 0.000).
TABLE VI

INSTRUCTIONAL RENEWAL PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE TEN TEACHING FIELD GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td>-5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43.80</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.10</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>-10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>-6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 17.62; Sig. = 0.040).
differences existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. Any differences between the observed and expected frequency could be attributed to chance. The highest residual was reported in the "Other" teaching field category with a negative 11.10; ten observed cases were reported and 21.10 cases were expected. The lowest residual of .90 was reported in the developmental studies teaching field.

No significance at the .05 level was indicated by the NPAR Chi-square test of goodness of fit for rewards (Chi-square = 9.36; significance=0.404). This means there were no discrepancies between expected participation and observed participation in the "Reward" category. Any difference could be attributed to chance. The observed and expected cases are reported in Table VIII. The highest residual was reported in the communications teaching field with fifty-six reported cases and 46.70 expected cases. The lowest residual was reported in the humanities teaching field.

The NPAR test of goodness of fit reported no significance at the .05 level in the "Miscellaneous" category (Chi-square = 0.62; significance = 1.000). This means that no significant differences existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. The technology field reported the highest residual of negative 3.90; 50.9 cases were expected and forty-seven were observed. The lowest residual of .60 was reported in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37.90</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.90</td>
<td>-6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>-11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 11.56; Sig. = 0.239).
TABLE VIII
REWARD PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE TEN TEACHING FIELD GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>-5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.70</td>
<td>-4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Ed.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>-6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>-7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>341</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 9.36; Sig. = 0.404).
humanities teaching field. This information is cited in Table IX.

The second portion of the second research question made the following inquiry: **Are there significant differences in the number of faculty participating in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among five age categories?** An SPSS cross-tabulation procedure was used to determine the expected frequency in each of the age categories: thirty-five and under, thirty-six through forty, forty-one through forty-five, forty-six through fifty, and fifty-one and older. The NPAR Chi-square test of goodness of fit was then conducted to identify significance among the five age groups in each of the seven categories of professional growth and renewal.

Table X identifies the number of expected cases and the number of the observed cases in the career development and renewal category for each of the five age groups. No significance at the .05 level was observed in the participation in this category among the five age groups (Chi-square = 4.97; significance = .290). This means there were no significant differences between expected participation and observed participation among the five age groups. Any difference could be attributed to chance, which at the .05 level is five times in one hundred. A positive residual of 7.40 was observed in the fifty-one and over age
TABLE IX
MISCELLANEOUS PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG TEN TEACHING FIELD GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67.20</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69.10</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51.80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53.80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50.90</td>
<td>-3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>505</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 0.63; Sig. = 1.000).
category with thirty cases observed and 22.60 expected. A negative residual of 6.60 was observed in the thirty-six through forty age category with an expected frequency of 23.60 and an observed frequency of seventeen. The lowest residual of negative .40 was observed in the forty-six to fifty age category.

Table XI identifies the number of expected cases and the number of the observed cases in the "Leaves" area for each of the five age groups. No significance at the .05 level was observed (Chi-square = 2.85; significance = 0.582). This means there were no significant differences between the number who participated and the number expected

### TABLE X

CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE FIVE AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Among Five Age Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>-6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or Older</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 4.92; Sig. = .290).
### TABLE XI

**LEAVES PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE FIVE AGE GROUPS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Age Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>-4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and Older</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total           | 89                              | ...                             | ...      |

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 2.86; Sig. = .582).

to participate in this area. A negative residual of 4.30 was observed in the thirty-five and under category; no residual was observed in the forty-one through forty-five age category with nineteen expected and observed cases.

Table XII identifies the number of expected and observed cases in the "International Exchange and Travel" category for each of the age groups. No significance at the .05 level was observed (Chi-square = 4.33; significance 0.362). There were no discrepancies between expected participation and observed participation among the age groups. Any differences could be attributed to chance.
TABLE XII
INTERNATIONAL FACULTY EXCHANGE AND TRAVEL PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE FIVE AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Age Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>-4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.27</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>-3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and Older</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 4.33; Sig. = .362).

A negative residual of 4.49 was observed in the thirty-five and under age category. The lowest residual of .52 was reported in the thirty-six through forty age category with 17.48 expected cases and eighteen observed cases.

Table XIII identifies the number of expected and observed cases in the "Instructional Renewal Programs" category for each of the age groups. No significance at the .05 level was observed (Chi-square = 3.99; significance = 0.407). This means no significant differences existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. Any differences between the observed and expected frequency could be attributed to chance. A
TABLE XIII

INSTRUCTIONAL RENEWAL PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG FIVE AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Age Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>-9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68.10</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and Older</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65.70</td>
<td>-4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 4.00; Sig. = .407).

A negative residual of 9.50 was observed in the thirty-five and under age category with 33.50 expected cases and twenty-four observed cases. The lowest residual of 3.30 was reported in the thirty-six through forty age category with 68.70 expected cases and seventy-two observed cases.

Table XIV identifies the number of expected and observed recipients of grants for each of the five age groups. No significance at the .05 level was observed (Chi-square = 1.56; significance = 0.815). This means no significant difference existed between the number who participated and were expected to participate. The highest
TABLE XIV

GRANTS PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG FIVE AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIVE AGE Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>-3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59.48</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58.98</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and Older</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56.88</td>
<td>-2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>• • •</td>
<td>• • •</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 1.56; Sig. = .815).

Residual of 6.02 was observed in the forty-six through fifty age group with 58.98 expected cases and sixty-five observed cases. The lowest residual of negative 2.48 was observed in the thirty-six through forty age range with 59.48 expected cases and fifty-seven observed cases.

Table XV identifies the number of expected and observed cases in the "Rewards" category for each of the five age groups. Significance at the .05 level was reported in this area. (Chi-square = 11.17; significance = 0.025). This means there were discrepancies between the number who participated and those expected to participate in this category. The .05 level means that this significant result could occur by chance only five
### TABLE XV

**REWARD PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG FIVE AGE GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Age Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.69</td>
<td>-14.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73.28</td>
<td>-11.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72.58</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and Older</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69.98</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>341</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 11.17; Sig. = .025).*

Times in one hundred. A negative residual of 14.69 was observed in the thirty-five and under age range with 35.69 expected cases and twenty-one observed cases; the lowest residual of 8.42 was observed in the forty-six through fifty age range with 72.58 expected cases and eighty-two observed cases.

Table XVI identifies the number of expected and observed cases in the "Miscellaneous" category for each of the five age groups. No significance at the .05 level was observed (Chi-square = 0.21; significance = 0.995).

This means that no significant differences existed between the number who participated and those expected to
TABLE XVI
MISCELLANEOUS PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE
DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED
CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG
FIVE AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Age Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.80</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108.50</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>132.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>107.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and Older</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 0.21; Sig. = .995).

participate. A negative residual of 2.80 in the thirty-five and under age range with 52.80 expected cases and fifty observed cases. The lowest residual of .30 was observed in the fifty-one and over age group with 103.70 expected cases and 104 observed cases.

The third portion of the second research question made the following inquiry: Are there significant differences in the number of faculty participating in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among five years-of-service groups? A cross-tabulation procedure using the SPSS computer package was used to determine the expected frequency
in each of the years of experience categories: three and under, four through six, seven through nine, ten through fourteen, and fifteen or more. The NPAR Chi-square test of goodness of fit was then conducted to identify significance among the five years-of-experience groups in each of the seven categories of professional growth and renewal.

Table XVII identifies the number of expected and observed cases for "Career Development and Renewal". No

**TABLE XVII**

<p>| CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCC SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS* |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or Fewer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>-3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.10</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 6.46; Sig. = 0.168).

significance at the .05 level was observed among the years-of-service groups (Chi-square = 6.45; significance = 0.168).

This means that no significant difference existed between
the number who participated and those expected to participate. The highest residual of 5.90 was reported in the fifteen or more years-of-experience group with 34.10 expected cases and forty observed cases. The lowest residual of negative 3.00 was reported in the seven through nine years-of-experience category with 19.00 expected cases and sixteen observed cases.

Table XVIII identifies the number of expected and observed participants in "Leaves" for each of the years-of-experience group. Significance at the .05 level was reported (Chi-square = 23.58; significance = 0.000). There

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or Fewer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>-7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>-7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>-4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 23.58; Sig. = 0.000).
was a significant difference between the number who participated and those expected to participate among the five years-of-experience groups. The .05 level means that this difference could occur by chance only five times in one hundred. The highest residual of 14.40 was observed in the fifteen or more years-of-service group with 27.60 expected cases and forty-two observed cases. The lowest residual of negative 4.40 was observed in the seven through nine years-of-experience group with 15.40 expected cases and eleven observed cases.

Table XIX identifies the number of expected and observed cases in "International Exchange and Travel" for each of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or Fewer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>-5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>-5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.10</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 14.25; Sig. = 0.0007).*
years-of-experience group. Significance at the .05 level was reported in this category (Chi-square = 14.25; significance = 0.007). There was a significant difference between the number who participated and those expected to participate among the five years-of-service groups. At the .05 level this significance could occur by chance only five times in one hundred. The highest residual of 10.90 was reported by the group with fifteen or more years of experience with 25.10 expected cases and thirty-six observed cases. The lowest residual of negative 1.40 was reported by the group with ten through fourteen years of experience with 27.40 expected cases and twenty-six observed cases.

Table XX identifies the number of expected and observed cases in "Instructional Renewal Programs" for each of the years-of-experience group. Significance at the .05 level was reported in this category (Chi-square = 19.59; significance = 0.001). This means that a significant difference existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. The highest residual of 21.73 was reported by the group with ten through fourteen years of experience with 108.27 expected cases and 130 observed cases. The lowest residual of negative 4.38 was reported by the group with seven through nine years of experience with 55.38 expected cases and fifty-one observed cases.
TABLE XX

INSTRUCTIONAL RENEWAL PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCES GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or Fewer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>-16.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.99</td>
<td>-10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55.38</td>
<td>-4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>108.27</td>
<td>27.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>99.17</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 19.59; Sig. = 0.001).

Table XXI identifies the number of expected and observed recipients of grants for the years-of-experience groups. No significance at the .05 level was reported in this category (Chi-square = 6.02; significance = 0.197). This means that no significant difference existed between the expected number who received grants and those who actually received the grants. The highest residual of 12.17 was reported by the group with fifteen or more years of experience with 85.83 expected cases and ninety-eight observed cases. The lowest residual of 1.08 was reported by the group with seven through nine years of experience with 47.92 expected cases and forty-nine observed cases.
TABLE XXI

GRANTS PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or Fewer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>-6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>-7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47.92</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93.73</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85.83</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 6.02; Sig. = 0.197).

Table XXII identifies the number of expected and observed cases in the "Rewards" category for the years-of-experience groups. Significance at the .05 level was reported in this area (Chi-square = 50.63; significance = 0.000). There were significant differences between the number who participated and the number expected to participate. The .05 level means that this significance could occur by chance only five times in one hundred. The highest residual of negative 26.89 was reported in the group with three or fewer years of experience with 27.89 expected cases and one observed case. The lowest residual of negative 8.98 was reported by the group with seven through
TABLE XXII
REWARD PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or Fewer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.89</td>
<td>-26.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>-17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58.98</td>
<td>-8.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>115.37</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>105.67</td>
<td>35.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 50.63; Sig. = 0.000).

nine years of experience with 58.98 expected cases and fifty observed cases.

Table XXIII identifies the number of expected and observed cases in the "Miscellaneous" category for each of the years-of-experience group. No significant at the .05 level was reported in this activity (Chi-square = 2.36; significance = 0.671). This means that no significant differences existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. The highest residual of negative 9.29 was reported in the group with three or fewer years of experience with 41.29 expected cases and thirty-two
TABLE XXIII

MISCELLANEOUS PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or Fewer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>-9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48.99</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87.38</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>170.87</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>156.47</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>• • •</td>
<td>• • •</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 2.36; Sig. = 0.671).

observed cases. The lowest residual of .01 was reported by the group with four through six years of experience with 48.99 expected cases and forty-nine observed cases.

The final portion of the second research question made the following inquiry: Are there significant differences in the number of faculty participating in the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among the seven campuses? A cross-tabulation procedure in the SPSS statistics package was used to determine the expected frequency for each of the campuses: Brookhaven, Cedar Valley, Eastfield, El Centro, Mountain View, North Lake, and
Richland. The NPAR Chi-square test of goodness of fit was conducted to identify significance among the seven campuses in each of the seven professional growth and renewal categories.

Table XXIV identifies the number of expected cases and the number of observed cases in the "Career Development and Renewal" category for the seven campuses. No significance at the .05 level was observed (Chi-square = 7.83; Sig. = 0.250).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>-4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>-3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 7.83; Sig. = 0.250).
significance = 0.251). This means there were no significant differences between the number who participated and those expected to participate among faculty at the seven campuses.

The highest residual of 8.20 was reported at El Centro with 25.90 expected cases and thirty-four observed cases. The lowest residual of negative .30 was reported at Brookhaven with 11.30 expected cases and eleven observed cases.

Table XXV identifies the number of expected cases and the number of the observed cases in faculty leaves for the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>. . .</strong></td>
<td><strong>. . .</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 2.79; Sig. = 0.835).*
campuses. No significance at the .05 level was observed (Chi-square = 2.79; significance = 0.835). This means that no significant difference existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. The highest residual of 3.90 was reported at the Brookhaven campus with 9.10 expected cases and thirteen observed cases. No residual was reported at Eastfield with the expected and observed case number of eleven.

Table XXVI identifies the number of expected cases and the number of the observed cases in "International Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>-4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 3.84; Sig. = 0.699).
Exchange and Travel" for the seven campuses. No significance at .05 level was observed (Chi-square = 3.84; significance = 0.699). This means that no significant difference existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. It can be stated with 95 percent confidence that any difference is the result of chance. The highest residual of negative 4.10 was reported at El Centro with 19.10 expected cases and fifteen observed cases. The lowest residual of .10 was reported at Richland with 21.90 expected cases and twenty-two observed cases.

Table XXVII identifies the number of expected cases and the number of the observed cases in "Instructional Renewal Programs" for the campuses. No significance at the .05 level was reported (Chi-square = 8.91; significance = 0.179). There was no significant difference between those who participated and those expected to participate. The highest residual of 19.57 was reported at Richland with 86.43 expected cases and 106 observed cases. The lowest residual of .09 was reported at Brookhaven with 32.91 expected cases and thirty-three observed cases.
TABLE XXVII

INSTRUCTIONAL RENEWAL PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE SEVEN CAMPUSES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>-2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39.51</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75.42</td>
<td>-11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.61</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.61</td>
<td>-8.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>86.43</td>
<td>19.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 8.91; Sig. = 0.179).

The number of expected and observed recipients of grants appear in Table XXVIII. No significance at the .05 level was reported (Chi-square = 11.19; significance = 0.083). This means that no significant difference existed between the number who participated and those expected to participate. The highest residual of negative 21.30 was reported at El Centro with 65.30 expected cases and forty-four observed cases. The lowest residual of .50 was reported at
### TABLE XXVIII
GRANTS PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG SEVEN CAMPUSES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.30</td>
<td>-21.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74.80</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 11.19; Sig. = 0.083).

Cedar Valley with 19.50 expected cases and twenty observed cases.

Table XXIX identifies the number of expected cases and the number of the observed cases in the "Reward" category. No significance at the .05 level was reported (Chi-square = 3.62; significance = 0.728). There was no significant difference between the number who participated and those expected to participate. With 95 per cent confidence, it can be stated that any difference is due to chance. The
TABLE XXIX
REWARD PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG THE SEVEN CAMPUSES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80.40</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92.10</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>341</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 3.62; Sig. = 0.728).

highest residual of 8.30 was reported at Mountain View with 33.70 expected cases and forty-two observed cases. The lowest residual of .30 was reported at North Lake with 33.70 expected cases and thirty-four observed cases.

The number of expected cases and the number of observed cases in the "Miscellaneous" category appears in Table XXX. No significance at the .05 level was reported (Chi-square = 0.33; significance = 0.999). This means there was no
TABLE XXX

MISCELLANEOUS PARTICIPANTS CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. CASES OBSERVED, CASES EXPECTED AND RESIDUALS AMONG SEVEN CAMPUSES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Observed Number of Participants</th>
<th>Expected Number of Participants</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51.82</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.51</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62.42</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>119.05</td>
<td>-4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.92</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.92</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>136.35</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>505</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (Chi-square = 0.33; Sig. = 0.999).

significant difference between the number who participated and those expected to participate. The highest residual reported was a negative 4.05 at El Centro with 119.05 expected cases and 115 observed cases. The lowest residual of .49 was reported at Cedar Valley with 35.51 expected cases and thirty-six observed cases.

The third research question made the following inquiry: Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities A. among ten teaching fields; B. among five age categories; C. among five years-of-experience categories;
and D. among seven campuses? A condescriptive test in the SPSS statistical package was used to determine the mean and the standard deviation for the seven types of activities. Each faculty member identified his or her opinion of twenty-five activities which were grouped into seven categories. Each faculty member's score for individual activities within an area was summed to get a category score for each faculty. All faculty scores were then summed, and the total was divided by the number of faculty responding in order to obtain a sum of score mean. The sum of score mean and standard deviation for each of the seven areas of professional growth and renewal activities appear in Table XXXI.

**TABLE XXXI**

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND RENEWAL OPINIONS FOR CATEGORIES ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR FOR FACULTY RESPONDING*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Professional Growth and Renewal</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Development and Renewal</td>
<td>11.901</td>
<td>2.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>13.195</td>
<td>2.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Exchange and Travel</td>
<td>11.817</td>
<td>2.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Renewal Programs</td>
<td>12.536</td>
<td>2.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>17.345*</td>
<td>2.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>12.467</td>
<td>2.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>16.435*</td>
<td>2.916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These categories have four activities; all other categories have three activities.
In order to provide more detailed information about this data, an additional condescending test in the SPSS computer package was conducted on the individual twenty-five activities which had been grouped into the seven categories. These activities were ranked by mean score and appear in Table XXXII.

**TABLE XXXII**

RANKED MEAN SCORES OF INDIVIDUAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND RENEWAL ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division Travel Funds</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Sabbatical</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Leave</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Program Grant</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Agency Grant</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Development Fund</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Mini-Grant</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Wellness Program</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Development Grant</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service Recognition</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Teaching Format</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Teaching Award</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Faculty Exchange</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-District Faculty Exchange</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Project</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity Award</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Consortium for International Study</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Renewal Week</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understudy</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripartite Conference</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Conference Day</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first portion of research question three made the following inquiry: **Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among ten teaching fields?** A
multivariate analysis computer program, MANOVA, was used to determine significance among the ten teaching fields: business, communications, counseling and Learning Resource Center, developmental studies, health sciences and physical education, humanities and fine arts, mathematics and science, social science, technology, and one "other" category. Pillai's trace identified significance among the ten teaching fields. One-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to determine in which of the seven categories significance was reported. Table XXXIII through Table XXXIX identify the number of cases, the sum of score means, the standard deviations and any reported significance among teaching fields for each of the seven categories of professional growth and renewal activities: "Career Development and Renewal," "Leaves," "International Faculty Exchange and Travel," "Instructional Renewal," "Grants," "Rewards," and a miscellaneous category.

The analysis of variance test (ANOVA) revealed significance at the .05 level for the "Career Development and Renewal" category among the ten teaching fields (F = 3.33; significance = .001). This indicated that statistically significant differences of opinion existed among the teaching fields. The .05 level means that this significance could occur by chance only five times in one hundred. A Newman-Keuls' test, which provides a statistical analysis procedure for post-hoc comparison among means, was
conducted to determine between which teaching fields opinions differed. The Learning Resource Center/counseling faculty's sum of score mean of 12.94 in this category differed significantly from all other mean scores among all other teaching fields. Those faculty who identified their teaching field as "other" differed significantly from faculty in all other teaching fields with the exception of the developmental studies and health science/physical education faculty. The health science/physical education group's opinion was not significantly different from those faculty in the communications and developmental studies teaching fields as well.

The humanities, social science and communications faculty's opinions were not significantly different. However, the three groups each differed significantly from all other groups with the exception of communications faculty whose opinion did not differ significantly from the developmental studies and health science/physical education faculty. The mathematics/science, technology and business faculty opinion did not differ significantly from each other.

The highest sum of score mean of 12.94 for this category was reported by the counseling/Learning Resource Center faculty. The lowest sum of score means of 11.26 were reported by both the mathematics/science faculty and the technology faculty. The lowest standard deviation was
reported by faculty in the "other" teaching field. The highest standard deviation of 2.80 was reported by business faculty. (See Table XXXIII.)

Significance was reported in the "Leaves" category among the ten teaching fields \( F = 2.91; \) significance \( = .002 \). This means the opinion of faculty in the ten teaching fields differed significantly regarding leaves. The differences were more than could be attributed to chance. A Newman-Keuls' test was conducted to compare the sum of score means in order to determine which faculty opinions in specific teaching fields differed significantly from those in other teaching fields. Opinion regarding leaves in the developmental studies, communication, Learning Resource Center/counseling and humanities teaching fields did not differ significantly with only one exception, faculty opinion in humanities differed from that in developmental studies. The opinion of the LRC/counseling group did not differ from the faculty attitude in the "other" teaching field; however, the faculty opinion in developmental studies, communications and LRC/counseling differed significantly from all other teaching fields.

The opinion of humanities faculty as well as developmental studies, communications and LRC/counseling differed significantly from that of business faculty and technology faculty. The opinion of health science/physical education faculty did not differ significantly from faculty in humanities, "other, mathematics/science, and social science teaching fields,
## TABLE XXXIII

CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE TEN TEACHING FIELD GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>525</td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups ($F = 3.33; \text{Sig.} = .001$).
but it did differ significantly from all other groups. The attitude of business faculty and technology faculty did not differ significantly from each other regarding leaves but differed significantly from all other groups. The highest sum of score mean of 13.85 was reported by faculty in the developmental studies teaching field. This group also reported the lowest standard deviation of 1.52. The lowest mean of 12.21 was reported by technology faculty. The highest standard deviation of 2.71 was reported by business faculty. (See Table XXXIV.)

Significance at the .05 level was reported in the "International Faculty Exchange and Travel" category among the faculty in ten teaching fields ($F = 3.22; \text{significance} = .001$). This indicated that there was a significant difference of opinion regarding international exchange and travel; the .05 level means that this could occur by chance only five times in one hundred. A Newman-Keuls' test was conducted to determine between which teaching field groups significance could be identified. The opinion of faculty from the social science, communication, developmental studies and Learning Resource Center/counseling fields did not differ significantly regarding international travel with the exception of the social science field whose opinion differed from the humanities and LRC/counseling groups. The attitude of each of these four teaching groups differed significantly from all other teaching fields. Faculty opinion in the "other" teaching field differed significantly
### TABLE XXXIV

**LEAVES OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE TEN TEACHING FIELD GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (F = 2.91; Sig. = .002).*
from all groups except faculty from the health science/physical education group, whose attitude also was not significantly different from faculty in the mathematics/science and business fields.

The perceptions of faculty from the mathematics/science, business and technology fields did not differ significantly from each other regarding "International Exchange and Travel." The mathematics/science faculty opinion did not differ significantly from that of faculty in the "other" teaching field as well.

The highest mean of 12.70 for "International Faculty Exchange and Travel" was reported by those from the social science teaching field. The lowest mean of 11.04 was reported by the technology faculty. The highest standard deviation of 2.88 was reported by the mathematics/science faculty; the lowest standard deviation of 2.10 was reported by the developmental studies faculty. (See Table XXXV.)

The ANOVA test revealed significance at the .05 level for "Instructional Renewal Programs" (F = 3.08; significance = .001). This indicated that statistically significant differences of opinion existed among the teaching fields. These differences could not be attributed to chance at the .05 level, which simply means that the probability of differences being attributed to chance could occur in only five out of one hundred cases. A Newman-Keuls' test was conducted to compare the sum of score means in order to
TABLE XXXV

INTERNATIONAL FACULTY EXCHANGE AND TRAVEL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE TEN TEACHING FIELD GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>524</td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (F = 3.22, Sig. = .001).
determine which faculty opinions in specific teaching fields differed significantly from opinions in other teaching fields. The perception of faculty in the developmental studies and LRC/counseling fields did not differ significantly. The attitude of the LRC/counseling faculty also did not differ from faculty opinion in the communications teaching field. The communications faculty perception did, however, differ significantly from all other groups with the exception of faculty in the "other" teaching field. The faculty opinion in the "other" teaching field differed from all other groups.

The opinion of faculty in the social science, humanities, health science/physical education, mathematics/science and technology teaching fields did not differ significantly from one another. The attitude of each of these groups did differ significantly from faculty opinion in the developmental studies, LRC/counseling, communications, and the "other" teaching fields. The perception of faculty in the business field differed from that of faculty in all other teaching fields except the technology field.

"Instructional Renewal Programs" received the highest mean of 13.46 from developmental studies faculty. The lowest mean of 11.86 was reported by business faculty who also reported the highest standard deviation of 2.60. The lowest standard deviation of 1.38 was reported by those in the
"other" teaching field, but developmental studies also had a low standard deviation of 1.39. (See Table XXXVI.)

Significance at the .05 level was reported in the "Grants" category among the ten teaching fields (F = 3.36, significance = .001). This means the opinions of faculty differed significantly regarding leaves. A Newman-Keuls' test, which provides a statistical analysis procedure for post-hoc comparison among means, was conducted to determine between which teaching fields opinions differed. The attitude of communications faculty did not differ significantly from LRC/counseling faculty, but the opinion of these two groups differed significantly from that of all other teaching fields. The faculty perception in the humanities teaching field differed significantly from that of faculty in all other teaching fields. Faculty opinion in the "other" teaching field differed significantly from that of all other groups except for the social science and developmental studies teaching areas. The faculty attitude in the social science teaching field did not differ significantly from the views of mathematics/science, developmental studies and the "other" faculty. The mathematics/science, health science/physical education, and business faculty's opinions did not differ significantly from each other. The faculty opinion in health science/physical education did not differ significantly from that of developmental studies and social science faculty. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (F = 3.08; Sig. = .001).*
technology faculty opinion did not differ from that of business faculty, but did differ from all other teaching fields. The "Grants" category had four activities identified within it so the sum of score mean is much higher than reported in previous professional growth categories; this fact does not prevent a comparison of mean scores across ten teaching fields in this category. The highest mean of 18.35 was reported by faculty in the communications teaching field. The lowest mean of 16.32 was reported by faculty in the technology field. The highest standard deviation of 3.35 was reported by business faculty; the lowest standard deviation of 1.77 was reported by those identifying their teaching field as "other." (See Table XXXVII.)

Significance at the .05 level was reported in the "Rewards" category among the ten teaching fields (F = 2.19, significance = .002). This indicated that statistically significant differences of opinion existed among faculty which at the .05 level simply means that the probability of differences being attributed to chance could occur in only five out of one hundred cases. A Newman-Keuls' test was conducted to determine between which teaching field groups significance could be identified. Opinion of faculty in the developmental studies, LRC/counseling, and the "other" teaching fields did not significantly differ. However, the attitudes of faculty in the three teaching areas were significantly different from opinions in all other teaching
TABLE XXXVII

GRANTS OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE TEN TEACHING FIELD GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>519</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (F = 3.36; Sig. = .001).
fields. The faculty perception in the communications, health science/physical education, humanities, technology and social science teaching fields did not differ significantly from each other but did differ from the all other teaching fields. The opinion of faculty in the mathematics/science and business teaching fields did not differ significantly, but the two groups' attitudes differed significantly from faculty opinion in all other teaching fields. In the "Rewards" category the highest sum of score mean of 13.38 was reported by faculty in the developmental studies teaching field. The lowest mean of 11.75 was reported by the business faculty. The highest standard deviation of 3.29 was reported by faculty in the mathematics/science field; the lowest standard deviation of 1.90 was reported by faculty in the "other" teaching field. (See Table XXXVIII.)

No significance at the .05 level was reported in the "Miscellaneous" category (F = 1.81, significance = .062). This means the opinions of faculty in the ten teaching fields did not differ significantly regarding miscellaneous activities. This category has four activities identified within it; therefore, the sum of score means appear much higher than several of the other categories. This, however, does not prevent a comparison of sum of score means among ten teaching fields. The highest mean score of 17.15 in the "Miscellaneous" category was reported by those faculty in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (F = 2.19, Sig. = .022).*
"other" teaching field. The lowest sum of score mean of 15.64 was reported by faculty in the technology teaching field. The highest standard deviation of 3.42 was reported by business and mathematics/science faculty; the lowest standard deviation of 2.25 was reported by faculty in the "other" teaching field. (See Table XXXIX.)

Another segment of research question three made the following inquiry: Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among five different age categories? Age groups included thirty-five years and younger, thirty-six years through forty years, forty-one through forty-five years, forty-six through fifty years and fifty-one years or older. Fifty-five cases were reported in the thirty-five and younger group; 113 cases were reported in the thirty-six through forty group; 138 cases were reported in the forty-one through forty-five group; 112 cases were reported in the forty-six through fifty group; and 108 were reported in the fifty-one or older category. A multivariate analysis program was used to determine significance among the five age groups. Pillai's trace test indicated no significant difference of approval of the seven professional growth and renewal activities among the age groups. However, when additional one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to determine if any significance existed in any of the seven categories, significance was reported in the "Career
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten Teaching Fields</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC/Counseling</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Studies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Physical Education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Science</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = 1.82, Sig. = .062).
Development and Renewal" category among the age groups ($F = 3.28; significance = .011$). This indicated that differences of opinion existed among faculty in the five age groups. A Newman Keuls' test, which provides a statistical analysis procedure for comparing two means, identified which age groups had opinions significantly different from other age groups. In this category the sum of score mean of $11.09$ for those faculty in the fifty-one or older age group differed significantly in descending order from those in the thirty-six through forty age group, the forty-six through fifty age group and the thirty-five and younger group. The sum of score mean of $11.45$ reported by those faculty in the forty-one through forty-five age group differed significantly from those in the thirty-six through forty group, the forty-six through fifty category and the thirty-five and younger group. No significant differences of opinion were reported among the thirty-six through forty group, the forty-six through fifty group, and the thirty-five and younger group. The highest sum of score mean of $12.38$ was reported by the thirty-six through forty age group. The lowest sum of score mean was reported by the forty-one through forty-five age group. High standard deviations of $2.54$ and $2.53$ were reported respectively by the fifty and older age group and the forty-one through forty-five age group. (See Table XL.)
TABLE XL

CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FIVE AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or Older</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>525</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (F = 3.28; Sig. = .011).

No significance was reported in the "Leaves" category among the five age groups (F = 2.02, significance = .090). This means the opinion of faculty in all age groups did not differ significantly. The highest sum of score mean of 13.60 was reported by the forty-six through fifty age group, and the lowest sum of score mean of 12.69 was reported by those faculty fifty-one or older. The highest standard deviation of 2.55 was reported by the thirty-six through forty age group. The lowest standard deviation of 1.95 was reported among the forty-six through fifty age group. (See Table XLI.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or Older</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = 2.02; Sig. = .090).

No significance was reported in the "International Faculty Exchange and Travel" category by the five age groups (F = .11, significance = .980) This means that faculty opinion in the age groups did not differ significantly regarding international exchanges and travel. Any differences could be attributed to chance. The highest sum of score mean of 11.91 was reported by faculty in the thirty-five or younger and the thirty-six through forty categories; the lowest mean of 11.74 was reported by those in the forty-one through forty-five age group. However, there is little difference in the sum of score means among the five age groups. (See Table XLII.)
TABLE XLII

INTERNATIONAL FACULTY EXCHANGE AND TRAVEL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FIVE AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or Older</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = .11; Sig. = .980).

The highest standard deviation of 2.77 was reported by the thirty-six through forty age group; the lowest standard deviation of 2.23 was reported among the forty-six through fifty age group.

No significance was reported in the "Instructional Renewal" category among the five age groups (F = .50, significance = .736). This indicated that no statistically significant differences of opinion existed among the age groups regarding instructional renewal activities. The highest sum of score mean of 12.68 was reported by faculty in the forty-six through fifty age group, but a mean of 12.67
was reported by the thirty-six through forty group. The lowest sum of score mean of 12.34 was reported by faculty fifty-one or older, but little difference is evident in the sum of score means among the five age groups in the "Instructional Renewal" category. The highest residual of 2.36 was reported by the thirty-six though forty group; the lowest residual of 2.13 was reported by the forty-six through fifty group. (See Table XLIII.)

TABLE XLIII

INSTRUCTIONAL RENEWAL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FIVE AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or Older</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = .50; Sig. = .736).

No significance was reported in the "Grants" category among the five age groups (F = .56, significance = .692).
This means that faculty opinion in the various age groups did not differ significantly regarding grants. This category with four activities has what appears to be a much higher sum of score mean, but this is attributed to the additional activity in the category and will not prevent a comparison across the five age categories. The highest mean of 17.53 was reported by faculty in the forty-six through fifty age group; this group also reported the lowest standard deviation of 2.63. The lowest sum of score mean of 16.99 was reported by the fifty-one and older group. The highest standard deviation of 3.16 was reported by the thirty-six through forty age group. (See Table XLIV.)

**TABLE XLIV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or Older</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>519</td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = .56; Sig. = .692).
No significance was reported in the "Reward" category among the five age groups ($F = 1.30$, significance $= .267$). This indicated that no statistically significant differences of opinion existed among the faculty in the age groups. The highest sum of score mean of 13.00 in the category was reported by the thirty-five and under age group; the lowest mean of 12.24 was reported by the thirty-six through forty age group that also reported the highest standard deviation of 2.76. The lowest standard deviation of 2.29 was reported by the forty-six through fifty age group. (See Table XLV.)

### TABLE XLV

**REWARD AND RECOGNITION OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE FIVE AGE GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or Older</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>523</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups ($F = 1.30$; Sig. $= .267$).

No significance was reported in the "Miscellaneous" category among the five age groups ($F = 1.35$, significance
This means that faculty opinion in the age groups did not differ significantly. This category has four activities within it, so the sum of score means appear higher than several of the other categories. This, however, is not a problem for comparison of the sum of score means among the five age groups within this category. The highest sum of score mean of 16.94 in the "Miscellaneous" category was reported by those faculty in the forty-six through fifty age group. The lowest mean of 16.06 was reported by those fifty-one and older who also reported the highest standard deviation of 3.22. The lowest standard deviation of 2.80 was reported by faculty in the thirty-six through forty age group. (See Table XLVI.)

**TABLE XLVI**

MISCELLANEOUS OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE FIVE AGE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Younger</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 through 40</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 through 45</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 through 50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or Older</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups ($F = 1.35$; $\text{Sig.} = .250$).
One segment of research question three made the following inquiry: Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among five years-of-experience groups? The experience groups included three or fewer years, four through six, seven through nine, ten through fourteen, and fifteen or more. Forty-three cases or 8.2 per cent were reported in the three or fewer years-of-experience group; fifty-one cases or 9.7 per cent were reported in the four through six years of experience group; ninety-one cases or 17.3 per cent were reported in the seven through nine years-of-experience group. The largest numbers were reported among the groups with ten or more years of experience. One hundred seventy-eight cases or 33.8 per cent were reported in the group with ten through fourteen years of experience. One hundred sixty-three or 21.0 per cent were reported by the group with fifteen or more years of experience. A multi-variate analysis program, MANOVA, using the SPSS computer package was used to determine significance in the degree of approval of the seven categories of professional growth activities among the five years-of-experience groups. Pillai's trace test indicated significance among the years-of-experience groups. Additional one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to determine in which of the seven categories significance was reported. The number of cases, the sum of score means, standard deviations, and significance are reported in Table XLVII through Table LIII.
In the "Career Development and Renewal" category no significance was reported ($F = 2.19$, significance = .069). This means that faculty opinion in the years-of-experience groups did not differ significantly regarding career development and renewal. The highest sum of score mean of 12.72 was reported by faculty with three or fewer years of experience; this group also reported the lowest standard deviation of 1.97. The lowest sum of score mean was reported by the group with four through six years of experience. The highest standard deviation of 2.82 was reported by faculty with seven through nine years of experience. (See Table XLVII.)

TABLE XLVII

CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or Fewer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups ($F = 2.19$; Sig. = .069).
Significance at the .05 level was reported in the "Leave" category among the five years-of-experience groups (F = 2.95, significance = .020). This indicated that statistically significant differences of opinion existed among faculty in the different years-of-experience groups which at the .05 level simply means that the probability of differences being attributed to chance could occur in only five out of one hundred cases. A Newman-Keuls' test used to compare means was conducted to determine between which age groups differences existed. Faculty with fifteen or more years of experience and those with ten through fourteen years of experience reported the higher sum of score means; these groups' opinions did not differ significantly. However, the two groups' opinions did differ significantly from the other three groups with less experience: seven through nine; four through six and three or fewer. The opinion of the group with seven through nine years of experience differed significantly from the opinion of the group with four through six years of experience. The four through six years-of-experience group also differed from those with three or fewer years of experience. The highest sum of score mean of 13.60 in the "Leaves" category was reported by the group with ten through fourteen years of experience; this group also reported the lowest standard deviation of 1.88. The lowest sum of score mean of 12.40 was reported by the four through six years-of-experience
group. The highest standard deviation of 2.70 was reported by the group with fifteen or more years of experience. (See Table XLVIII.)

TABLE XLVIII

LEAVES OPINION CATEGORY OF THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or fewer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = 2.95; Sig. = .020).

No significance was reported in the "International Faculty Exchange and Travel" category among the five years-of-experience groups (F = 1.98, significance = .096). This means that faculty opinion regarding international exchange and travel did not differ significantly among the years-of-experience groups. In this category the highest sum of score mean of 12.09 was reported by the group with three or fewer years of experience who also reported the lowest
standard deviation of 2.20. The lowest mean of 10.96 was reported by the group with four through six years of experience. The highest standard deviation was reported by the group with ten through fourteen years of experience. (See Table IL.)

**TABLE IL**

INTERNATIONAL FACULTY EXCHANGE AND TRAVEL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or fewer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = 1.98; Sig. = .096).

No significance was reported in "Instructional Renewal" by the five years-of-experience groups (F = 1.53, significance = .194). This indicated that faculty opinion did not differ significantly among the years-of-experience groups. The highest sum of score mean of 12.79 in the
category was reported by the group with ten through fourteen years of experience. The lowest mean of 11.96 was reported by those with four through six years of experience. The highest standard deviation of 2.34 was reported by those with fifteen years of more experience. The lowest standard deviation of 2.05 was reported by the group with three or fewer years of experience. (See Table L.)

TABLE L

INSTRUCTIONAL RENEWAL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or fewer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = 1.53; Sig. = .194).

Significance at the .05 level was reported in the "Grants" category among the five years-of-experience groups (F = 3.02, significance = .018). This indicated that
statistically significant differences of opinion existed among faculty which at the .05 level simply means that the probability of these differences being attributed to chance could occur in only five out of one hundred cases. The Newman-Keuls' test was used to compare the means of the years-of-experience groups in order to determine between which groups differences existed. The sum of score mean of 16.10 reported by faculty with four through six years of experience differed significantly from all other age group opinions in the "Grants" category. The only other significant difference was reported between the faculty with seven through nine years of experience and those with ten through fourteen years of experience and three or fewer years of experience. The highest sum of score mean of 17.77 was reported by the group with three or fewer years of experience. The lowest sum of score mean was 16.10. The highest standard deviation of 3.24 was reported by the group with fifteen years or more of experience. The lowest standard deviation of 2.45 was reported by the those with ten through fourteen years of experience. (See Table LI.)
### TABLE LI

**GRANTS OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT.**
**NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or fewer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>519</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups ($F = 3.02; \text{Sig.} = .018$).

No significance was reported in the "Reward" category among the five years-of-experience groups ($F = 1.69$, significance = .151). This means the opinions of faculty in the years-of-experience groups did not differ significantly regarding rewards. The highest sum of score mean of 13.30 in this category was reported by the group with three or fewer years of experience who also reported the lowest standard deviation of 2.17. The lowest sum of score mean of 12.19 was reported by the group with seven through nine years of experience; this group also reported the highest standard deviation of 2.84 in the "Reward" category. (See Table LII.)
**TABLE LII**

REWARD AND RECOGNITION OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or fewer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = 1.69; Sig. = .151).

No significance in the "Miscellaneous" category was reported among the five years-of-experience groups (F = .72, significance = .577). This indicated that the opinions of faculty did not differ significantly regarding miscellaneous activities. The highest sum of score mean of 16.65 was reported by both the group with three or fewer years of experience and the group with ten through fourteen years of experience. The highest standard deviation of 3.23 was reported by the group with seven through nine years of experience; the lowest standard deviation of 2.55 was reported by the group with ten through fourteen years of experience. (See Table LIII.)
TABLE LIII
MISCELLANEOUS OPINION CATEGORY ONF THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience Groups</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or fewer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 through 9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 through 14</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = .72; Sig. = .577).

The final segment of research question three made the following inquiry: Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities among the seven campuses of the Dallas County Community College District? The seven campuses include Brookhaven, Cedar Valley, Eastfield, El Centro, Mountain View, North Lake and Richland. A multivariate analysis program, MANOVA, was used to determine significance in the degree of approval of the seven categories of professional growth activities among the seven campuses. Pillai's trace test indicated significance among the campus groups. Additional one-way analysis of variance tests were conducted to determine in which of the seven
categories significance was reported. The number of cases, the sum of score means, standard deviations, and significance are reported in Table LIV through Table LX.

Significance was reported in the "Career Development and Renewal" category among the seven campuses ($F = 3.10; significance = .005$). This indicated that statistically significant differences of opinion existed among faculty which at the .05 level simply means that the probability of differences being attributed to chance could occur in only five out of one hundred cases. A Newman-Keuls' test, which provides a statistical analysis procedure for post-hoc comparison among means, was conducted to determine which campuses had opinions significantly different from other campuses. Brookhaven faculty's opinion differed significantly from that of faculty at all other campuses. The El Centro faculty's attitude differed significantly from the faculty at North Lake, Eastfield, Mountain View, Cedar Valley and Brookhaven. The perception of Richland faculty in this category differed significantly from the faculty at North Lake, Eastfield, Mountain View and Cedar Valley. In addition to significant differences mentioned previously for North Lake faculty, this group's opinion differed significantly from the faculty at Cedar Valley. Eastfield faculty's attitude was not significantly different from the opinion of faculty from the North Lake, Mountain View and Cedar Valley campuses. Mountain View
faculty's perception differed from those faculty at the Richland, El Centro and Brookhaven campuses. Cedar Valley faculty's opinion was significantly different from the faculty at Brookhaven, El Centro, Richland, and North Lake.

The highest sum of score mean of 12.69 in the "Career Development and Renewal" category was reported by faculty at Brookhaven. The lowest sum of score mean of 11.11 was reported by Cedar Valley faculty who also reported the highest standard deviation of 2.75, which was also reported by the Eastfield faculty. The lowest standard deviation of 1.99 was reported by the El Centro faculty. (See Table LIV.)

TABLE LIV

CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE SEVEN CAMPUSES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>525</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups \( F = 3.10, \text{Sig.} = .005 \).
No significance was reported in the "Leave" category by faculty among the seven campuses \((F = 1.08, \text{ significance} = .378)\). This means that faculty opinion on the seven campuses did not differ significantly regarding leaves. The highest sum of score mean of 13.70 was reported by Brookhaven faculty; the lowest mean of 13.05 was reported by the faculty on the Eastfield campus. The highest standard deviation of 2.95 was reported by Mountain View faculty, and the lowest standard deviation of 1.82 was reported by Cedar Valley faculty. (See Table LV.)

**TABLE LV**

**LEAVES OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE SEVEN CAMPUSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups \((F = 1.08, \text{ Sig.} = .376)\).*
No significance at the .05 level was reported in the "International Faculty Exchange and Travel" category among the faculty on the seven campuses (F = 1.53, significance = .167). This indicated that faculty opinion did not differ significantly regarding international exchange and travel. The highest sum of score mean of 12.32 was reported by faculty at North Lake; the lowest sum of score mean of 11.23 was reported by Mountain View faculty. The lowest standard deviation of 2.28 was reported by Richland faculty; the highest standard deviation of 2.82 was reported by Eastfield faculty. (See Table LVI.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>. . .</strong></td>
<td><strong>. . .</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (F = 1.53, Sig. = .167).
No significance at the .05 level was reported in the "Instructional Renewal" category among the faculty on the seven campuses (\(F = .45, \text{significance} = .849\)). This means that faculty opinion on the seven campuses did not differ significantly regarding instructional renewal. The highest sum of score mean of 12.65 was reported by Richland and Brookhaven faculty; the lowest mean of 12.17 was reported by North Lake faculty. The highest standard deviation of 2.61 was reported by Eastfield faculty. The lowest standard deviation of 1.66 was reported by Cedar Valley faculty. (See Table LVII.)

**TABLE LVII**

**INSTRUCTIONAL RENEWAL OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE SEVEN CAMPUSES***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (\(F = .45, \text{Sig.} = .849\)).
No significance at the .05 level was reported in the "Grants" category among the seven campuses (\( F = 1.45 \), significance = .193). This indicated that faculty opinion on the seven campuses did not differ significantly regarding grants. The highest sum of score mean of 17.89 was reported by Brookhaven faculty; the lowest sum of score mean of 16.60 was reported by Eastfield faculty who also reported the highest standard deviation of 3.72. The lowest standard deviation was reported by Cedar Valley faculty. (See Table LVIII.)

**TABLE LVIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>519</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are no significant differences among these groups (\( F = 1.45 \), Sig. = .193).*
Significance at the .05 level was reported in the "Rewards" category among the seven campuses (F = 2.48, significance = .023). This indicated that statistically significant differences of opinion existed among faculty on the seven campuses which at the .05 level simply means that the probability of differences being attributed to chance could occur in only five out of one hundred cases. A Newman-Keuls' test was conducted to determine between which campuses opinions differed. El Centro faculty's sum of score mean of 13.04 in this category was the highest reported and differed significantly from the opinion score of faculty on all other campuses. Eastfield faculty reported the lowest sum of score mean of 11.57 which was significantly different from the scores on all other campuses in the category. The only other significant difference was reported between the Richland and Mountain View campuses. The highest standard deviation of 3.14 was attributed to the Eastfield faculty; the lowest standard deviation of 2.36 was reported by El Centro faculty. (See Table LIX.)
TABLE LIX

REWARD AND RECOGNITION OPINION CATEGORY ON THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE SEVEN CAMPUSES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>523</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
<td><strong>...</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (F = 2.48, Sig. = .023).

Significance at the .05 level was reported in the "Miscellaneous" category among the seven campuses (F = 2.20, significance = .042). This indicated that statistically significant differences of opinion existed among faculty which at the .05 level simply means that the probability of differences being attributed to chance could occur in only five out of one hundred cases. A Newman-Keuls' test was conducted to determine between which campuses opinions differed. Both the Brookhaven and El Centro faculty opinions differed from all other campuses' opinions. The Richland, North Lake and Cedar Valley faculty opinions did not differ
significantly from each other. Faculty opinion at Richland differed significantly from Mountain View and Eastfield campus opinion as well as Brookhaven and El Centro. North Lake and Cedar Valley faculty differed only from Brookhaven and El Centro faculty. Mountain View faculty opinion differed significantly from Brookhaven, El Centro and Richland faculty. Eastfield's faculty opinion did not differ significantly from opinion on the Mountain View, Cedar Valley and North Lake campuses.

The highest sum of score mean of 17.22 was attributed to the Brookhaven campus; the lowest mean score of 15.71 was reported by Eastfield faculty who also reported the highest standard deviation of 3.44. The lowest standard deviation of 2.33 was reported by the Cedar Valley faculty. (See Table LX.)

**TABLE LX**

**MISCELLANEOUS OPINION CATEGORY OF THE DCCCD SURVEY INSTRUMENT. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS, SUM OF SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR THE SEVEN CAMPUSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campuses</th>
<th>Number of Faculty in Each Group</th>
<th>Sum of Score Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>. . .</strong></td>
<td><strong>. . .</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are significant differences among these groups (\( F = 2.20, \text{Sig.} = .042 \)).*
Additional Information

Faculty members completing the survey were asked to suggest additional professional growth and renewal activities; 164 suggestions were made. These have been grouped into ten categories: travel and teacher exchange; work in related fields; leaves; flexible schedule; seminars, workshops and conferences; reward; additional study and research; sharing ideas; professional organizations; and a miscellaneous category. A complete list of these suggestions are in the appendices.

Interviews were conducted with faculty members from each of the seven campuses who had completed the DCCCD Survey. Faculty members were selected randomly using a table of random numbers. Faculty from the ten teaching fields identified on the instrument were interviewed.

Faculty interviewed were asked which professional growth and renewal activity supported by the Dallas County Community College District was most valuable for his or her own professional growth. A variety of responses were given but the sabbatical leave or the summer sabbatical was mentioned by three faculty. Two faculty members identified special projects as the activity most valuable for their own professional development. Other activities included an outstanding teaching award, recognition, Employee Development Fund (EDF), internship, international faculty exchange, College Consortium for International Study (CCIS),
instructional development grants, and division travel funds. The reasons given for selection of specific activities were as varied as the activities identified. The reasons given for identifying the sabbatical leave as the most valuable included the opportunity for change, a flexible schedule which allowed individual study, and a time for personal professional development. Those identifying reward and recognition activities as most valuable indicated that this activity was a way of "celebrating our good work." Those identifying the CCIS conference and international faculty exchange indicated such activities broadened their perspective regarding higher education and the international business world. The faculty who identified special projects and instructional development grants as most valuable indicated that these activities helped them develop instructional materials. EDF and division travel funds were valued because they provided opportunities for educational advancement. The internship was valued because it broadened faculty perspective and provided an opportunity to meet the district leaders.

Faculty interviewed were asked to identify the professional growth activity most valuable for the educational programs in the district. The instructional development grant was mentioned by more faculty than any other activity. Reasons given for selection of this activity were that it provided a systematic way to develop
course material, it enhanced learning in the classroom and it was rewarding for individuals. The sabbatical was identified as valuable for educational programs in the district because it gave faculty members an opportunity to prepare new courses and then return to the classroom renewed. Division travel funds were valued because of current information that can be gained when attending conferences. One faculty member said that travel funds are essential for professional development. The EDF grant was valued because it provided funds when division travel funds were not available; one faculty member stated that the funds were small but were easier to obtain than division travel funds. Other activities of value to educational programs in the district included in-district teacher exchange, internship, conference day and reward and recognition.

When faculty were asked their perception of the Dallas County Community College District's support of professional growth and renewal, most faculty were satisfied with the district's program. One faculty member believed that more professional growth activities were provided by the Dallas community college system than by any other system in the state. However, some faculty indicated that they were not encouraged to participate in professional growth activities. Another faculty member indicated that some activities are not humanistic and are simply an attempt to increase
productivity. One faculty member stated that professional growth will meet disaster if travel funds are eliminated.

Suggestions for improving professional growth in the system included providing more professional journals, and providing speakers for specific disciplines rather than information about learning behavior. Because funds are limited and faculty are staying, professional growth will become a greater challenge according to one faculty member who suggested in-house professional growth activities. One faculty member indicated that renewal is a responsibility that cannot be ignored and suggested that all supervisors make certain that personnel in their work group are renewed and recognized.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem of this study was to determine the extent to which faculty participate in and approve of existing professional development activities supported by the multi-campus community college district. The DCCCD Survey was used to gather data for this study. This instrument identifies professional growth and renewal activities which are grouped into seven categories. Those responding to the survey identified participation in the activities as well as their approval of them. Demographic information including age, years of experience in the multi-campus community college district and teaching field was also provided by respondents.

The population surveyed included all full-time faculty in the Dallas County Community College District. Seven hundred twelve survey instruments were distributed and 526 were completed and returned, approximately 74 per cent. For the statistical analysis, the population was grouped by teaching fields, age ranges, years of experience, and campus. Statistical procedures included a Chi-square test of goodness of fit to determine if significant differences existed between actual participation and expected
participation in professional growth activities. An analysis of variance was conducted to determine if significant differences of opinion existed regarding the multi-campus district's support of these activities. When significance was reported, the Newman-Keuls' test was conducted to determine between which groups opinions differed. The results of the statistical procedures are reported in Chapter IV. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings, draw conclusions and implications, and make recommendations.

Findings

Research Question 1. Are there differences in the number who participate in seven types of professional growth activities? The "Miscellaneous" category had the highest rate of participation with 505 faculty. Activities in this category included the Project Renewal Week with forty-four participants, district conference day with 458 participants, the wellness program with 295, and division travel funds with 427 participants. The high rate of participation in the district conference day is easily explained since attendance at this activity is required of faculty. The high number of participants in division travel funds is not unusual since instructional divisions have travel funds designated for out-of-county travel for faculty attending professional meetings. These funds are limited but the division allocation is based on the number of faculty in a
division. These funds, which are easily accessible for faculty, had the second highest number of participants. The district wellness program provides a variety of health-related activities; respondents who identified participation in this activity may have taken part in an exercise class or diagnostic tests paid for by the district. The fact that over 56 per cent of those completing the survey have participated in the district's wellness program is reflective of society's current interest in health. The Project Renewal Week, which was initiated in the summer of 1985, is a relatively new activity. The selection of participants for this activity is competitive, and faculty must pay their own transportation costs to this event as well as some additional costs. These conditions probably account for the lower number participating. It can be concluded that an activity with required attendance, for example the district conference day, has a higher rate of participation than activities for which faculty volunteer. It may also be concluded that division travel funds that are easily accessible for faculty have a higher rate of participation than activities which are not as accessible.

The second highest level of participation was reported in the "Reward" category. The activities within this area included recognition for years of service with 324 participants, outstanding teaching award with fifty-nine, and productivity awards with seventeen participants. The
years-of-service recognition is provided in a variety of ways. Faculty are sometimes simply recognized at a campus-wide meeting and their years of service announced. On one campus luncheons are held once a year to honor those faculty with ten or more years of service. The recognition for years of service is not competitive and the high number of participants is expected since over 50 per cent of faculty in this multi-campus district have ten or more years of experience. The other two activities are competitive and only a limited number of outstanding teaching awards and productivity awards are given each year. It can be concluded that those activities which are competitive and limited will have fewer participants than activities that are not.

The "Instructional Renewal Programs" category ranked third in the number of participants with 320. The activities in this category included instructional renewal grants with 199 participants, the in-district teacher exchange program with twenty-four participants and special teaching formats with 192 faculty participating. Instructional development funds are available for faculty who wish to prepare special materials for classes. Although faculty compete for these grants, some of the awards are for small amounts of funds and so many faculty can participate. Participation in special teaching formats is growing as honors programs are expanded and faculty are encouraged to
teach interdisciplinary courses. The in-district faculty exchange program is not as popular as other instructional renewal programs. This may be because this activity requires a move to another campus. Such exchanges must also be approved by the home campus division chair as well as the supervisor on the receiving campus. Because the arrangement does not require an even exchange between two faculty members, arranging a schedule for a faculty member wishing to teach for a semester or a year on another campus may be difficult. It can be concluded that those activities with fewer details to be handled will have a higher rate of participation.

The "Grants" category ranked fourth in the number of participants with 277. Activities in this area included an employee development fund (EDF) for professional travel with 233 participants, a president's mini-grant which may also be used for professional travel with 123 faculty participating, grants from an outside agency with seventy participants, and renewal program grants for faculty with fifteen or more years of experience with twenty-nine participants. The high rate of participation in the EDF grant indicates that faculty do travel to professional meetings; these funds are often used to supplement division travel funds on some campuses to defray the rising cost of travel to professional conferences. The mini-grant funds are more limited and have a lower rate of participation, but they are used for the
same purpose. Grants from outside agencies are limited but seventy faculty members had participated in such grants. The Renewal Program Grant, available only to faculty with fifteen or more years of service to the district, has been in existence for a short time and therefore has not been used as extensively.

One hundred ten faculty in this study indicated participation in the district's Career Development and Renewal Program. The program consists of three different types of activities: internships with fifty-five participants; understudies with twenty-nine participants; and special projects with fifty-five faculty indicating participation. The internship involves a move from one position to another within the district; this often involves a move from a faculty position to an administrative position for a limited period of time. The internship arrangement is used to give faculty members an opportunity to work as an administrator in order to gain a broader perspective of the district's operation and also to give them experience in an administrative position. Interns have been used for a limited time to replace administrators who have resigned. The special project activity had the same number of participants as the internship program. The special projects are often completed in a short period of time and cover some topic of special interest to the faculty member and of some benefit to the district. Because this activity has flexibility, more
faculty can participate. The understudy activity has been used less by faculty; this may be because it is often an added responsibility to a full teaching load. Faculty may work with an administrator for one day a week or a few hours each week, but such an arrangement is difficult for faculty who are teaching five classes. The Career Development and Renewal Program is of interest to some faculty, but because it is not as closely related to teaching as several other professional growth activities, faculty do not participate as extensively.

The "Leaves" category had eighty-nine participants. The types of leaves identified in this category included sabbatical leaves with forty-three participants, the mini-sabbatical leave with nineteen participants and the developmental leave with thirty-seven faculty indicating participation. Both the regular sabbatical and the mini-sabbatical leaves are granted on a competitive basis with a maximum of seven regular sabbaticals granted each year. The mini-sabbatical which is for six weeks in the summer is also competitive and has been in existence for a few years. Developmental leaves must be for some activity that enhances a faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher and are granted without pay. It can be concluded that activities that are limited and competitive will have fewer participants; it can probably also be concluded that leaves without pay have only a limited appeal to faculty.
"International Faculty Exchange and Travel" had the lowest number of participants with eighty-one. The activities included international faculty exchanges with ten participants, College Consortium for International Study (CCIS) with fifty-eight participants and a tripartite conference with eighteen participants. An international faculty exchange is often arranged through an organization such as the Fulbright Foundation and requires a match between a teacher in the district and a teacher in a foreign country; the exchange is usually for one semester or one year. Because of the length of time involved and the difficulties of matching faculty with appropriate educational and professional backgrounds, this activity has limited appeal. The CCIS activity is very competitive and conferences often cover topics that are not of general interest to all faculty. Participants are also expected to pay a portion of the expenses to attend. The tripartite conference has been in existence for only three years and participation is competitive; only two or three candidates are selected from each campus. It can be concluded that because of the competitiveness, the time commitment and the cost, faculty participation in international activities is more limited than in other professional growth activities.

To summarize participation in professional growth and renewal activities, the highest rate of participation was reported in the "Miscellaneous" category and the activity
with the greatest participation in this area was the
district conference day, which requires faculty attendance.
Another area receiving high participation was the "Reward"
category with the faculty recognition activity having the
highest number of participants. This activity is not
competitive and not limited. Other categories with high
participation included "Instructional Renewal Programs" and
"Grants." The more competitive activities have fewer
participants.

Research Question 2. Are there significant differences
in the number who participate in the seven types of
professional growth and renewal activities A. Among ten
teaching areas? B. Among five chronological age groups? C.
Among five years-of-service groups? and D. Among seven
campuses in the multi-campus community college district?

A Chi-square test of goodness of fit was conducted to
determine if significant differences existed between
expected participation and observed participation in the
seven categories of activities among the different groups.

When respondents to the survey were grouped by teaching
area, a significant difference at the .05 level was reported
in the "International Faculty Exchange and Travel" category.
Six of the teaching fields reported fewer participants than
expected: communications, developmental studies, health
science/physical education, humanities, technology and
"other." The faculty in the social science field reported a
much higher number of participants, twenty-three, than the expected number of 8.59. The CCIS activity within the international category had the greatest participation. It may be concluded that more opportunities for international teacher exchange and travel are available to social science faculty.

Significance at the .05 level was reported among the ten teaching fields in instructional renewal programs. Faculty in the communications, social science and developmental studies fields reported a much higher number of participants than expected. The technology field had only twenty-two participants and 32.20 expected. The business and "other" teaching fields had more than five fewer participants than expected. Instructional renewal grants and special teaching formats had the highest number of participants. Perhaps the instructional renewal programs supported by the district are not as appropriate for the technology and business fields as for several other teaching fields.

When respondents were grouped by chronological age, only the "Reward" category had a significant difference between the expected and observed number of participants. The two younger groups, thirty-five and younger and thirty-six through forty, each reported less participation than expected. The fifty-one or older group reported a higher rate of participation, which is to be expected since
respondents were asked to identify their participation in
the activity any time they were employed by the district.
The activity in this category with the highest number of
participants was years-of-service recognition with 324. As
faculty in this district get older, chances are greater they
will be rewarded or recognized for years of service.

When respondents were grouped by years of experience,
significance was reported in the following categories:
"Leaves," "International Faculty Exchange and Travel,"
"Instructional Renewal Programs," and "Reward." The three
groups with the fewest years of experience had a much lower
rate of participation in leaves. The groups with ten
through fourteen and fifteen or more years of experience
had a much higher rate of participation. Two of the three
leaves within the category require at least seven years of
experience before a candidate is eligible. It can be
concluded that faculty with the required years of experience
will be those granted leaves.

Faculty with fifteen or more years of experience
participated much more than expected in international
faculty exchange and travel. With the exception of faculty
with seven through nine years of experience, all other
groups participated less than expected.

Faculty with ten or more years of experience
participated in instructional renewal programs much more
than faculty with seven or fewer years of experience.
Faculty with ten through fourteen years of experience had nearly twenty-eight more participants than expected. Faculty with four through six years of experience had eleven fewer participants than expected.

The "Reward" category had a high level of significance; the three or fewer years-of-experience group reporting only one participant. The four through six and seven through nine experience groups also reported fewer participants than expected. Faculty with ten or more years of experience participated much more than expected. It can be concluded that more experienced faculty have been rewarded more.

When respondents to the DCCCD Survey were grouped by campus, no significant differences between expected participation and observed participation were reported. It can be concluded that participation in seven categories of professional growth and renewal does not differ significantly among the seven campuses.

Research Question 3. Are there significant differences in the degree of approval of the seven types of professional growth and renewal activities A. Among ten teaching fields; B. Among five age groups; C. Among five years-of-experience groups; and D. Among seven campuses?

The sum of score mean and standard deviations were determined for each type of professional growth activity. An analysis of variance test was then conducted to determine if significant differences of opinions could be identified.
among respondents when they were grouped according to teaching field, age, years of experience and campus. A Newman-Keuls' test was conducted to determine between which specific groups opinions differed.

When respondents were grouped by teaching fields, significant differences of opinion were reported in six of the seven professional growth categories; only in the miscellaneous area did faculty opinion not differ significantly. In the "Career Development and Renewal" category the Learning Resource Center/counseling faculty had the highest mean score (12.94) which indicated strong approval as well as a much higher number of participants. Greater participation by this group may account for the higher opinion of this activity. The communications (11.95), social science (11.64), and humanities (11.93) faculty's degree of approval of this activity was similar. The opinions of mathematics/science (11.26), technology (11.26) and business (11.33) faculty were similar with sum of score means that indicated approval of the activity, but not as strong a degree of approval as all other teaching areas.

Opinion regarding leaves also differed significantly among the ten teaching fields. Developmental studies faculty reported the strongest degree of approval (13.85) of this activity, and their opinion was similar to that of LRC/counseling (13.68) and communications (13.76) faculty.
The business (12.45) and technology (12.21) faculty opinion was similar; their mean scores were the lowest reported among the teaching fields. Differences of opinion about leaves are evident among faculty in the teaching fields, but all opinions appeared in the approve to strongly approve range.

Faculty opinion of international teacher exchanges and travel also differed significantly. Social science teachers had the highest opinion (12.70) of this type of activity as well as the highest number of participants. This group's opinion was similar to that of faculty in the communications (12.46) and developmental studies (12.42) fields. The groups reporting the lowest degree of approval were technology (11.04), business (11.12) and mathematics/science (11.24) whose opinions were similar and were in the range between neither disapprove nor approve and approve. Again, it can be concluded that significant differences of opinion exist regarding international faculty exchange and travel, but that groups generally approve of the activity.

Faculty opinion among the ten teaching fields also differed significantly regarding instructional renewal programs. The highest sum of score mean (13.46) was reported by developmental studies faculty whose opinion was not significantly different from LRC/counseling instructors (13.28). The opinion of communications (12.97) and "other" (12.80) teaching faculty were also similar. The opinions of
faculty in social science (12.41), humanities (12.33),
health science/physical education (12.26),
mathematics/science (12.22), and technology (12.06) did not
differ significantly. The opinion of business faculty who
reported the lowest mean score (11.86) differed
significantly from all groups except technology. The
opinion of faculty regarding instructional renewal programs
fell in the approve to strongly approve range. It can be
concluded that opinion regarding instructional renewal
differs significantly among teaching areas, but that faculty
do approve of the activity.

The opinion of respondents in the study differed
significantly regarding the district's support of grants. The highest opinion was held by instructors in
communications (18.35) whose attitude was similar to that of
LRC/counseling (18.26) faculty. The opinion of faculty in
social science (17.27), mathematics/science (16.91),
developmental studies (17.04) and "other" (17.43) teaching
fields was not significantly different. The opinions of
technology (16.32) and business (16.63) faculty were the
lowest reported and were similar. All groups, however,
approved with varying degrees of the district's support of
grants.

Faculty opinion of rewards supported by the district
differed significantly among teaching fields. The highest
degree of approval was reported by developmental studies
instructors (13.38) whose opinion was not significantly different from faculty in LRC/counseling (13.03) and the "other" (13.33) teaching field. Opinions of communications (12.56), health science/physical education (12.45), humanities (12.40), technology (12.36) and social science (12.30) faculty were not significantly different. The mathematics/science (11.80) and business (11.75) faculty reported the lowest degree of approval of rewards, but all faculty approved of the district's support of rewards.

No significant difference of opinion was reported in the "Miscellaneous" category by faculty in the ten teaching fields. In summarizing the opinions of faculty in the teaching fields regarding professional growth and renewal activities supported by the district, faculty in the technology area reported the lowest sum of score mean in five of the seven areas of professional growth and renewal. The lowest means in "Instructional Renewal" and "Rewards" categories were reported by business faculty. Developmental studies faculty had the highest mean score in the "Leave," "Instructional Renewal" and "Reward" categories. In other categories the top mean score was reported by LRC/counseling, social science, communications and "other" faculty. All group opinions fell in the approve to strongly approve range, however.

When faculty were grouped by age, significant differences of opinion were reported only in the "Career
Development and Renewal" category. The forty-one through forty-five (11.45) and fifty-one and older (11.59) groups reported the lowest degree of approval of this area. Both of these groups had numbers of participants above those expected. All faculty, however, approved of the district's support of career development activities. Those groups who participated at a higher rate than expected in this activity had a lower opinion of the activity.

When faculty were grouped by years of experience, significant differences of opinion were reported in the "Leaves" and "Grants" categories. The highest sum of score means for leaves were reported by faculty with ten through fourteen years of experience (13.60) and fifteen or more years of experience (13.15). These two groups' opinions were similar but differed significantly from the other three groups with less experience. The group with four through six years of experience reported the lowest degree of approval (12.40) of leaves and their opinion differed significantly from all other groups. All groups, however, approved of the district's support of leaves.

Faculty with four through six years of experience reported the lowest degree of approval (16.10) of the district's support of grants; this group's opinion differed significantly from all other groups. Faculty opinion of those with seven through nine years of experience (17.17) differed significantly from the opinion of those with ten
through fourteen (17.65) and three and fewer years of experience (17.77). The opinion of faculty with ten through fourteen (17.65) and fifteen or more (17.39) years of experience was not significantly different from faculty with three or fewer years of experience (17.77).

When faculty were grouped by campus, significant differences of opinion were reported in the "Career Development and Renewal" category, the "Reward" category and the "Miscellaneous" area. Faculty on the Brookhaven campus reported the highest degree of approval (12.69) of career development; their opinion was significantly different from faculty on all other campuses. Eastfield (11.43), North Lake (11.65) and Mountain View (11.33) faculty opinion did not differ significantly. Richland (12.04) and El Centro (12.22) faculty opinion was similar. Cedar Valley's opinion (11.11) was not significantly different from Eastfield and Mountain View faculty. Although there were significant differences of opinion regarding the district's support of this activity, all faculty approved.

In the "Reward" category the highest sum of score mean (13.04) was reported by El Centro faculty; their opinion differed significantly from all other faculty in the district. Eastfield's faculty opinion (11.57) of rewards differed significantly from all other faculty and was the lowest reported. The only other significant difference of opinion was reported between Richland (12.58) and Mountain.
View (12.10) faculty, but all campus groups approved of the district's support of this activity.

In the "Miscellaneous" category Richland (16.47), Cedar Valley (16.08) and North Lake (16.13) faculty reported similar degrees of approval. Brookhaven faculty, who reported the highest degree of approval (17.22), differed significantly from faculty on all other campuses. El Centro faculty reported the second highest degree of approval (16.86), and their opinion also differed from all other faculty opinion. Eastfield (15.71) and Mountain View (15.98) faculty who reported the lowest degree of approval did not differ significantly. All faculty approved of the district's support of miscellaneous activities.

In summarizing campus opinions of professional growth and renewal activities, Brookhaven reported the highest sum of score means in four of the seven categories and shared the highest score with Richland in a fifth category, "Instructional Renewal." The highest mean for international activities was reported by North Lake faculty; the highest score for rewards came from El Centro faculty. Eastfield reported the lowest sum of score means in the grants, rewards and miscellaneous areas. Mountain View reported the lowest scores in the leaves and international categories. Cedar Valley reported the lowest score in the career development area; North Lake reported the lowest sum of score mean in instructional renewal programs.
Conclusions

1. An activity with required attendance had a higher rate of participation than activities for which faculty volunteer.

2. Activities with fewer details to be handled will have a higher rate of participation.

3. Activities that are limited and competitive will have fewer participants.

4. Faculty participation in international activities is more limited because of the competitiveness, the time commitment and the cost.

5. More opportunities for international teacher exchange and travel are available to social science faculty.

6. Faculty with the required years of experience will be those granted leaves.

7. More experienced faculty have been rewarded more.

8. Faculty in different teaching fields have significant differences of opinion regarding professional growth and renewal activities.

9. Professional growth activities provided by the Dallas County Community College District are not as appropriate for technology faculty as for those in other teaching fields.

10. More experienced faculty value leaves more.
Implications

The faculty responding to the DCCCD Survey indicated high participation in those professional growth and renewal activities which were not competitive and less participation in categories with activities for which faculty had to compete, for example, grants, leaves and international teacher exchange and travel. Only 110 faculty had been a part of the career development and renewal activities. Participants in this activity are often administrators and staff members, but several faculty indicated in interviews that they were not informed about the career development program. It may be implied that faculty do not have sufficient information about this activity. The category with the highest number of participants was the miscellaneous area; the specific activity with the highest number of participants was the district conference day to which faculty attendance is required. This activity had the lowest degree of approval score of all activities. It may be implied that faculty do not value activities which are mandated. Faculty responding made the following suggestions regarding the district conference day, "Change District day to an in-service day." Another faculty member stated, "Less 'hoopla' at conference day, more conferring about teaching."

When respondents were grouped by teaching field, age, years of experience and campus, significant differences between expected and observed participation were reported in
the following areas: international faculty exchange and travel, instructional renewal, reward, and leaves. Because social science faculty and faculty with fifteen or more years of experience participated in international faculty exchange at a much higher rate than expected, it may be implied that the international conferences supported by the district may have a limited focus. Support for this implication was provided by a respondent who requested, "A CCIS type conference with topics for faculty in fields other than social sciences, business, and communications."

Another respondent stated (We) "need an international faculty exchange program that includes technology instructors."

In the "Instructional Renewal" category communications, social science and developmental studies had a higher number of participants than expected, but the technology field had a much lower number of participants than expected and also reported the lowest degree of approval of this activity among all teaching fields. It may be implied that the district is not providing instructional renewal activities appropriate for faculty in technology. Twelve survey respondents suggested that those in the technology and business teaching fields have an opportunity to work in industry or business for a limited time and attend seminars sponsored by industry. One faculty suggested, "Tech/Occ instructors should be actively encouraged to maintain
outside activities in their specialities, including limited
release time." As one respondent stated, "I've worked in
business for ten years. In the business world employees are
trained on the company time at no extra cost to keep
employees productive and updated. Education is the only
'business' that does not routinely re-train workers . . ."
Faculty with ten through fourteen years of experience
participated in instructional renewal programs much more
than expected. The implication being that as more district
faculty have taught for ten years the number of participants
in instructional renewal programs will rise.

Faculty with fifteen or more years of experience had
been granted leaves at a higher rate than expected. This
implies that as more faculty gain experience in this multi-
campus district, there will be a greater demand for leaves.
This is supported by suggestions from respondents on the
survey who stated, "More mini-sabbaticals," "Sabbatical
leave that is non-competitive and that need not be tied to
district goals," "a true sabbatical program," and
"sabbatical leaves should be easier to obtain."

In the "Reward" category faculty with ten or more years
of service and those forty-one and older had been rewarded
at a higher rate than expected. Those faculty with fewer
years of experience and forty years or younger had
participated at a much lower rate. This implies that
faculty must teach for several years before they can expect
much reward for their work. Perhaps the Dallas County Community College District should reward faculty with less experience; as one respondent suggested, "Many new faculty are simply new to this district and have had outstanding careers in other places. Diversification deserves reward!"

When faculty identified their degree of approval or disapproval of the district's support of professional growth and renewal, the respondents approved of all seven categories of activities. Perhaps this positive opinion is because of the wide range of activities; although not all faculty participate in all activities, they do approve of the district's support. In this study, there were, however, significant differences of opinion when faculty were grouped by teaching field, age, years of experience and campus. Faculty opinion in the ten teaching areas differed regarding six of the seven categories of professional growth activities. The lowest degree of approval was reported by technology in five of the seven categories and by business in the other two areas which may imply that the types of activities provided by the district are not appropriate for faculty in technology or business. Suggestions from business and technology faculty members also recommend that the district provide opportunities for them to return to industry or to attend seminars provided by business and industry. The highest mean scores among the ten teaching fields were reported by developmental studies faculty in
three of the seven categories. Other high scores were attributed to LRC/counseling for career development, communications for the leaves, social science for international activities, and the "other" teaching area for miscellaneous activities. Perhaps the LRC/counseling faculty with fewer teaching responsibilities see career development as a viable option for them whereas other faculty with more teaching duties do not. Communications faculty, who commit much time to out-of-class grading, perhaps value the leave as a means of renewal. Social science faculty value international activities which are appropriate to this teaching field. Opinion regarding the "Career Development and Renewal" category differed significantly when faculty were grouped by age and campus. The mean scores for the individual activities within this category ranked in the lowest quarter of scores, also. This may imply that career development and renewal as it is now structured is not appropriate for most faculty. Perhaps this indicates that faculty are uninformed about the career program.

When faculty were grouped by campus, significant differences of opinion were reported in the "Reward" and "Miscellaneous" categories. Eastfield faculty reported the lowest sum of score means in each of the two areas. Brookhaven had the highest score in the miscellaneous area; El Centro had the highest score in the "Reward" category.
Brookhaven reported the highest score in five of the seven categories of professional growth and renewal activities. Perhaps Brookhaven faculty are more informed about professional growth activities and are encouraged to participate in such opportunities. Eastfield faculty reported the lowest sum of score mean in three of the seven categories, which may imply that they are not as informed about such activities or are not encouraged to participate.

When faculty were grouped by years of experience, differences of opinion were reported in the "Leaves" and "Grants" categories. Faculty with ten or more years of experience reported higher scores than those with fewer years. It may be implied that after ten years of service in the same district, faculty wish to have a leave. This is supported by several suggestions made in the survey which asked that such leaves be easier to obtain and that more be granted. Faculty with three or fewer years of experience reported the highest degree of approval of grants followed by those with ten through fourteen years of experience. Perhaps faculty who are relatively inexperienced feel the need for assistance which a grant could provide; faculty with ten years of experience may feel the need for grants which could provide support for renewal activities.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings, the following are recommendations for implementation:
1. The Dallas County Community College District should continue to provide a wide variety of professional growth and renewal activities for faculty.

2. The Career Development and Renewal program should be expanded to include activities that are appropriate to faculty and should be better publicized.

3. District conference day should be restructured to allow faculty from the various teaching disciplines an opportunity to meet together to discuss concerns and common issues.

4. Continued efforts should be made to provide additional professional growth and renewal activities for faculty in the Dallas County Community College District.

5. Leaves should continue to be provided with more short-term leaves available for all faculty, but particularly in the fields of technology and business where instructors need to update their skills by working in industry for a specified period of time.

6. International faculty exchanges and travel opportunities should be provided for faculty in all teaching fields.

7. Instructional renewal opportunities should be expanded so that faculty in all teaching areas may have opportunities to participate in activities appropriate to their respective fields.
8. An effort should be made to reward and recognize faculty with ten or fewer years of experience.

9. Opportunities for grants should be provided for faculty in all teaching areas.

10. Every effort should be made to provide division travel funds for faculty.

11. All community colleges should evaluate their professional growth and renewal programs.

The following are recommendations for research:

1. Additional research should be done to determine professional growth and renewal activities valued by administrators and non-contractual employees in the Dallas County Community College District.

2. Further study should be conducted in specific areas of professional growth to determine if these activities influence the effectiveness of faculty.

3. Further study should be conducted with faculty in the technology field in order to identify appropriate professional growth activities for this group.
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PERMISSION MEMOS
Date: July 12, 1985

To: Steve Mittelstet

From: Mary Osentowski

Subject: District-Wide Study of Faculty Renewal Activities

I am requesting permission to survey full-time faculty members on all campuses in the District in order to determine the faculty's degree of satisfaction with professional growth and renewal activities provided by or supported by the Dallas County Community College District. The study will also give faculty the opportunity to suggest additional growth or renewal activities the District may offer. I may also interview a small sample of the faculty members who respond to my survey.

The study's data will be shared with the District and will provide the following benefits: it will present data which identifies faculty's degree of satisfaction with professional growth and renewal activities; it will identify the degree of participation in these activities; the study will identify activities which are most valued by the faculty; it will identify additional activities the faculty would like the District to offer; and it will inform faculty of the wide range of professional growth and renewal activities available to them.

The survey will be conducted in the fall semester of 1985 as a part of a dissertation I am writing for my doctoral work at North Texas State University.

Thank you for your attention to this request. If you have a question or wish to make suggestions regarding this study, please call me.

Attachment
The Executive Cabinet has approved your request to conduct a study involving all full-time faculty members in the DCCCD. The following four suggestions were made for your consideration:

1) Give a brief explanation of each activity to ensure that faculty remember the name of some activities in which they participated.
2) Move the instructions regarding participation to the top of the survey.
3) Do not limit the participation question to the past two years.
4) Include development of instructional television materials. Several of those who have worked on these projects have indicated it has been a very rewarding professional growth activity.

If you make any substantive changes in the research design or the method of collecting data, it will be necessary for you to request approval of those changes from the Executive Cabinet.

Best wishes in conducting your study and in completing your doctoral work.

cc: Executive Cabinet
    Director of Planning,
    Research and Evaluation
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FACULTY MEMOS
Professional growth and renewal is an important part of any individual's personal and professional life but particularly for us in higher education at this time. As a part of my doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University, I am conducting a study of professional growth and renewal activities that are supported by the Dallas County Community College District. The attached survey is being distributed to all full-time faculty in the DCCCD. You are asked to:

A. Check those activities you have participated in
B. Identify your approval or disapproval of the District's support of the twenty-five activities
C. Suggest any additional professional growth activities

Completing the survey should take no longer than fifteen minutes. If you have questions or need further information, I will be happy to talk to you. Your participation in this activity is voluntary, but it is an opportunity to make suggestions; your response will help me complete my study.

Please return the survey through inter-campus mail within seven days to:

Mary Osentowski
Communications Division
Richland College

Thank you for your cooperation in completing this survey.
MEMORANDUM
THE DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS

TO: DCCCD Faculty
FROM: Jack Stone
DATE: March 25, 1986
SUBJECT: Professional Growth and Renewal Study by Mary Osentowski

Attached is a survey instrument which is being administered to all DCCCD full-time faculty. It asks you to indicate your participation in and your opinion of the District's support of selected professional growth and renewal activities. The survey also asks you to suggest additional professional growth activities the District should provide in the future. The survey is a part of a dissertation study by Mary Osentowski, Communications Division Chair at Richland College and doctoral candidate at North Texas State University.

The study, approved by the Executive Cabinet, will be beneficial as we continue to provide those activities that are appropriate for faculty's professional growth and renewal. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey instrument and return it to Mary Osentowski as she has directed.

js
attachment
You received a survey instrument from me a few weeks ago, but I have not yet received a response from you. Therefore, I am enclosing a second instrument which should take you approximately ten minutes to complete. I know you are busy preparing finals and grading papers, but I really do need your survey in order to complete the study.

This study will identify faculty members' participation in and approval of professional growth and renewal activities supported by the DCCCD. I selected the topic for the study because of my sincere interest in professional growth for faculty members. My fourteen years in the District as a faculty member and division chair have convinced me of the importance of professional growth and renewal.

Thank you for completing the survey. Please return the survey instrument to me within five days:

Mary Osentowski
Communications Division
Richland College
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DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND RENEWAL ACTIVITIES

SURVEY

[1] Identify Your Teaching Area

1. ___ Business
2. ___ Communications
3. ___ Counseling/LRC
4. ___ Developmental Studies
5. ___ Health Science/P.E.
6. ___ Humanities/Fine Arts
7. ___ Math/Sciences
8. ___ Social Sciences
9. ___ Technology
10. ___ Other (Please Specify)

[2-3] Identify Years of Service in the District

[4-5] Identify Your Age

PLEASE COMPLETE ALL PORTIONS OF THIS SURVEY. YOUR RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL.

Please check (✓) those activities in which you have participated at any time during your years of employment in the DCCCD.

Check only those activities of actual participation, not those for which you applied but did not actually participate.

1. Internship: Work in a different job for a period of time
2. Understudy: Work with a mentor as an understudy
3. Special Project: Work with a mentor on a project of interest
4. Sabbatical Leave: A semester or a year leave with pay
5. Mini-Sabbatical Leave: A summer leave with pay
6. Developmental Leave: A leave without pay
7. International Faculty Exchange: Fulbright, Colombian Exchange

8. College Consortium for International Study (CCIS): Conference in Europe on topics of international interest


10. Instructional Development Grant: Funds for special teaching materials

11. In-District Teacher Exchange Program: Assignment on another DCCCD campus for a semester or a year

12. Special Teaching Format: Team-teaching, interdisciplinary courses, honors courses

13. Employee Development Grant (EDF): Travel funds for meetings

14. President's Mini-Grant: Funds for professional activities

15. Grant from an Outside Agency: Funds for various purposes

16. Renewal Program Grant: Funds for professional growth for faculty with 15 years of service to the DCCCD

17. Outstanding Teaching Award: Campus winner of this award

18. Productivity Award: Campus winner for a cost-efficient project

19. Years of Service Recognition: Campus or District recognition for years of service to the DCCCD

20. Project Renewal Week in New Mexico: a week retreat for staff

21. District Conference Day: District-wide meeting to discuss issues facing higher education

22. District Wellness Program: Exercise programs, health profile, tests provided by DCCCD

23. Division Travel Funds: Funds provided for professional meetings

24. Other campus-wide Professional Growth Activities:

(Please Identify)

25. Other Division Professional Growth Activities:

(Please Identify)
The DCCCD supports the following professional growth and renewal activities.

Please circle the number that most closely identifies your approval or disapproval of the DCCCD's support for the selected activities listed. Please respond to all activities.

The following scale will be used in this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disapprove</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Neither Approve Nor Disapprove</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Approve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Development and Renewal Program

1. Internship
   1  2  3  4  5
2. Understudy
   1  2  3  4  5
3. Special Project
   1  2  3  4  5

Leaves

4. Sabbatical Leave
   1  2  3  4  5
5. Mini-Sabbatical Leave
   1  2  3  4  5
6. Developmental Leave
   1  2  3  4  5

International Faculty Exchange and Travel

7. International Faculty Exchange Program
   1  2  3  4  5
8. College Consortium for International Study (CCIS)
   1  2  3  4  5
9. Tripartite Conference
   1  2  3  4  5

Instructional Renewal Programs

10. Instructional Development Grant
    1  2  3  4  5
11. In-District Faculty Exchange
    1  2  3  4  5
12. Participation in Special Teaching Format
    1  2  3  4  5
Grants

13. Employee Development Fund (EDF) 1 2 3 4 5
14. President's Mini-Grant 1 2 3 4 5
15. Grant from Outside Agency 1 2 3 4 5
16. Renewal Program Grant for Employees with fifteen years of service 1 2 3 4 5

Reward and Recognition

17. Outstanding Teaching Award 1 2 3 4 5
18. Productivity Award 1 2 3 4 5
19. Years of Service Recognition 1 2 3 4 5

Miscellaneous Activities

20. Project Renewal Week/New Mexico 1 2 3 4 5
21. District Conference Day 1 2 3 4 5
22. District Wellness Program 1 2 3 4 5
23. Division Travel Funds 1 2 3 4 5
24. Other Campus-wide Professional Growth and Renewal Activity 1 2 3 4 5
   (Please Identify)
25. Other Division Professional Growth and Renewal Activity 1 2 3 4 5
   (Please Identify)

Please recommend any additional professional growth and renewal activities for DCCCD faculty members:

1. 
2.
3.

PLEASE RETURN TO MARY OSENTOWSKI, COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION, RICHLAND COLLEGE.
THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY. ALL RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL.
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OTHER PROFESSIONAL GROWTH ACTIVITIES

PARTICIPATED IN BY FACULTY
OTHER PROFESSIONAL GROWTH ACTIVITIES
PARTICIPATED IN BY FACULTY

Discipline Workshops and Conferences
Technology Workshops
Developmental Studies Conference
LRC meetings
Counseling Professional Day
Division Workshops
CEU Credit Approved Workshop for LRC (3)
Readymen Series (Communications Division at Richland)
LRC Staff Development Program
Counseling Staff Development
Communications Staff Development
Composition Workshop
Common Learning for the Humanities
Physical Education Meetings
Music Workshops
Auto-Tech Workshops
Developmental Writings Workshops
ESL Workshops
Counselor's Training for State License Requirements

Grants
N.E.H. Grant (2)
Grant for Planetarium Play
Technical/Occupational Grant for Renewal
Grant for Research in Program Effectiveness
Grant to Develop Criminal Justice Courses
Business and International Education Grant

Committees
Writing Across the Curriculum (7)
Word Processing Task Force
Professional Development Committee
Common Learning Committee
"Here's To Your Health" Committee
Sophomore Literature Committee
District Committees (3)
Curriculum Revision Committee
Professional Experience Committee
S.A.C.
Workshops (10)
  Myers-Briggs Type Indicator
  Interdisciplinary Approach to Teaching
  Stress Management
  Writing Consultant Workshop
  Presenter of Workshop on Business Writing
  Interpersonal Communication Workshop
  CPR
  Student Behavior Workshop
  Computer Workshops (14)
  Sensitivity Groups/Maxi-Rap

Individual Professional Growth Activities
  Self-study projects
  Graduate Courses
  Courses within Division
  Research Projects
  Update Training
  Publications
  Personal Travel Projects
  Professional Growth Courses
  Book Reviews

Community Activities
  Talented and Gifted Program for Community
  Employment in Industry (2)
  Career Development Day at Area High School (2)
  University Interscholastic League (2)
  Seminar for High School English Teachers
  Issues Facing the "80s"
  Dallas Journalism Day
  On-Location Business Visits (2)
  "Jog-In"
  All American High School Journalism Workshop
  Coordinate Sport Meets and Clinics
  UTA CLACTIP Program

Retreats (8)
  Division (17)
  Planning Retreats (4)
  Teaching Excellence Retreat (10)
  College-Wide Retreat
  Inter-Divisional Retreat
  President’s Council Retreat

Fine Arts Activities
  College Theatre Production (2)
  Art Juries
  Art Exhibits
  Musical Performances
  Arranging Guest Conductors for Music Groups
Conferences and Conventions
National Cable Television Association Convention
ACTG Conference
President's Council on Physical Fitness and Health Conference
Co-Op International Conference
T.A.S.C. Convention
Common Learning Conference
Dyslexia Society Convention
State and National Conventions
Hosted Professional Association of Diving Instructors Conference
Travel at Own Expense to Conferences

Membership in Professional Organization
Faculty Association
President of District Faculty Association

Teaching Activities
Teaching Field Courses
Project Horizon: Semester in Rome
Computer Assisted Instruction
Prepared Telecourse (3)
Teaching a Class in Another Division
D.I.S.D. Co-op Teaching with Selected Minority Students
Self-Paced Individualized Instruction in Office Careers
Curriculum Revision
Syllabus Writing

Seminars
Cross-Cultural Communications
Health Seminars
Conducting Seminars for Employees
Area Network Seminar
Handicapped Students
Financial Planning Seminar
Brown Bag Seminar (7)
Orientation for New Equipment
Personnel Service and Benefits for Employees

Speakers
Political Speakers
Authorities in Teaching Field
Guest Consultants from IBM
U.T.A. Speakers
C.U.N.Y. Speakers
Guest Speaker at Student In-service Day
Miscellaneous
Editor of Literary Magazine
Contribute to Scholarships and EDF
Innovator of the Year (4)
I.A.P.s
President’s Movable Feast
Uncommittee (6)
Food for Thought Luncheons (2)
Part-time Supervision
Acting Division Chair
Budget Development
Informal Sharing of Ideas and Experiences
Professional Growth and Staff Development Meetings (13)
Taking Students to Europe
AAMFT Supervision
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SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND RENEWAL ACTIVITIES
SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND RENEWAL ACTIVITIES

Travel and Teacher Exchange

More availability for travel to conferences which help keep health occupation faculty up-to-date

Colleges should pay expenses for at least one conference that the person wants to attend. I'm tired of having to pay for them out of my pocket.

I strongly recommend that travel to conferences be totally funded by the school. The result would be travel enjoyed by the majority of the faculty as opposed to the "wealthy" minority.

Due to the budget cuts for 86-87, we do not have travel funds for the division. I recommend that the district examine divisional travel funds.

Year by year the funds have dwindled until the amount is only a token with faculty members being expected to bear the major portion of the expense.

Enough travel funds for experienced faculty (over ten years) to attend a major conference each year.

Travel is exceptionally important to experience and share with others.

Foreign travel is and will be even more important to understand the world we live in today and tomorrow.

On our campus various monies for travel, etc., are awarded strictly as a "perk" for longevity, not on a merit basis, this is wrong.

Greater emphasis on travel funds for attending professional conferences in individual content areas.

We should have more opportunity to travel to other college districts to visit similar programs (those of us with program responsibility). Overall opportunity is too limited due to extremely low travel funds. Where can you go with $80?
We have not had sufficient funds for travel in our division lately. It's important to be able to attend conferences in our disciplines.

More art studio faculty exchanges with other countries which would benefit all the District's colleges, not just one of the colleges.

Art faculty groups should go to major cities, NYC, LA, Chicago, to visit art museums, art galleries.

We need more money to travel to conferences but only when we make a presentation at the conference.

Credit for educational travel on salary scale.

More initiative on the part of the college district for foreign faculty exchange.

More opportunities for faculty exchanges out-of-state or to Canada.

Include more disciplines in semester abroad programs besides history, English, and humanities; they are not the only ones with potential foreign connections.

Need an international faculty exchange program that includes technology instructors. Also, semester courses overseas that include technology.

Increase travel funds available at Division level.

A faculty exchange program with Ealing College would be a welcome addition.

Work in Related Field

Provision for Health Occupation faculty to return to clinical area for update in summers.

Include participation in the Business Professional Institute as a professional development activity.

TEA—Technical, Occupation funds to work in an industry job to renew skills for teaching area. I've worked in business for ten years. In the business world employees are trained on the company time at no extra cost to keep employees productive and updated. Education is the only "business" that does not routinely re-train workers to keep them up to date in innovative teaching skills and new learning theories. We need to continue to be on the "cutting edge" in our profession.
Work in appropriate setting in business and industry.

Time (release time) or special opportunity to take advantage of working in industry situations, or special training classes for technical-occupational teachers.

Technical-Occupational instructors should be actively encouraged to maintain outside activity in their specialities, including limited release time.

Allowing a faculty member to renew himself in his teaching field by working in industry. Salary paid in part by the host company and part by the District, i.e., for the three month summer session.

Leaves

A time bank for sabbatical leave. Perhaps a semester or a year early retirement for the DCCCD Piper Award Winners (district-wide) should they so choose.

Sabbatical leaves should be easier to obtain.

I sometimes question the basis for granting funds and/or leave, this year's mini-sabbatical, for example.

I have some feelings about mini-sabbaticals and sabbaticals: I DO NOT believe that just because there are 7 applications that 7 should be granted. We should grant on merit of the proposal.

More sabbatical leaves for artist-teachers to do more ART work in their studios.

I think sabbaticals should be restructured to reflect renewal/burn out activities.

Sabbatical leave that is non-competitive and that need not be tied to district goals. Sometimes just sleeping for four and one half months may be the best form of renewal.

Paid leave for instructors (with seniority) who wish to write a textbook, not just I.D. Grants, but a full semester off if the instructor is writing a major text for publication.

More mini-sabbaticals!

(I) would like to see a larger number of mini-sabbatical leaves available.
Some sort of way to encourage writing and research. More means of allowing for blocks of time for special projects.

Let faculty with 10 years or more of service earn a semester off or accept a 3/5 contract by teaching 6 courses or 3/5 of an annual load in the fall. This person would not teach either spring or summer, but would be paid at 3/5 of full pay for the year.

Flexible Work Schedule

Allowing Fridays off if you’ve put in your 30 hours a week. I believe in merit raises.

I would appreciate more flexibility in work schedule so instructor could take classes at a University during the day. How about allowing an instructor to teach 12 hours in the summer in exchange for spring or fall off.

Required rotation of faculty by campus after 7-10 years tenure.

More activities such as Gil King’s field trip (for faculty) to the site of the 10,000 year old burial near Leander, Texas---very educational, very enjoyable. Such as Susanne Starling’s slide lecture presentation of a week with the sesquicentennial wagon train. Group (faculty, etc.) campouts at Big Thicket or Caddo Grasslands with Biology instructors.

Taking courses on campus as part of work load or using the one and one half hour time slot like we do for wellness.

TIME to attend seminars at GM, Ford, Chrysler, training centers.

Opportunity to be off campus for two weeks for seminars/travel in October/April. Opportunities to visit in other classes--our colleges or other colleges. A semester off for full pay to study, to improve courses, to travel, to observe.

Released time (e.g. 20%) for special projects or study.

Possible release time for short term projects in the community?

An opportunity for a college professional to serve on loan to an area business. This would be as a service to the community and should be as release time. On some monthly schedule for a semester or a year the District would loan an expert to a local business to engage in the individuals professional training to help the local business.
Reduced teaching loads for publication projects. Grants for publication projects (research and writing).

Reading, research, publication grants for 2/5 release time a semester for faculty with at least seven years service and record of professional activities (presentations, publications, service to professional organizations).

Work outside of teaching discipline.

More opportunity to have faculty in our classrooms for just one lecture or a week--guest lectures

DCCCD approved one-day retreats for any interested division once a year, for a renewal project (not merely meetings). Some divisions have had such experiences but our division has been discouraged to have such experiences. We work in a high-stress environment and one day away, for purposes of renewal, would do much for professional staff morale.

Release time from teaching to cross-train.

Retreats for divisions (by campus).

Retreats on a regular basis with a format somewhat similar to Excellence retreat.

More liberal guidelines for release time. Fewer institutional service demands--less meaningless paper shuffling and "Innovative Busy Work."

Greater flexibility in faculty scheduling--suspend mandatory 5 day per week attendance.

I appreciate the District and College's support of "release time" to do special projects such as common learning team chair, writing across the curriculum, etc.

Allowing faculty to audit other instructor's courses throughout the day during their "free" time.

Shorter renewal activities like the New Mexico Retreat but for a 3-day period or weekend.

Have District loan instructors to the community.

Release time granted for surveying metroplex needs in order to upgrade various tech/occupational programs to produce students who can get entry level jobs.
A "dead" hour for faculty interchange which has virtually died because we are all so busy.

3/4 to full time release time for service as officers of state-wide and national professional organizations.

Abolish "extra service contracts" and replace with full-time equivalent funding or release time for special projects.

Release time for faculty to do special projects of value and interest.

Seminars, Workshops, and Conferences

ESL workshops to help faculty teach ESL students. District sponsored summer institutes for graduate credit.

Professional writing seminars. Seminars on research and development.

In-service workshops for technical programs.

Methods workshops on campus. Technical seminars on campus.

On-campus seminars to train full time and part time faculty for the teaching of Common Learning Curriculum.

More discipline area workshops. Support for re-training and inspiration from professionals in "academic" areas.

Workshops in professional field (Specific not general).

Bring scholars to the colleges for annual series of lectures on varied academic subjects/topics.

Seminars on improving the college success rate for minorities since the minorities will be the majority in Texas in 15 years.

A more receptive attitude to attend seminars that last over 3 days in length—especially if the participants (faculty) pick up part of the expense.

Student prepared and presented workshops on teaching excellence from their point of view.

TEA workshops. Interdisciplinary workshops.

Seminars on WHAT is available.
More frequent workshops within the District to share information and ideas among faculty on different campuses. More of us should be dragged—even if kicking and screaming into 1980's technology and (be taught) how to teach critical thinking and learning activities within disciplines.

Less "hoopla" at Conference Day, more conferring about teaching.

National conference on teaching excellence and conference of administrators.

A CCIS type conference with topics for faculty in fields other than Social Science, Business, and Communications.

Change District Conference Day to an in-service day.

During District Conference Day, I would like to omit "general" meetings and meet all day with faculty in my discipline in a format similar to the one for Common Learning (Perhaps with a guest speaker).

Computer software seminars

Reward

"Perks" for faculty of five or less years. Most enrichment activities reward faculty of more than five (in some cases ten) years! Many new faculty are simply new to this district and have had outstanding careers in other places. Diversification deserves reward!

The awards and employee of the month is not necessary. It is not professional.

I think the district should look with approval--not reward, but merely recognize as good--even rather obtruse study, say of old verse, that keeps the instructor alive as intellectual beings.

Identify instructors that are interested in advancement, then make them aware of the steps required to move up.

Include ALL faculty and interested staff as participants when honoring Richland writer's. It might encourage more to participate and do their own in the future.

I quarrel with the way monies/awards recipients are selected. In some areas professional growth activities outside the academic area are the most beneficial and should be credited.
Recognition for professional growth activities that occur off-campus in the community or state wide.

Outstanding teaching award is too subjective. Logic suggests that each division nominate a different person each year; therefore, even a poor teacher can be nominated. Some divisions are small and the same person gets nominated more than once. Awkward. We need to manage this better.

(We) need more recognition of faculty besides Piper Professor Award.

Recognition of individual renewal programs as well as all this "groupy-fluff."

Encouragement and recognition of faculty who are active in their fields beyond teaching (as Richland already does). Use of release-time as reward for growth and renewal activities--rather than just grants and extra-service.

Outstanding teaching award selections need to be determined in a different manner.

Additional Study and Research

Graduate level credit courses in ESL strategies taught on campus.

The chance to take a course during the regular daytime hours of the college. . . . the time, of course, to be made up.

Funds (grants, scholarships, loans) for graduate level courses.

Tuition for graduate classes, not for degree purposes.

Grants or reimbursement for courses and seminars taken, not just academic or graduate courses, but those developing hobbies into retirement interests. (After all, the average age of DCCCD faculty is rising!)

Financial and personal support for graduate work at universities.

I would like the to see the District lend greater support to assisting instructors in soft areas where there is potential for lay-off. Retrain to shore up areas where there is a need for faculty.

New roles for faculty and counselors, i. e., for example process counselors. New and innovative teaching methods and strategies. We need to be retrained by our District.
Course work at major university at expense of faculty member.

On-campus graduate classes.

District could pay tuition for post doctoral course work.

Would be nice if District would pick up the cost of some of our Continuing Education classes for TSCPA.

Fund additional course in and outside of an instructor's major field.

Manufacturer's schools.

Additional course work especially in the summer could be done such as geology of the Great Barrier Reef or biology of the Galapagos Islands. . . maybe on a 50% cost born by the District and 50% born by the individual or 100% born by the District if the cost is less than $1000.

Tuition support and release time for cross-training.

Faculty should be allowed to audit credit and community service courses.

District should encourage research.

Support scholarly research and publication by helping with cost of typing manuscripts.

Sharing Ideas

I wish we did more sharing by area discipline throughout the District.

Small groups that meet for the purpose of sharing teaching ideas and problems, course content, etc. I believe it is more connected to what we do than most other activities and could certainly improve teaching/learning processes.

More opportunity to share ideas and techniques informally with faculty from other divisions.

Faculty idea sharing for teaching.

Risk taking with administrative, faculty, and staff support even if it does not succeed.

Activities uniting faculty from various universities and community colleges in the Dallas area by discipline.
District picnic, District tours, District sport function!

Reading groups composed of faculty and administrators across the District.

Book discussion groups.

A central faculty lounge with music, T.V./VCR, and a snack bar, which might prove stimulating for sharing ideas and "bull-sessions."

In-District Teacher exchanges (Teaching Modules of one-four weeks).

Guest instructors, not outside speakers. Conferences for exchanging ideas for classroom teaching.

Please have practitioners (teachers) in model programs discuss how and why their programs work (they should have evidence that they do work).

I think meetings of technical area instructors from like disciplines once a semester would help coordinate and keep course alike.

Discipline faculty should meet each semester.

Professional Organizations

Participation in Faculty Association to learn the complexities of District Operations, political awareness ... 60% of the budget is supplied by the state. People need to understand the political dynamics of state government.

Allow the faculty at the Job Training Center to participate in the Faculty Association.

Faculty Association for JTC instructors.

Opportunity for JTC contractual employees to join Faculty Association.

To allow J.T.C. faculty to join the Faculty Association.

Funds for appropriate professional society memberships.

Promote professional development through outside (professional) interaction.
Participation and service in professional societies

Miscellaneous

Create our own in-house travel agency and use the complimentary tickets as rewards for WHATEVER.

If the "Reading Room" (Nancy Armes' project) has worked at the district level, it might be interesting to try it at the campus level. ...Having a few places on campus where one could find solitude might contribute to renewal.

We have a wonderful staff development program at Richland due to Steve's commitment.

The DCCCD supports many of these activities in name only, or gives very little true support. I recommend that more attention be given to existing opportunities in the way of "support."

There are several listed above that I know nothing about. Some effort by District to publicize these would be helpful.

All of us (perhaps) need to support our district fine arts programs (music/arts/theatre) in a special way,...with a special coordinated day!

Since most of these activities are geared towards educators and benefit the district I have never applied or participated. Sabbatical leaves that are (seem to be) granted to people who do something to further or enhance the district (or appear to) not further or enhance an individual in a specific field.

Make us more aware of the opportunities. I didn't know about several of these programs. ...Make renewal/growth opportunities (available) for program instructors at the Job Training Center.

All internships that I have seen were administrative; why not internships for faculty in other subject areas?

I support faculty renewal programs. They are necessary and beneficial to the instructor and his/her students.

Continue to refine present program.

I have yet to see anything productive from the district's involvement in the "League For Innovation" or any of the similar "clubs." Whatever it costs is a waste!
More support activities for Job Training Center. Technical occupational areas do not offer activities.

I believe the "New Mexico Vacations" represents unwise use of scarce dollars. (What would the Dallas Morning News or the Legislature think about these expenditures?) I do not believe sending teachers to European conferences is the best use of scarce dollars.

It would be helpful to have a mentoring system. I would like to participate in an internship, or special project, or understudy, but I need some help.

Anyone wishing to advance in teaching techniques or in subject area competency will find the DCCCD education environment satisfying and enjoyable. There are enough opportunities and choices of direction to satisfy almost anyone.

Give mental health day as well as sick days.

Continuation of participation with DISD in use of fitness centers; only CVC and Eastfield participate now.

Aerobics classes.

Continue development of wellness program.

Change sick leave to health days—“An ounce of prevention.”
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