

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Building Community and Capacity: Institutionalized Faculty Development in Community Colleges

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/06p452d8>

Author

Krug, Jessica

Publication Date

2018

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Building Community and Capacity: Institutionalized Faculty Development in Community
Colleges

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Jessica Marion Michele Krug

2018

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Building Community and Capacity: Institutionalized Faculty Development in Community
Colleges

by

Jessica Marion Michele Krug

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2018

Professor Robert A. Rhoads, Chair

Based on the presumptions that faculty are critical to student success and that faculty in the community college sector are largely underprepared to serve the diversity of students they encounter, this study sought to examine how community colleges create and sustain their faculty development programs. The faculty development programs selected for this study have high participation of faculty across disciplines, including both adjunct and full-time faculty, and are permanent fixtures on their campuses instead of relying on grant funding or other temporary sources of funding that could eventually be phased out. Further, institutions in this study are improving student outcomes across their campuses, particularly of low-income students and students of color. Utilizing a multi-case study design based on semi-structured interviews, document analysis and observations of public spaces, this study looked holistically and in-depth at institutionalized faculty development programs at three community colleges across the

country: Bradley Community College, Pomelo College and High Hill College, all pseudonyms. Some critical findings of this study include the nature of leadership that facilitated institutionalizing these programs, the role of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) at each site, and the centrality of pedagogy. At all three sites, faculty and administrative leaders converged to create their faculty development programs. Critical administrative leaders in charge of faculty development began as faculty members, and they helped shepherd their respective programs to institutionalization as they moved into administration. Further, the CTLs at all three sites act as nexus points between authentic faculty needs and institutional priorities. All strategic initiatives are executed with the support of the CTLs; they are the facilitators of change. While each CTL still uses various grants from state, federal, local and foundation sources, the CTL staff and spaces have been institutionalized. Finally, all faculty development activities start with good instruction; whether the topic is high-impact practices, equity, guided pathways or global learning, the CTL focus is on what those ideas look like (or should look like) in a classroom. All three sites in this study are willing to invest in supports for the faculty, both adjunct and full-time, to help them become better instructors.

The dissertation of Jessica Marion Michele Krug is approved.

Kathryn M. Anderson

Mark Kevin Eagan

Cecilia Rios-Aguilar

Linda P. Rose

Robert A. Rhoads, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2018

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this manuscript to the memory of my father, Dr. Richard J. Wingell, professor of musicology. He was a knowledgeable scholar, generous colleague, and gifted teacher. He was never officially recognized for his teaching skill by the academy, though he was beloved by his students. I hope my research contributes to the growing body of work that posits that quality teaching in higher education matters. I still miss you every day, Dad.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION ii

DEDICATION v

TABLE OF CONTENTS vi

LIST OF TABLES viii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ix

VITA x

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION..... 1

 Statement of the Problem..... 1

 Background..... 2

 The Role of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education 5

 Statement of the Project..... 7

 Research Questions..... 7

 Research Design..... 8

 Project Significance 10

CHAPTER 2: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE..... 11

 Overview of the Development of Community Colleges..... 12

 The Role of the Community College in the California Master Plan..... 13

 The Evolution of Faculty Development in Community Colleges 16

 Challenges Community Colleges Face Implementing Faculty Development 26

 Effective Faculty Development Practices 29

 Linking Faculty Development and Improved Student Outcomes..... 34

 Conceptual Framework..... 38

CHAPTER 3: THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY..... 45

 Research Questions..... 45

 Research Design and Rationale 46

 Strategies of Inquiry..... 47

 Data Analysis 55

 Ethical Considerations 56

 Credibility and Trustworthiness..... 57

 Summary 58

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS 59

 Case Study 1: Bradley Community College 61

 Case Study 2: Pomelo College..... 81

 Case Study 3: High Hill College..... 103

 Cross-Case Analysis..... 124

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	131
Discussion of Major Findings	132
Limitations	139
Recommendations	142
Reflection	145
 APPENDIX A INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS	 148
 APPENDIX B STUDY INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS	 151
 APPENDIX C RECRUITMENT COMMUNICATION	 154
 REFERENCES	 155

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Alignment of Research Question and Data Collection Methods and Sources	51
Table 2. Bradley Administrator Titles and Pseudonyms	63
Table 3. Pomelo Administrator Titles and Pseudonyms	84
Table 4. High Hill Administrator Titles and Pseudonyms	106

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my contacts and now friends, the faculty development directors at my research sites. You were so generous with your time and knowledge, and I learned so much from you beyond what is shared in this manuscript that informs my work at my own institution. You made this project possible and fun.

I would also like to thank Mark and Jessica and my cousins Britt, Gautam, Tenn and Smith for housing me when they could while I was on the East Coast, and to Linda for housing me here out West. Your hospitality means so much to me, and spending time with you was a welcome respite from the grind of interviews, commuting, and writing.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to my committee. First, I'd like to thank my chair, Dr. Rhoads—your overall guidance and line-by-line editing were extremely helpful. Dr. Rose helped me from the inception of this idea to its fruition—the continuity of your support means a lot to me. Drs. Eagan, Anderson-Levitt and Rios-Aguilar each uniquely contributed to my project and my growth as a scholar and a researcher. Thank you all for your support and encouragement.

And finally, I must thank my family for tolerating my love for this project and sharing me with UCLA for the last three years. Paul, you've taken one for the team so many times, and always with a smile. Your love for me and for us is evident every single day. Sam and Allie, you have *mostly* understood that this project is important to me, and you have been some of my greatest cheerleaders. You both inspire me with your work ethic (you always do your homework right after school without prompting; if only I were so diligent!) and I am buoyed by your confidence in me. You three are my world—I love you.

VITA

1993	B. A. English Emphasis: American Studies magna cum laude University of California, Los Angeles
1996-2001	English teacher Santa Monica High School
1997	M. Ed. Cultural Linguistic Acquisition Development (CLAD) credential Professional Clear English credential University of California, Los Angeles
2001-2003	Secondary Support Provider Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District
2004-present	Associate Professor, English Santa Monica College
2011-present	Educational Consultant TeachingLearningSolutions (TLS)
2014-2016	Facilitator, The Art of Reflective Teaching Faculty Summer Institute Santa Monica College

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In 2012-2013, community colleges served about 11 million students, which was 44% of the U. S. college population. While 81.4% of first-time students intend to transfer to a 4-year university to earn at least a bachelor's degree, only 11.6% of them do so within 6 years (The Century Foundation, 2013). In the 6 years between 1995 and 2001, only 36% of first-time community college students attained a credential of some kind (certificate, associate's degree, or bachelor's degree,) and 17.5% of first-time students were still enrolled—an over 60% non-completion rate (Goldrick-Rab, 2010).

College completion has not been on the top of the higher education agenda, as most Americans are more concerned with issues of access and cost than of success (Doyle, 2010; Zumeta, 2011). Since the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, many more students have had access to college across all socioeconomic groups, but there remains a persistent gap between low- and high-income students in college enrollment, though it is shrinking. However, the gap in college completion rates between low-income students and higher-income students is actually *increasing* (Putnam, 2015; Scott-Clayton, 2015).

In addition to the equity gap between low-income and higher income students, there remains an equity gap in completion rates between students of color and white students. First, Latino and African-American college students are concentrated in community colleges (The Century Foundation, 2013), and in the state of California, 5-year completion rates for the cohort of community college students who entered in 2009-2010 was 47% of students overall, but only 35% of African-American students and 39.7% of Latino students, compared to 51.4% of white students (California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 2015.)

A college education, including a certificate or associate's degree from a community college, remains a critical lever into long-term middle-class earnings: a bachelor's degree confers an average 84% increase in lifetime earnings over a high school diploma, as well as greater probability of employment (Oreopolous & Petronijevic, 2013); an associate's degree confers an average 13% increase in earnings for men and a 22% increase in earnings for women over high school diplomas, as well as the additional benefits of reducing the likelihood of utilizing welfare and engaging with the criminal justice system, and increased lifetime health (Belfield & Bailey, 2011). Because of persistent, systemic social inequality, the issue of completion is particularly salient for low-income students and students of color (The Century Foundation, 2013; Goldrick-Rab, 2010).

Background

Several factors impede success for community college students: 19% of full-time and 42% of part-time students work 30 hours a week or more; 29% of full-time and 37% of part-time students care for dependents 11 hours a week or more; and 66% of all community college students enter needing developmental coursework (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2012). Community college students have diverse needs—academic, cultural, social and pragmatic—that demand flexibility and responsiveness from community college faculty.

But community college faculty, as a group, are not well prepared to meet current student needs because few have had formal preparation to teach. Historically, many community college faculty previously taught in K-12 schools, particularly high schools, but that is no longer the case (Amey, 1999; A. Cohen & Brawer, 2003); in one study, less than 16% of new community college faculty hires had K-12 experience (Gahn & Twombly, 2001). Instead, faculty learn how to teach by observing others (often as students themselves), through trial and error, and by reading in

areas of their interest (Eddy, 2010); faculty are also underprepared for the emphasis on teaching diverse learners they face in a community college setting (Murray, 2002). While many community colleges offer professional development opportunities to help support instructors, the popular choices of sabbaticals and conferences are not linked to improved classroom instruction (Goldrick-Rab, 2010; Maxwell & Kazlauskas, 1992; Murray, 2002). Professional development that focuses on the pedagogical practices in a discipline instead of just further development of discipline-specific knowledge is more likely to improve student outcomes (Perez, McShannon, & Hynes, 2012).

Indeed, professional development (commonly referred to as faculty development in higher education) is explicitly designated by the federal government as a tool to improve student success. Title III of the original Higher Education Act (HEA) is entitled “Strengthening Developing Institutions,” with specific language about needing to “strengthen the academic quality of developing institutions” and providing financial support to an institution that is “making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs” (Higher Education Act of 1965). In the reauthorization of the HEA, Section 513 of Title V provides “support of faculty exchanges, faculty development, faculty research, curriculum development and academic instruction” to enhance institutional quality (Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008), with a focus on Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs.) The overall goal of the HSI program is to support Latino/a, low-income, and other traditionally underrepresented students as they pursue their academic and career goals, and one of the fundamental uses of Title V grant funding is faculty development.

The whole idea of faculty development presumes that instructors and their teaching are critical to student success. In a study looking at college student data from the National Survey of

Student Engagement (NSSE) and the corresponding data from faculty at the same institutions, Umbach and Wawrzynski (2004) found that the educational context created by faculty has a dramatic effect on student learning and engagement. Particularly, high expectations of students and the use of active and collaborative learning strategies were correlated with student gains. In a report by the Aspen Institute (2013), community college faculty surveyed acknowledged their power to be agents of change for students. Finally, according to over 900 California community college students surveyed, faculty have the greatest impact on their educational trajectories (Cooper, Rodriguez-Kiino, Scharper, Karandjeff, Chaplot, & Schiorring, 2014).

Research in both the K-12 sector (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009) and higher education (Condon, Iverson, Manduca, Rutz, & Willett, 2016; Edwards, Sandoval, & McNamara, 2015; Perez et al., 2012) suggests that effective professional development is intensive, sustained and cohesive. Further, there is evidence to suggest that quality faculty development, as defined above, leads to improved student outcomes, including retention and performance (Condon et al., 2016; Elliott & Oliver, 2016; Perez et al., 2012). Condon et al. (2016) argue that there is a strong relationship between faculty learning and student learning, and they further posit that various faculty development efforts that coalesce lead to a productive culture of teaching and learning. The creation of a culture of growth for both faculty and students becomes a virtuous cycle: faculty invest further in their teaching and collaborate, and the faculty development activities then become a vehicle for changes in teaching practice that benefit students.

However, this kind of faculty development is in short supply in many community colleges. Institutions tend to have minimal faculty involvement, and the instructors most in need of support are the least likely to participate (Murray, 2002). It's important to find out what

elements are necessary to build and sustain faculty development programs that have the potential to improve the quality of teaching and help to improve student outcomes.

The Role of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

While many community college instructors have not had much—if any—formal pedagogical training, there is significant research that outlines what “quality teaching” looks like for undergraduate college students. In a seminal piece based on research on college teaching and learning, Chickering and Gamson (1987) identify seven principles to guide undergraduate education: (a) encourage contact between students and faculty; (b) develop reciprocity and cooperation among students; (c) use active learning techniques; (d) give prompt feedback; (e) emphasize time on task; (f) communicate high expectations; and (g) respect diverse talents and ways of learning, which is key to working with community college students. In a later study, Bain (2004) looked specifically at what 63 outstanding¹ college professors do in their classrooms via interviews, classroom observations, and supporting documentation, and found that these instructors: know their subject well and helped their students construct meaning; make student learning objectives the foundation of their course curriculum; support student collaboration; give formative feedback to students to help move learning forward; respect and trust students; and are self-reflective.

Yet teaching methods in the community college do not match what is known about effective college teaching: 31% of community college faculty report that they spend 50-100% of class time lecturing, and 53% allocate less than 10% of class for small group activities.

¹ Bain (2004) found the subjects of his study through hundreds of interviews with students, conversations with professors about colleagues, lists of major teaching award winners in higher education, nominations from email discussion groups, and finally, suggestions from national and international conference attendees once the project about defining teaching excellence became well-known. Nominations were substantiated by student evaluations and student work, including subsequent student performance.

Additionally, 64% of community college students report that rote memorization of facts and ideas is relied upon *quite a bit* or *very much* in their current classes (Community College Survey of Student Engagement, 2008). There seems to be a disconnect between what practitioners know about effective college teaching practices and the implementation of these practices at the community college level.

There is some evidence to support that professors are willing to use pedagogy that supports student learning. In a qualitative study by Beyer, Taylor, and Gilmore (2013) at the University of Washington called the Growth in Faculty Teaching Study (GIFTS), the scholars found that professors at all levels—from new instructors to experienced, tenured faculty, across demographic groups and across disciplines—were constantly changing their teaching strategies and approaches. The researchers themselves were surprised by this finding, as it goes against the conventional wisdom that instructors, particularly tenured professors, have little incentive to change or improve classroom practice at a large research university. The second key finding of the survey is that instructors often made changes in response to the needs of their students, not from external sources. This finding suggests that faculty want to improve student outcomes in the classroom and are willing to adapt to meet student needs.

The challenge, then, is to harness the impetus to support students with the kind of pedagogy that moves students forward. Goldrick-Rab (2010) conducted a study, a meta-analysis of over 25 years of both qualitative and quantitative research that examined the ongoing problem of poor student outcomes in community colleges; she contends that we need to know more about how faculty affect student success and that “more evidence is needed on what kinds of professional development and support translate into more effective teaching practice” (p. 23).

This project attempts to begin to address that gap in the research by conducting empirical analyses of three community colleges and their faculty development programs.

Statement of the Project

This study investigated institutionalized faculty development programs in community colleges to find out how institutions initially created and continue to sustain those programs. The definition of *institutionalized* in this context includes high participation of faculty across disciplines, including both adjunct and full-time faculty, and institutions that have made their faculty development programs permanent fixtures on their campuses instead of relying on grant funding or other temporary sources of funding that could eventually be phased out. Further, institutions in this study were selected in part because they are improving student outcomes across their campuses, particularly for low-income students and students of color. The research focused on the following questions:

Research Questions

Overarching Research Question: How do community colleges create and sustain institutionalized faculty development programs?

- a. According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what financial conditions facilitate the creation of a faculty development program?
- b. According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what kind of relationship between administrators and faculty facilitate the creation of a faculty development program?
- c. According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what kind of campus culture facilitates the creation of a faculty development program?

- d. What do community colleges do to institutionalize² faculty development centers on their campuses?
- e. What is the role leadership at multiple levels of the institution plays in creating and sustaining institutionalized faculty development programs?

Research Design

Site and population. There were three criteria for site selection. The first criterion for sites for this study was community colleges that are closing achievement gaps and showing improvement in student outcomes. Because there is no standard measurement of student success data generated by community colleges nationally, I used the Aspen Institute criteria for its bi-annual Community College Excellence Award, which they measure using multiple forms of publicly available data; all research sites have been eligible for the award. The Aspen Institute criteria are: (a) retention, completion and transfer; (b) improvement in student performance across the campus over time; (c) employment in the local labor market after completion; and (d) equitable performance outcomes for low-income students, students of color, and other underrepresented and underserved groups (The Aspen Institute, 2013.) The second criterion for research sites for this project was community colleges with well-developed faculty development programs, including programs in place for at least 5 years, substantial faculty participation over time, and institutionalized faculty development centers. Finally, the three sites were selected for maximum variation, including size, labor relations (i.e., union versus right-to-work states,) and geographic diversity.

² In this context, institutionalization is the process of embedding a program or center into the college permanently. To be institutionalized, a center needs to be a line-item in the budget, have a specific permanent location on campus, be a part of the culture, and be included in the strategic plan of the college.

Because I am interested in how the role of leadership affects the development and implementation of faculty development programs, I interviewed the administrators in charge of faculty development at each site, which is approximately four people per site. Each faculty development center has a director who reports to a dean or assistant vice president, who may report to an associate vice president or someone holding a similar title and role, who reports to the president. I also spoke to faculty leaders who were instrumental in developing, implementing, and sustaining faculty development at their sites. Additionally, I interviewed campus faculty leaders who are *not* currently active in faculty development opportunities to validate or challenge what I learned from the administration and active faculty development leaders at each institution. Finally, I reviewed internal needs assessments, faculty development activity evaluations, and faculty development attendance patterns to get a sense of what different faculties say they need, what activities they choose to attend, and how valuable they find those activities.

Overview of research design. Because the overarching research question driving this study is a *how* question, implying understanding a process, a qualitative study was the best fit. Because the unit of analysis is a bounded system—the evolution of a program within a community college—this study used comparative case studies, looking holistically at the development and continuation of individual programs, and then utilized cross-case analysis to find commonalities across the cases (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Because this study utilized multiple sources of data to triangulate findings and used the research sub-questions based on my theoretical propositions to guide the data collection and analysis, case study was the most appropriate method (Yin, 2014).

I used semi-structured interviews, document analysis and observations of public spaces to create holistic organizational portraits of each institution. The interviews with leadership involved in faculty development helped me trace the lifecycle of the programs, as well as revealed how different administrators and faculty leaders affected development and implementation of programs. I interviewed faculty leaders who are not actively involved in faculty development to get an outside perspective, as well as reviewed relevant documents to triangulate and validate the initial leadership interview data. This triangulation of data also adds credibility to my study. After creating individual case studies, I used my theoretical propositions as codes for cross-case analysis to find similarities across all three cases. Because I used a multi-case design, my findings should be more compelling and more robust (Yin, 2014).

Project Significance

Because I conducted case studies of three specific institutions, there are limitations to the generalizability of this study. However, any insight into how community colleges have engaged faculty in their own growth and development while simultaneously improving student outcomes, especially for low-income students and students of color, will be useful for other community colleges trying to improve instructor and student learning. It could also add to the larger body of work about what kinds of faculty development programs both appeal to faculty and, according to college administrators and faculty, facilitate student success. As our nation seeks to move to a college-for-all culture and a greater focus on student outcomes as measures of institutional success, this study provides recommendations for creating and sustaining faculty development programs that work. I plan to share my findings and recommendations first with my home institution through presentations to the Board of Trustees and campus leadership, and then publish them to be shared more widely.

CHAPTER 2: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Community college students and instructors face challenging odds; only about 50% of community college students transfer, earn an associate's degree or a certificate within 6 years (Goldrick-Rab, 2010). There are several factors that impede community college student success, including having to work, caring for family members, and needing remediation in English, mathematics, or both (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2012). Moreover, community college faculty are generally underprepared to meet the diverse needs of their students because few have had formal preparation to teach (Eddy, 2010; Murray, 2002). One avenue to support instructors—and, by extension, students—is faculty development. To make an impact on faculty and students, research suggests that faculty development should be intensive, sustained and cohesive (Condon et al., 2016; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Elliott & Oliver, 2016; Perez et al., 2012). Faculty and administrative leadership need to coordinate and complement one another to facilitate a faculty development program that engages a significant portion of the faculty over time and with a clear focus (Murray, 2002; Nwagwu, 1998; Shugart, 2017).

This chapter begins with a brief discussion of the history of community colleges and the shift in purpose and student demographics over time. I then show the evolution of faculty development in higher education, focusing on community colleges, and the challenges that community colleges face implementing faculty development programs. I then review the evidence of effective faculty development and follow with an exploration of the evidence that links faculty development to improved student outcomes. Finally, I will situate my study in the conceptual framework of the kaleidoscope convergence of bottom-up and top-down leadership (Kezar, 2012) under the assumption that both faculty and administrative leadership are necessary

to create and sustain a widespread, institutionalized faculty development program, nested within a collaborative culture. I will focus the conceptual framework discussion on Kezar's (2012) strategies to promote successful convergence as a lens for my data analysis.

Overview of the Development of Community Colleges

Since its inception at the turn of the 20th century, the community college has had a unique position in higher education. In some ways, it functions like a K-12 public school because of its open-door policy, but it is still a postsecondary institution. Originally known as the junior college, the community college was conceived as a high school-based program offering vocational education, teacher education, and some general post-secondary coursework. These junior college programs then grew into separate institutions, primarily to serve communities that didn't have a 4-year institution nearby (A. Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Robinson-Neal, 2009). A. Cohen and Brawer (2003) argue that existing universities could have accommodated additional students, but a movement of scholars arguing to remove all freshman- and sophomore-level work from the university also bolstered the need for junior colleges for general education.

The first major expansion of community colleges occurred in the 1940s and 1950s, fueled by the G. I. Bill (Brint & Karabel, 1989) and in response to the 1947 final report of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education entitled *Higher Education in American Democracy* that supported the expansion of higher education through 2-year *people's colleges* (A. Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Delmont, 2014). Community colleges did not begin with the intention of facilitating transfer to a 4-year institution; instead, in the first expansion in the 1940s and 1950s, the associate's degree was developed and job training programs expanded (A. Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Robinson-Neal, 2009). The community college was a regional phenomenon in 1940, but by 1970, there was at least one community college in every state (Brint & Karabel, 1989). The

community college became a prominent force in higher education after the second expansion of campuses and a huge increase in enrollment as post-war babies entered young adulthood in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Murray, 2002) and a confluence of other factors: the emergence of financial aid that goes straight to students and is transferable to any institution; various social movements encouraging new segments of the population to see higher education as a possibility; and state investments in statewide systems of community colleges that embraced the new mission of open access (A. Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Vaughn, 1985).

Brint and Karabel (1989) argue that the community college has accentuated rather than mitigated social inequality; low-income and underrepresented minority students are diverted away from 4-year institutions and instead are *stuck* in less successful 2-year institutions. Murray (2002), however, argues that the primary mission of the modern community college is social justice: to serve a larger, more diverse group of students, who are sometimes less academically prepared, than 4-year institutions serve. A. Cohen and Brawer (2003) weigh in on this debate but take a different stance, focusing on individual versus group achievement. They argue that a fundamental American value is the opportunity for an individual to rise to her greatest potential, and that talent can be found in all social classes and at any age. Additionally, they argue, “People who fail to achieve in their youth should be given successive chances” (p. 10); the community college serves these functions. What is clear is that the organizational multiplicity of a community college—multiple missions serving multiple clients—is a fundamental challenge for the modern community college (Rhoads & Valadez, 1996).

The Role of the Community College in the California Master Plan

The California Master Plan is important because of the size of the combined systems as well as the scope of the plan, and other states followed California’s lead. In California’s Master

Plan for Higher Education, the role of the community college is clearly defined: to provide the first 2 years of lower division coursework, to provide coursework leading to terminal associate's degrees, to provide vocational-technical education (distinct from occupational education in the state college system, and professional and graduate education plus research at the University of California), and to provide remedial education for students underprepared for college-level work (Coons et al., 1960). Anyone who has graduated from high school or is over 18 and able to benefit from college coursework is eligible to enroll in a community college. The function of the California community college (or the junior college, in the language of the Master Plan) is two-fold—transfer and terminal degrees, depending on student needs. The quandary explored by Brint and Karabel (1989), Murray (2002), and A. Cohen and Brawer (2003) is written in to the Master Plan. Further, part of the design of higher education for the state of California in 1960 was to intentionally divert students from overcrowded state colleges and universities to junior colleges. The intentions stated in the Master Plan were mostly benevolent, but also in the best interests of the state and to a great extent the research university structure in the form of the University of California (Dougherty, 1994). Diverting half of lower-division students to community colleges would save those students money by having them live at home; there would be more material and physical resources for upper-division and graduate students at state colleges and universities if some lower-division students were diverted to junior colleges; there would be reduced demand for dormitories at state colleges and universities with fewer lower-division students; and the state would pay less for students at community colleges, with higher overall teacher-to-student ratios, than at state colleges and universities (Coons et al., 1960).

Another key point in the Master Plan regarding community colleges is the role of faculty. Junior colleges are teaching institutions focused on lower-division coursework; any research

undertaken by faculty should be directed to improving the quality of instruction (Coons et al., 1960). Further, any individual scholarship should be undertaken in the summer, implying on the instructor's time away from the college. At the time of the Master Plan, just over 9% of community college faculty had doctorates. A significant portion of junior college faculty at the time of the Master Plan came out of high school and even elementary school teaching.

Changes in demographics, state funding, and response to recessions has complicated the role of the community college (Johnson, 2010). As eligibility for admission has been limited further at University of California and California State University campuses to cut costs, more students are funneled to community colleges, and those students are more underprepared, as Murray (2002) suggests.

Other states followed California's lead and implemented their own master plans for higher education. For example, Holcombe (1979) explains that the state of Florida created a master plan in 1957 for a statewide system of comprehensive 2-year colleges in response to the Truman Commission report and in anticipation of the baby boom. In 1968, the state established local boards of trustees, thereby removing community colleges from local K-12 school districts. By 1972, there were 28 community colleges in the system, and every Floridian lived within commuting distance of one of these institutions. In the late 1970s, an Articulation Coordinating Committee (part of the state-level Community College Coordinating Board, later the State Board of Community Colleges) mandated that all courses in the community college system have common numbering and that all Florida institutions of higher education should have a common calendar to facilitate transfer from community colleges to 4-year institutions in Florida. In another iteration, just 1 year after the California Master Plan, New York City created a centralized university system composed of four selective 4-year colleges and three community

colleges: Staten Island Community College (opened in 1955), Bronx Community College (opened in 1957), and Queensborough Community College (opened in 1958) into one integrated municipal system (The City University of New York, 2017). New York state education law mandates close articulation between the 4-year baccalaureate-granting institutions and community college units in the City University of New York (CUNY) to provide both academic excellence and equal access and opportunity for students (The City University of New York, 2017). The model of a comprehensive system of higher education, with the community college as a point of access for all, was pioneered by California, but emulated by others.

The Evolution of Faculty Development in Community Colleges

There is some recognition that, as of the 1970s, the student population in higher education in general, but in community colleges in particular, included many more first-generation, underrepresented minority, nontraditional and low-income students who required a different style of teaching than traditional lecture (Gaff, 1975; Murray, 2002). While the college student population was changing, the ranks of faculty were not—there was a tight academic labor market in the 1970s, the advent of the adjunct had not yet occurred, and faculty anticipated staying at their current schools for long periods of time (Gaff, 1975). This combination of evolving student needs and unchanging faculty encouraged community college leaders to think about how to *develop* their existing faculty (Gaff, 1975; Murray, 2002).

The idea of a comprehensive, multi-faceted faculty development program was in its infancy in the 1970s. In his seminal work, Gaff (1975) recognized that the concept of faculty development, especially with a focus on classroom instruction, could strike faculty as an affront to academic freedom and as unprofessional to question or challenge the quality of colleagues' work. As such, he noted that historically, the idea of professional learning in the academy

revolved around sabbaticals, meetings of professional organizations, and institutional support for research. But he acknowledged that scholarly competence does not equal teaching effectiveness. Moreover, community college faculty are not required to do research, though most come out of traditional graduate programs with a research emphasis (Eddy, 2010). Gaff studied over 200 promising formal faculty development programs at diverse institutions to understand what varied institutions were doing to develop their faculty and how they implemented their programs. He noted that the conceptual framework for the effective programs revolved around the idea that teaching is paramount, complex, and undervalued, and faculty are critical resources whose existing talents need to be leveraged. He added that improving teaching requires work with administrators, students and even the larger community. Finally, Gaff's research acknowledged that there is no one-size-fits all approach to effective instruction, and any *magic bullet* prescription should be viewed with suspicion. Gaff found three different approaches to improving instruction. The first is faculty development, focusing on instructors acquiring knowledge and skills related to teaching and learning. The next is instructional development, focusing on improving student learning through new materials, curriculum redesign, and systematic instruction. The third is organizational development, focusing on the larger institutional environment through improved interpersonal relationships, improved team functioning, and the creation of policies to facilitate effective teaching and learning. He found that these three approaches weren't necessarily mutually exclusive, though one approach—either the faculty, instructional or organizational development component—seemed to predominate at individual institutions, depending on institutional focus and needs.

Bergquist and Phillips (1975), in another seminal work looking at faculty development, also noted three approaches to improving instruction, but these are attitude, process, and

structure. They argue for a comprehensive approach, noting that organizational and personal development must be part of instructional development to have a lasting impact on an institution. Through case histories and their own experience running faculty development programs, the authors explored how to develop a comprehensive program. They suggest that any new program begin with classroom instruction, which they call process, for validity. The process component includes teaching evaluation (self, peer, and students) to pinpoint areas for growth, collecting and reflecting on evidence of teaching practice, microteaching, technology usage, and curriculum development. The attitude component includes personal growth workshops and therapeutic counseling. Finally, the structure component focuses on departmental management, conflict resolution, team building and decision-making to confront resistance to making change.

Some specific examples from Gaff's (1975) research illustrate the organizational or structure component and the more personal or attitude component of faculty development noted by both Gaff and Bergquist and Phillips (1975). In 1968, the Florida State Department of Education established a staff and program support system for community colleges allocating 2% of the overall community college budget to support new staff development and innovative programs. This seed money went to all community colleges and was tied to long-range (5-year) staff and program development. The funds could not be spent on typical operating costs nor materials, and evaluations of the programs created with this money by the campuses indicate that the new projects were valuable and worthwhile (Gaff, 1975). This funding scheme facilitated by the state helped alleviate financial constraints on institutions and encouraged innovation and coordination. On a more personal level for faculty, the City College of New York, and later additional institutions in the CUNY system, created a summer institute in the early 1970s focused on helping faculty understand the challenges of underrepresented minority students in

business and technology to help the instructors prepare to teach their students more effectively. The workshops focused on changing faculty attitudes and increasing their understanding of a new wave of students (Gaff, 1975).

While Gaff (1975) and Bergquist and Phillips (1975) focused their work on describing successful programs, Centra (1976) conducted a study to ascertain what faculty development practices were in use in community colleges and 4-year institutions. Of 756 institutions surveyed, 326 were 2-year colleges. The questionnaires were completed by faculty development directors, deans or other administrators tasked with faculty development, or faculty who ran a faculty development program or center as part of their assignment. Respondents surveyed found summer grants for independent projects, sabbaticals and travel grants the most effective institutional practices. The most popular workshops were about specific instructional techniques and the sharing of new knowledge in a given field. In community colleges, faculty visits to other institutions or other parts of their own institutions to review innovative projects were an effective practice. The most active participants in faculty development, per the respondents, were good teachers who wanted to get better, and those least likely to participate were the teachers most in need of improvement. Half of the 2-year colleges in the study had dedicated units (though most were quite small—one or two people on the staff), with an emphasis on the development of faculty, staff and administrators; the organizational/structure component (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975; Gaff, 1975) was a primary approach for community colleges. Finally, Centra found that 70% of funding for faculty development came from institutional budgets.

While Centra (1976) notes that significant portions of the community colleges in his study had dedicated faculty development units, in a later review of the literature on faculty development focusing on community colleges, Brawer (1990) found that faculty development

was not a high priority. Looking at the intervening decade of research since the spate of studies at the beginning of the faculty development movement in the 1970s, she notes that most districts allocate funds to faculty development, but that professional development opportunities are often infrequent and scattered. The most common faculty development activities were workshops, released time, and conference attendance. She also found that most programs were geared to full-time faculty, though some institutions had special activities designed for part-time instructors. Finally, few programs included administrators or classified staff.

Maxwell and Kazlauskas (1992) built on the work of Brawer (1990) but went one step further by focusing on faculty development research in community colleges to pinpoint effective practices. They were trying to find out which programs garnered faculty participation, and which methods were effective for improving instructor teaching, again surveying research from the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s. Community college professors were interested in sabbatical leaves, conference attendance, and time and funds for travel, which are more traditional forms of faculty development. The authors began their study by acknowledging that faculty development programs were not research-based when first constructed in the 1970s, and therefore that existing faculty development programs need evaluation to determine their effectiveness. The researchers' findings echo Brawer's: that faculty development programs are widespread, but few faculty participate, and the programs are relatively ineffective. Like Centra's (1976) findings, Maxwell and Kazlauskas found that instructors most in need of improvement were the least likely to participate in and benefit from faculty development. Part of the challenge of making faculty development work is that there wasn't consensus among researchers about what constitutes *good teaching* or underlying learning theories; few studies delineate what more effective teaching approaches look like. Further, most of the research focused on general ratings of programs

instead of direct observations of them. And the perspective of the stakeholder affected perceived effectiveness: program administrators rated faculty development workshops much higher than did participating faculty. One key finding from their study is that the methods most often used to deliver faculty development activities—workshops and newsletters—are the least effective methods of instructional development.

Maxwell and Kazlauskas (1992) also found some promising practices. One effective method was individual consultation with a subject matter and pedagogy expert. They posit that the ideal consultant is a department colleague who can share up-to-date subject matter knowledge as well as discipline-specific instructional strategies. Another effective method was microteaching, which includes training followed by peer and video feedback, revision of the lesson based on feedback, and then another round of peer and video feedback. This feedback loop can occur for additional cycles. Other effective practices included using technology specialists for support, faculty exchange programs and temporary course load reductions. These specific practices were found to be most effective with a specific course and goal in mind instead of just for *general* improvement. Maxwell and Kazlauskas called for further research in community college faculty development that directly ties specific programs to teacher and student learning.

Two key studies, one a comprehensive review of the literature and another an empirical study based on a survey of a random sample of nationwide community colleges, give an update of the state of faculty development in community colleges at the turn of the 21st century. Murray (2002), in a seminal piece on the state of community college faculty development frequently cited in the literature, found three key themes that define faculty development in community colleges: (a) few community colleges explicitly tie their faculty development programs to the

stated mission of the institution, (b) few community colleges evaluate their faculty development programs, and (c) faculty participation in most faculty development opportunities is low, and those who most need improvement are the least likely to participate. He notes that the most common theme running through the literature of community college faculty development—including small studies of individual institutions as well as larger, more comprehensive studies—is that very few faculty development programs had goals that tie directly to the individual institutional mission. Activities were neither goal-oriented nor cohesive, which makes faculty development programs less likely to be avenues for institutional change and improvement. Part of the problem is that institutions are trying to help faculty improve pedagogical practices, while also giving opportunities for discipline-specific knowledge and personal growth through sabbaticals and conferences; the resulting smattering of options doesn't lend itself to a cohesive, mission-driven program. Additionally, the lack of rigorous evaluation—partially due to the lack of clear goals and objectives to measure—made it difficult to ascertain program effectiveness. Finally, there is a tension between what faculty want—generally, more time to develop knowledge in their discipline—and what administrators think they need—more innovative teaching approaches for teaching nontraditional students.

An empirical study conducted by Grant and Keim (2002) challenges some of Murray's (2002) conclusions but solidifies others. The researchers were trying to investigate current practices in community college faculty development—including planning, implementation, funding and evaluation—and to compare the status of faculty development programs among institutions of different sizes and in different accreditation regions. They selected a random sample of 300 community colleges from the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) database and mailed out a 30-item survey to college presidents to forward to the person

in charge of faculty development at each site. The survey looked at six dimensions of faculty development: program practices, program content, program coordination, program participation, funding and evaluation. They had a 77% rate of return on their surveys ($N = 272$); the individual most often responsible for responding was an administrator (vice-presidents for instruction, academic deans, or presidents), but they also had faculty development coordinators and faculty respond. Most institutions (90%) had a formal faculty development program in place, and 93% of colleges received funding for their programs, mostly from states, but also grants, institutional funds, federal funds, endowments, and from local business support. A critical finding that challenges Murray's conclusions is that organizational and curricular practices were widespread among the respondents, and these activities were more common than sabbatical leaves and travel funds, traditional faculty development activities. The researchers posit that this shift in practice and content implies that colleges are at least as focused on the institutional mission of teaching and learning as they are on the augmentation of faculty content knowledge. Further, most institutions (85%) made faculty development available to both full-time and part-time faculty, and the larger the college, the more likely it was that all faculty were eligible to participate. Incentives for faculty to participate included release time, salary advancement, and the intrinsic incentive of professionalism and commitment; some colleges offered monetary rewards, but they were not the most influential factor for faculty attendance and participation. Also, 58% of colleges used a formal needs assessment, typically a survey, to help determine program content. One critical finding that supports Murray is that less than half of the colleges report having a formal evaluation process to gauge the effectiveness of their faculty development programs. Grant and Keim conclude by suggesting further investigation of broad standards for faculty development programs.

Hines (2017) has proposed an evaluation model to address some of the issues raised by Grant and Keim (2002) and Murray (2002). She field-tested her model at nine institutions, including one community college. Hines' Four-Phase Evaluation Model deliberately addresses two of the concerns posed by earlier research: lack of a cohesive curriculum (trying to do too much) and lack of clear goals tied to the institutional mission and strategic plan. The first phase of the model is Evaluation Capacity Analysis—program leaders need to figure out how to leverage their existing resources to make a feasible plan. The second phase, which directly addresses Grant and Keim and Murray, is Curriculum Conceptualization—program leaders should group services and offerings into distinct programs, then identify program goals and outcomes, and then finally map activities and offerings to those outcomes. Once these linkages are identified, directors know what to measure. The third phase is Evaluation Planning—Hines suggests staged evaluation, focusing on the deepest impact programs first, and finally, Plan Implementation. Key components of the fourth phase include analyzing and then reflecting on the findings to make program improvements. This model is still in its infancy, but the early field tests conducted by Hines suggests it works.

The field of faculty development continues to evolve. Austin and Sorcinelli (2013), two faculty members and faculty developers themselves, wrote a chapter reflecting on where faculty development has been since its inception in the 1970s and where it is going in the future. Their chapter is based on findings from an earlier study conducted by Sorcinelli in 2006 that surveyed members of the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education, an organization founded in 1974 at the beginning of the burgeoning faculty development movement. The survey addressed some critical questions: What various structures do faculty development programs use? What goals, resources and purposes guide various

programs? What are the challenges facing faculty development programs, and what are new directions in the field of faculty development? The survey was sent to all POD Network members, but only about 50% responded; this group includes various institutional types, including community colleges. While the data is not comprehensive, some key insights emerge from the study.

Per Austin and Sorcinelli (2013), much of the work done by faculty development programs is learning-centered. One critical component of current faculty development programs is how to assess student learning, both to help inform future practice and to meet accountability standards. A priority in community college faculty development programs is preparing faculty to teach underprepared students. Another critical function played by faculty development programs is to help faculty integrate new technology into teaching and course development. A more recent trend in current faculty development is leadership development, particularly of department chairs or heads. As the demand for new faculty increases in the next decade due to an aging faculty cohort, department chairs will be critical in hiring and new faculty support, and learning to blend administrative and teaching roles will be an important service for faculty development programs to provide.

While the goals of faculty development centers have remained consistent over time, with a focus on teaching and learning and a similar array of programs and services offered at various kinds of institutions, some changes are afoot in the field (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013). Some centers are partnering with instructional technology units, consolidating various programs in a center, or reorganizing an existing center to meet multiple needs, such as mentoring or leadership development. Community college faculty development programs tend to emphasize responding to the critical needs of the institution. There has been a widespread focus on the needs of new

faculty in faculty development programs over time, but there is a shift to the needs of mid-career faculty, senior faculty, and department chairs underway. Another important new direction is focusing more on the needs of adjunct faculty, particularly in community colleges. Moreover, there is some consensus about varying modes of delivery; while face-to-face is still the priority, on-line tutorials, blended courses (incorporating both face-to-face meetings and on-line work), and webinars are becoming more popular. Finally, the field of faculty development is becoming more professionalized, and the authors see faculty development as a collaborative venture both within and among institutions worldwide.

Austin and Sorcinelli (2013) sum up the evolution of the field of faculty development from its beginnings as an interesting option for faculty, though not fundamental to the actual work of the institution, to “a strategic lever for institutional excellence and quality, and a critically important tool for fostering institutional readiness and change” (p. 95) to the myriad complex demands facing institutions of higher education.

Challenges Community Colleges Face Implementing Faculty Development

Quality faculty development is time- and resource-intensive. Community colleges have structural and economic challenges that can make the implementation of comprehensive programs difficult. Supportive leadership may be able to mitigate some of the systemic challenges.

The reliance on adjuncts in the community college and the teaching load of community college faculty may make it difficult for faculty to engage in quality faculty development at their institutions. Part-time faculty, who are correlated with negative outcomes for students (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009), are about 69% of faculty in community colleges (The Century Foundation, 2013). Adjuncts often work at multiple institutions and may not have the time or energy to engage more

deeply in additional professional development at any one school. While Grant and Keim (2002) note that most institutions include adjunct faculty in faculty development opportunities, the time constraints on adjuncts may make it difficult to participate. Additionally, there are higher student-to-faculty ratios in community colleges, which translates to larger class sizes, and community college faculty teach more courses than faculty at 4-year institutions (The Century Foundation, 2013). While instructors at 4-year institutions teach fewer courses under the assumption that they will engage in scholarship and service in addition to teaching, community college instructors are focused on teaching, leaving less time for individual professional growth activities. Finally, community college faculty, especially at smaller, rural colleges, often have administrative duties as part of their role, which may detract from time for faculty development (A. Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Fugate & Amey, 2000).

The economics of the community college may also inhibit instructors from participating in comprehensive professional development activities. Levin (2006) conducted a qualitative study, through 16 focus group interviews of 171 instructors at seven community colleges, looking at the behaviors and values of faculty in the face of institutional expectations of high productivity, dynamic change and competition. He found that faculty feel that their key work as educators—their teaching practice and development of curriculum—is being circumscribed by economic and competitive demands put on their institutions. Their colleges allegedly espouse the value of student-centered curriculum and services, but faculty feel that the pressures of the business community for system efficiencies³ and their value of marketable skills over comprehensive curriculum are more important to their college administrations than the needs of students. Additionally, Goldrick-Rab (2010), in an extensive review of the literature looking at

³ Lecturing is more “efficient”—more information can be delivered in less time—than small group work exploring a concept, for example.

possible explanations for inadequate community college student outcomes at three levels of influence (macro-, institutional, and individual), found that the dependence on state and local funding makes community colleges accountable to local taxpayers and business leaders first, particularly in the current era of accountability. Further, she notes that there are no additional resources to support innovative pedagogical practices or to support on-going professional development for faculty to learn and implement new and innovative teaching approaches. Finally, Winston (2000) explains how community colleges deliver more services for less money than any other sector in higher education; costs can't be transferred to students entirely, and there are fewer subsidies in terms of private money (endowments and the like) than in other kinds of institutions of higher education. Community colleges and their faculty continue to be asked to do more with less.

To address these challenges, community college faculty need institutional support to promote and facilitate their engagement in faculty development. Murray (2002), in a review of the literature documenting faculty development practices in community colleges, found that the role of the chief academic officer is critical. To create the conditions of collegiality and the desire to improve instruction, Amey (1999) suggests that effective administrative leadership is needed to redefine faculty priorities to facilitate their growth and development as effective instructors who can meet the diverse needs of community college students. Nwagwu (1998) goes further, and makes it incumbent upon community college leadership to facilitate faculty improvement and effectiveness. He suggests a variety of activities that could be promoted by the dean, including explicitly encouraging participation in faculty development as well as grants for scholarly activities related to teaching. Moreover, he suggests that department chairs can support an overall effort to improve teaching practice by developing workshops on effective teaching for

faculty in their departments. At the institutional level, Nwagwu suggests reducing teaching loads to lower the student-to-faculty ratio, thereby promoting more meaningful faculty-student interaction. But Shugart (2017) suggests that to truly support a transformation in teaching and learning, top-level administrators must be willing to take real risks with enrollment (the funding source for community colleges, based on bodies in classrooms, not completion) to demonstrate to faculty leadership that the institution will support substantive change and place student learning first. He argues that faculty are the solution to improving teaching and learning, and administrators must demonstrate trust and then support meaningful collaboration *led by the faculty* to improve teaching practices. The structural and economic challenges faced by community colleges are ingrained, but effective leadership may be able to mitigate some of those challenges.

Effective Faculty Development Practices

In his seminal review of the literature looking at the state of faculty development in community colleges, Murray (2002) identifies the principles that undergird successful community college faculty development programs. He notes that there are many descriptions of innovative, stand-alone programs that haven't stood the test of time, and a few programs that are both highly successful and lasting but warned that these specific programs don't transfer to other institutions. Instead of looking at the content of successful faculty development programs, Murray looked at some of the structural components that various successful programs had in common. He found five key underpinnings of successful faculty development programs: (a) institutional support that fosters and encourages faculty development programs; (b) faculty development programs that are formalized, structured and goal-directed, specifically in alignment with the mission of the college; (c) connecting faculty development to the reward

structure, with the caveat that the reward does not have to be monetary; (d) faculty ownership, particularly in the design and implementation stages, of faculty development programs; and (e) the support of colleagues for an investment in teaching. These same ideas were validated in a report on successful community college practices by the Aspen Institute (2013) entitled “Building a Faculty Culture of Student Success” over a decade later.

While there seems to be some agreement on the structure of effective faculty development, there is less agreement on content. There is an overwhelming understanding that faculty development, particularly in teaching institutions like community colleges, should focus on teaching and learning, but not much about what that looks like. A groundbreaking report by Boyer (1990), supported by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, began a movement known as the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), a framework to look at teaching in higher education as a scholarly endeavor. SoTL can serve as one avenue of faculty development that focuses on the art and science of teaching and how it affects student learning.

Boyer (1990) posited that the work of an academic is four-fold: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. The traditional role of research is encapsulated in the scholarship of discovery, while integration refers to multidisciplinary work, often thought of as *soft* scholarship, or an afterthought, though Boyer argues otherwise. The scholarship of application is how Boyer refers to service, but he advocates pushing beyond just advising clubs or doing departmental administrative work and instead applying new knowledge in the real world beyond the institution. Finally, Boyer suggests that the scholarship of teaching is just as important and valuable as the other facets of scholarly work. It is this component that was the catalyst for a new movement in faculty development. While research remains the coin of the realm in the

academy, Boyer framed the role of teaching as just as valuable *and as scholarly* as the other facets of academia. Gaff (1975) argued about the importance of teaching at the outset of the faculty development movement, but to frame the work of teaching as scholarship akin to research was new. While Boyer's ideas have yet to take hold in research universities, Kezar and Maxey (2016) make a compelling case that faculty work in research, service and teaching should be equally valued and cultivated to create a nimble professoriate across all sectors of higher education, including community colleges.

Building on Boyer's (1990) work and under his guidance and the support of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) specifically explain how to look at teaching from a scholarly perspective. This lens—teaching as scholarship—is a natural bridge for community college faculty who have been trained at research institutions but find themselves in colleges dedicated to teaching and with little to no expectation to conduct typical research. The authors outline, using a framework like that used to drive more traditional forms of research, how to look critically at teaching practice. First, one begins with clear goals, which could be course objectives and student learning objectives, followed by adequate preparation. In a teaching context, this preparation includes deep knowledge of content as well as preparation for an individual class and the entire course. One must also use appropriate methods: teaching strategies, pacing, a syllabus. One must then measure to see if results are significant through student work and student evaluations. The next stage is effective presentation. The authors argue that a scholarly approach to teaching includes sharing what one has learned in practice with colleagues. Finally, the last stage, which then begins a new cycle, is a reflective critique of one's work. The reflective piece is what drives a practitioner to refine

practice: pinpoint what worked, what didn't, and how the next class could be improved based on that learning.

Bass (1999) further clarified the scholarly approach to teaching by exploring the process in his own classroom. He notes that all scholarship should be public, susceptible to critical review and evaluation, and exchange with and use by colleagues. He argues that the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning does as well. He outlines how to conduct participatory action research in one's own classroom, and this framework remains the bedrock of SoTL. The classroom focus is particularly relevant to community college faculty since the mission of the sector is to teach. Bass begins by thinking about the problem one's research is trying to solve; he concludes that it isn't one's teaching practice that is a problem, but that there are problems worth investigating in one's teaching. He outlines how he studied teaching for real understanding in his own classroom as an example. Bass also makes it clear that one's own classroom research should be shared with colleagues to broaden the institutional understanding of teaching and learning.

A project that encapsulates the essence of SoTL and many of the best practices cultivated in faculty development over the last forty years is the pedagogy matters practice improvement model, based on a pilot program called the Global Skills for College Completion (GSCC) funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Mellow, Woolis, Klages-Bombich, & Restler, 2015). The rationale underlying the work is that teaching matters in higher education, and perhaps most saliently in the community college sector in developmental education. The researchers posit that it is teaching quality that will most affect student outcomes, based on research conducted rigorously in the K-12 sector. Their model is situated in a community of practice, and the key benchmark is an individual instructor's practice as assessed by his or her students' work. On an individual basis, an instructor posts video of classroom practice on a computer-based tool called

Classroom Notebook that is *tagged* according to themes created inductively through the pilot program, with evidence of those themes selected separately from the lesson as a whole.

Instructors formally reflect on their weekly work three times over the course of the semester and create a synthesis reflection once a semester based on their reflections and colleagues' reflections on their work. Each week, two to three colleagues in the project meet to discuss the tags of the uploaded evidence of practice of each member, make comments and identify innovation. There is also a coach assigned to each small peer group who can facilitate discussions or work one-on-one with any individual instructor in the group. The whole group of participants meets about once a month for special activities related to the project facilitated by a coach, for pedagogy circles where the whole group debriefs their learning, and there is also an on-going discussion thread available to the whole group. The first two cohorts of teachers in the pilot program—26 in Cohort 1 and 24 in Cohort 2 in community colleges nationwide—were strong developmental education community college instructors as identified by their administrators. While this program is intended for more widespread use, the initial idea of moving good teachers to great echoes earlier work (Centra, 1976). Putting teaching and learning at the center of practice in line with the institutional mission of the community college, using reflective and scholarly practice, focusing on student work as a tool of teacher practice assessment, using a codified set of themes to help identify best practices, leveraging technology to help build collegial, supportive, coaching relationships within and between institutions—all are facets of this community college-based model that meshes the best in faculty development research and practice since its inception in the 1970s.

Linking Faculty Development and Improved Student Outcomes

The intention of faculty development is to improve teaching and learning, with student success as the ultimate goal. But the relationship between professional development and improved student outcomes can be difficult to make. Much more research on this connection has been done in the K-12 sector. In an extensive review of existing qualitative and quantitative studies as part of a multi-year study by the National Staff Development Council and The School Redesign Network at Stanford University, Darling-Hammond et al. (2009) were able to substantiate that professional development that occurs over time (an average of 49 hours in 6 to 12 months) and that is beyond discrete, one-stop workshops, is related to substantial student achievement gains, up to a 21% increase in student performance. Additionally, connecting the professional development opportunities to authentic classroom practice is more successful. The studies reviewed and analyzed by Darling-Hammond et al. were conducted in K-12 schools but suggest that what the researchers term as sustained and intensive professional development can influence student outcomes. The researchers also found that when collaboration among faculty is central to professional learning, school culture can change beyond just the individual classrooms of participants. They note, however, that this dissemination of change is most likely to occur when teachers have sheltered time to collaborate.

There is scant research in higher education that connects faculty development explicitly to student outcomes. What little exists does seem to support the research conducted by Darling-Hammond et al. (2009). A core challenge in higher education is making time to engage in sustained faculty development when faculty are often on very different schedules. At Doña Ana Community College (DACC) in Las Cruces, New Mexico, mentor faculty from the existing STEM departments are released from one class (three of fifteen total units of instruction) to

support the learning of four to five new STEM instructors. Perez et al. (2012) conducted a quantitative study of the Gaining Retention and Achievement for Students Program (GRASP) at DACC with the intention to make the causal connection between faculty development and student outcomes. DACC provides STEM instructors with weekly classes over the course of the semester to learn about student-centered teaching strategies, and then mentor faculty support the instructors as they implement the new strategies in their classrooms. During their release time, mentor faculty observe instructors utilizing the new strategies learned, and then debrief with the instructor after the lesson to assess the efficacy of the strategies and troubleshoot for the next class. The observation and debrief cycle occurs over the course of the semester, tracking both instructor and student growth over time. The researchers collected data from 31 DACC faculty from fall 2006 to spring 2008 in mathematics, physical science, health science, and computer technology courses, both before and after the intervention. GRASP at DACC has increased retention by 4%, and overall student success (measured by grades of A/B/C) increased by 7.9%. The increase in academic achievement was particularly pronounced for males (10.8%) and students of color (10.3%). Improved student outcomes can come from sustained faculty development, if professors are given the time, space and support to change their practice.

In another study at a New Mexico community college, Elliott and Oliver (2015) conducted a mixed methods study to investigate the connection between faculty development and student achievement. This study began as a case study of a community college with *a culture of innovation and improvement* and included semi-structured interviews with administrators and faculty to answer the following research question: How do community college faculty perceive the relationship between faculty development and increased student academic achievement? The researchers then had an opportunity to add a student survey to

collect quantitative data, though this quantitative data did not measure student outcomes such as grades or assessment scores, but instead asked about students' perceptions of their instructors teaching practices, the effect of professional development on those practices, and students' perceptions of their learning. The students were selected from two programs at the institution with widespread faculty development opportunities: Nursing and Radiological Technology. Over half of the faculty of these two programs (107 unduplicated participants, out of 152 part-time and 51 full-time faculty) participated in 910 hours of training, focused on innovative teaching strategies using technology. The researchers collected additional evidence through document reviews and classroom observations to triangulate their interview data from administrators and faculty and the survey findings from students. The researchers found that faculty development and its link to both teacher effectiveness and student learning outcomes were embedded in the mission, goals and policies of the college; faculty development was vital, and was funded accordingly; more part-time than full-time instructors participated (though that could also be explained by their sheer numbers in these certificate programs); faculty development must be practical, and presenters should be credible; and, there was no formal evaluation of the faculty development program. The student perceptions of faculty effectiveness suggest that faculty development has a significant positive effect. While this research does not connect explicitly to measurable student outcomes, the inclusion of faculty, administrator and student perceptions and the additional collection of data through classroom observation and document reviews demonstrate that faculty development is believed to be connected to student achievement by all stakeholders.

In a longitudinal mixed methods study over the course of 3 years called the Tracer Project, Condon et al. (2016) make a convincing case that both belief in the power of faculty

development and evidence in student work of improved student learning is possible. The researchers looked at broad and inclusive faculty development programs at Washington State University (WSU)—the Critical Thinking Project—and Carleton College’s Writing Across the Curriculum project. The researchers triangulated their findings by talking to faculty and then looking for evidence of reported growth and change in instructor practice in syllabi, student work and classroom observations. The scholars substantiated that instructors who regularly participate in quality professional development (that is, sustained and intensive over time, involving active collaboration with colleagues around real classroom instruction, in line with the findings of Darling-Hammond et al. [2009]) have students with better outcomes. For example, faculty who participated at higher rates over time in training through the Critical Thinking Project at WSU had students whose written work recorded an entire point higher on a six-point scale (rated by outside, trained readers) than faculty who had participated at much lower rates in the intervention. Further, the researchers had a difficult time finding instructors who had not participated in any way in the Critical Thinking Project because the imperative for improved instruction was pervasive. Carleton College has a culture focused on teaching that has developed over two decades that is widespread on campus; teaching quality is critical even in a place where the expectations for research productivity are high. According to the scholars, teaching is often an invisible priority, particularly at a research university, but surfacing pedagogy as paramount can lead to an institutional culture of growth, and, more importantly, increase student success.

Connecting professional development directly to student outcomes can be challenging, but Perez et al. (2012) and Condon et al. (2016) make compelling cases that quality faculty development, as defined by Darling-Hammond et al. (2009), can increase student success. Further, Elliott and Oliver (2015) demonstrate that all stakeholders—faculty, administrators and

students—believe that faculty development has a positive effect on student learning. Programs that facilitate time and space for faculty to learn and collaborate can not only increase student outcomes but can create a culture of growth for instructors to incentivize further engagement with one another and new learning to support subsequent cohorts of students.

Conceptual Framework

Faculty development programs that consistently attract significant faculty participation and have been institutionalized must be shepherded and supported by multiple stakeholders to succeed. This section will begin with a discussion of how to build a college culture that is collaborative and focused on student success. Next, I will explore the complexity of institutions of higher education like community colleges and how difficult connecting various departments to collaborate can be. Then I will discuss the challenge of either top-down or bottom-up leadership guiding change alone. Finally, I will explore how the convergence of top-down and bottom-up leadership has the potential to affect substantive change. Kezar's (2012) framework of kaleidoscope convergence, nested in a culture that supports collaboration, undergirds this study.

Building a collaborative culture of student success. Based on its analysis of student success measures at over 1,000 community colleges, as well as further investigation of community colleges with the strongest student outcomes, the Aspen Institute suggests that cultures focused on student learning can be created through faculty development (The Aspen Institute, 2013). While other factors may come into play, it is the mechanism of faculty development that facilitates instructors' continuous reflection on teaching practice to improve student learning. The Aspen Institute describes the process of change to a faculty culture focused on student success through faculty development in the following steps: (a) establish a broad demand for change; (b) build the team; (c) determine and execute a plan for institutionalization;

and (d) evaluate, reflect, and continuously improve. The authors also suggest that a deep culture of student success as described above allows faculty and staff to continue to try new ways to improve student success, supports innovators who readily find colleagues willing to adopt and then help improve new student success initiatives, and encourages leaders to support, scale and sustain the most effective student success practices. What is not addressed in the guide is *how* faculty, staff and administrative leadership interact and complement one another to ingrain this culture and sustain it over time.

Fullan (2011) begins to specify how to change the culture of an institution—which includes “values, norms, skills, practices, relationships” (p. 5)—through what he terms “right drivers” (p. 5): building capacity, focusing on the group, putting pedagogy first, and systemic cohesion. Fullan’s drivers sound very much like the basics of effective professional development: intensive, sustained, cohesive, with a focus on classroom instruction (Condon et al. 2016; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Perez et al., 2012.) The key point in Fullan’s paper is that to change culture, the focus must be on the collective. All instructors need to be engaged in work together to improve teaching and learning with a clear vision and goals for systemic change to occur. Fullan also suggests that building trust is the first critical piece of creating a collaborative culture. Cultivating relationships, while time-consuming, is the most effective way to build trust in an educational organization (Holmes, Clement, & Albright, 2013; Lambert, 1995). With trust and respect in place and a focus on all instructors continuously improving, the culture stokes and then perpetuates intrinsic motivation, which leads to greater instructor expertise (Fullan, 2011). Fullan extends the guidelines of the Aspen Institute by showing where to start: build trust and collegiality first. However, in a complex system like a community college, this directive is a monumental task.

Institutions of higher education as loosely coupled systems. Weick (1976) explored the idea of educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. The analogy of loose coupling aptly illustrates the complex system of a college or university: smaller units tied together either weakly or strongly, with minimal interdependence. Weick also emphasizes that intentions and actions are not necessarily connected. Loosely coupled systems can be either fragile or resilient; understanding and coordination across groups can easily dissolve, but smaller entities within the larger institution can adapt more rapidly to change, and large-scale coordination can be expensive. Kezar (2005) further suggests that the *siloing* prominent in colleges and universities is based on the long-standing cultural norm of individualistic work (a single professor in a classroom; a lone scholar conducting research) that goes back a hundred years and is part of the isomorphism⁴ of higher education (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Creating the space to work collaboratively on any initiative, then, requires deft leadership to navigate and coordinate people in various, separate systems. The implication of the Aspen Institute (2013) guide is that the emergence of the need for change is organic among faculty and staff, and the spaces where faculty and administration connect—like shared governance and faculty contracts—are the places for institutionalization (step three,) not the building of the student success culture.

Top-down and bottom-up leadership. M. Cohen and March (1974) wrote the definitive piece on top-down leadership in higher education: “Leadership in an Organized Anarchy.” The organized anarchy metaphor pre-dates the idea of loosely coupled systems (Weick, 1976), but the idea is similar: power is dissipated across the entire institution, and the central leader, the president, has only limited power to affect significant change. While M. Cohen and March acknowledge that a college president has the greatest potential to affect change, they suggest that

⁴ A college has to “look” and function like a college, and over time, institutions of higher education become more similar than different.

a president's primary goals should be to "do good" (p. 205) and try to make the college *slightly* better. There is so much ambiguity in a president's power, purpose and day-to-day experience that it is difficult to come up with concrete measurements of success and failure. Hence, the authors suggest moderate goals, persistence, engaging and facilitating the participation of others with opposing viewpoints, giving others the space to "dump" their issues and problems, and an unobtrusive management style. Widespread systemic change is unlikely to happen with just the support of top-down leadership. A college president cannot make change quickly nor can she make it *stick* on her own (M. Cohen & March, 1974; Holmes et al., 2013).

Kezar and Lester (2011), in a radical departure from traditional leadership research, examine the other side of the coin: bottom-up or grassroots leadership. The researchers found that there was very little work done looking at shared leadership, specifically people working as a collective who are not in traditional roles of authority who affect change on their campuses. The researchers, using a case study model, interviewed 165 grassroots leaders (eighty-four staff members and eighty-one faculty members) at five different institutions: a community college, research university, public regional university, technical college and a liberal arts college. The interviewed faculty included tenure-track and non-tenure-track as well as all ranks (assistant, associate and full professor.) The staff ranged from custodial staff to mid-level managers. Key findings that emerged from their study seem to run parallel to the suggestions of M. Cohen and March (1974) for top-down leaders: grassroots leaders chose moderate and incremental tactics and strategies within their institutions. To facilitate organizational change, grassroots leaders in higher education followed more traditional grassroots tactics such as creating a vision for change, raising awareness about the problem at hand, empowering others to act even in the face of opposition within the organization, and building relationships with others interested in the

same change (Kezar & Lester, 2011.) Another key finding that emerged from this research is that flexibility is critical; if faculty have tightly circumscribed positions, they will not have the time or energy to devote to leadership roles. Grassroots leadership alone—without institutional support—is unlikely to sustain widespread change over time; faculty leaders need time and space to pursue their change initiatives.

Kaleidoscope convergence: Bottom-up/top-down leadership. Because of the complexity of institutions of higher education, and the relative weakness of top-down or bottom-up leadership acting alone, the theory of kaleidoscope convergence (Kezar, 2012) drives this study. As part of the larger study of grassroots leadership mentioned above (Kezar & Lester, 2011), Kezar (2012) looked at the existing data to see if faculty and administrative leadership can converge to broaden and institutionalize faculty change initiatives, and one of the research sites included a faculty-driven pedagogical change initiative, though not as part of a broader faculty development program. She notes that transformational change requires the convergence of top-down and bottom-up leadership. Top-down leadership guiding change alone lacks cognitive complexity, makes buy-in difficult, and concentrates power and authority in too few people; bottom-up leadership guiding change alone is too frail without institutional support. When making a substantive change, particularly in times of stress, convergence is critical.

Kezar (2012) and her colleagues conducted their case studies at *typical* institutions, defined as institutions not characterized by a widespread commitment to change, activism, or innovation, and used both campus observations and interviews to collect data. They found sites via document analysis and informant interviews that had a concentration of grassroots leaders but no culture or history that had led to bottom-up leadership. Their research questions for this sub-study focused on what convergence looks like, how it contributes to institutional change,

how grassroots leaders connect to top-down leadership, and what the major challenges are when bottom-up and top-down leaders converge. Within the five campuses based on 65 interviews where the topic came up, the researchers found 17 examples of convergence: six were labeled as successful by the interviewees, six had mixed results or were still in process, and five had failed.

The results of the study led Kezar (2012) and colleagues to construct a new framework to look at the convergence of bottom-up and top-down leadership: kaleidoscope convergence. The researchers chose the metaphor of a kaleidoscope because many patterns emerge in a kaleidoscope, and they found in their results that there are many different outcomes from the convergence of bottom-up and top-down leadership. Sometimes this convergence leads to institutional change, but sometimes it doesn't.

From her work, Kezar (2012) shares some strategies to help facilitate successful bottom-up and top-down leadership convergence. First, she notes that grassroots leaders need to be sensitive to timing—are there interests that overlap for bottom-up and top-down leaders? If so, grassroots leadership needs to be ready to capitalize on those opportunities when they arise. Next, bottom-up leaders need to find a translator—someone Kezar defines as a middle manager who can help frame the change initiative with the right research and pitch to appeal to top-down leadership. Following finding a translator, grassroots leadership needs to make top-down leadership aware of the change initiative slowly, over time, and in various capacities. Closely related to paving the way with information about the initiative, grassroots leaders should try to manage up and give top-down leadership the information and plan necessary to allow them to simply execute the change initiative. Another important step is to secure membership on key committees and task forces related to the change initiative. These committees can be a way to influence those in authority and help shape their plans. Kezar also emphasizes the importance of

negotiation skills and the collaboration with other related grassroots or top-down initiatives with similar goals. Another strategy to support the convergence of bottom-up and top-down leadership is garnering outside financial support for the initiative so that grassroots leaders can build a case for the importance of the initiative. Finally, Kezar suggests that grassroots leadership remain skeptical and suspicious; it is important to evaluate if top-down leadership has an authentic commitment to the change initiative, or if they are simply paying lip service to the initiative because they *should*. Kezar also recognizes that bottom-up and top-down convergence isn't always possible because they don't always have the same interests. Common interests and goals are critical to make convergence succeed.

This study used Kezar's (2012) strategies to promote successful convergence of top-down and bottom-up leadership as a lens for data analysis. For example, are there key leaders—either among faculty or administrators—who helped make faculty development happen at their sites, akin to Kezar's translator? Did other groups pursuing independent modes of faculty development coalesce? Additionally, there seems to be some overlap between the strategies for convergence and the steps to building a culture of student success (The Aspen Institute, 2013), such as “establish a broad demand for change” (The Aspen Institute, 2013, p. 2) and capitalizing on overlapping interests (Kezar, 2012), and I am interested to share if and how these different ideas interact in the data. Finally, I am interested to share if and how stakeholders at the research sites built relationships and cultivated a collective sense of responsibility for student learning, per Fullan's (2011) recommendations.

CHAPTER 3: THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study investigated how community colleges with noteworthy student success outcomes have engaged their faculties in intensive, sustained and cohesive faculty development programs. Creating institutionalized faculty development programs exemplified by the research sites necessitates both bottom-up and top-down buy-in and support, and college cultures cultivated by multiple stakeholders that value pedagogy and innovation. Therefore, this study is situated in the framework of kaleidoscope convergence (Kezar, 2012) to explore if these institutional leaders used Kezar's (2012) strategies to promote successful bottom-up and top-down convergence, or if they found other pathways to institutionalize faculty development programs at their sites. Additionally, I investigated how these sites built collaborative cultures using the Aspen Institute's (2013) guidelines as well as Fullan's (2011) drivers. This study was guided by the following primary research question and sub-questions that suggest my theoretical propositions, including the role of leadership.

Research Questions

Overarching Research Question: How do community colleges create and sustain institutionalized faculty development programs?

- a. According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what financial conditions facilitate the creation of a faculty development program?
- b. According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what kind of relationship between administrators and faculty facilitates the creation of a faculty development program?
- c. According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what kind of campus culture facilitates the creation of a faculty development program?

- d. What do community colleges do to institutionalize⁵ faculty development centers on their campuses?
- e. What is the role leadership at multiple levels of the institution plays in creating and sustaining institutionalized faculty development programs?

The sub-questions guided the creation of the protocols used to interview administrators and faculty to help answer the larger, overarching question in this study.

Research Design and Rationale

This project is a qualitative study using comparative case study design from the perspective of faculty and administrative stakeholders involved in institutionalized faculty development programs at community colleges and substantiated by relevant institutional documents. The focus of this study is understanding how community colleges with noteworthy student outcomes have built and sustained their faculty development programs. Further, I am interested in the process of institutionalization of faculty development centers as a source of cohesion for multiple endeavors to improve teaching and learning on community college campuses. Because my research questions address understanding and process, a qualitative approach was deemed to be the best fit (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Additionally, because my overarching research question is a “how” question about “a contemporary set of events over which [I have] little or no control” (Yin, 2014, p. 14), a case study method was warranted. Further, my inclusion of sub-questions that capture my theoretical propositions guided both the data collection and the analysis, which is another strategy that is an important part of case study inquiry (Yin, 2014).

⁵ In this context, institutionalization is the process of embedding a program or center into the college permanently. To be institutionalized, a center needs to be a line-item in the budget, have a specific permanent location on campus, be a part of the culture, and be included in the strategic plan of the college.

Strategies of Inquiry

In this section, I delineate the primary strategies of inquiry implemented in my study. Accordingly, I address the following key topics: site selection, sample selection, gaining access, data collection methods, and data analysis. The primary data collection methods were interviews and document review.

Site selection. While doing preliminary research in the larger field of faculty development, I worked with an expert in the field—a colleague at another community college in the same region as my home site—who suggested I visit two of my three research sites as model faculty development programs. I began with the purposeful selection of two of my three sites based on his recommendation, and then I began to look at the available data to see if the demographics of the suggested sites mirrored those of my home site. I am interested in colleges who are closing achievement gaps for underrepresented and underserved students, and I wanted to make sure my research sites were serving large populations of low-income students and students of color. Based off the original recommendation of two sites, I created criteria that helped me select a third site and that validated my existing choices.

One criterion for selecting research sites for this project is evidence of student success. Because there are no easily accessible, consistent data used nationwide to measure student success in community colleges, I relied on the metrics devised by the Aspen Institute to select eligible institutions for their Community College Excellence Award. Using available public data, the Aspen Institute selects approximately 150 community colleges from around the country every 2 years as eligible institutions for their coveted Community College Excellence Award. The 150 colleges are then offered the opportunity to apply for the award by submitting additional data and allowing Aspen Institute staff to interview faculty and administrators at selected sites, adding

qualitative data to the existing quantitative data. The criteria that the Aspen Institute utilizes to select the initial eligible institutions were the criteria for the research sites in this project as well: (a) retention, completion and transfer (specifically, better-than-average numbers of students staying in school semester to semester, completing a program, and transferring to a 4-year college); (b) improvement in student performance across the campus over time; (c) student employment in the local labor market after completion; and (d) equitable performance outcomes for low-income students, students of color, and other underrepresented and underserved groups (The Aspen Institute, 2013).

The second criterion for research sites for this project is community colleges with well-developed faculty development programs. These sites have institutionalized faculty development centers that are integrated into the work of the college and not reliant on grant funding that may disappear. All sites included in the study have faculty development programs that have been in place for at least 5 years. Further, research sites have a significant portion of the faculty participate annually in various kinds of faculty development activities across departments and disciplines.

Finally, I selected the three sites for this project for maximum variation. Each institution has a different organizational context in terms of size and working conditions (right-to-work versus stronger unions), and the three sites represent geographic diversity as well. Looking at institutions with different contexts but similar priorities and outcomes could uncover some shared values or practices that might inform practice at other community colleges, or perhaps reveal specific conditions at the successful sites that may not be relevant in other institutions.

I studied three community colleges with well-developed faculty development programs and institutions that have been eligible for the Aspen Institute Community College Excellence

Award. The three colleges are: Bradley Community College, a Northeastern school which is part of a larger system that includes both 2- and 4-year institutions; Pomelo College, a large, multi-campus single institution in the Southeast; and High Hill College, also a multi-site single college, but on a much smaller scale, located in the West.

Sample selection. To find the appropriate people to interview for my study, I read college websites, especially the faculty development pages, and organizational charts to determine under whose purview faculty development falls. I have also used faculty development directors as a point of contact; these “gatekeepers” have given me the names of the relevant people to interview, and I have asked specifically to whom they think I should talk to best address my research questions. At each site, there is a similar chain of command: the director works under a dean or vice-president (there are sometimes two levels here), who then reports to the president. I engaged in casual conversations with the faculty development directors at each site prior to my first visit and began a list of names for potential faculty interviewees for my second visit. During my first site visits, I included a question in my administrator protocol about faculty leaders who could contribute to my study and gathered additional potential names from all my administrator interviewees. Through the help of the directors and other administrator suggestions, I found my faculty leadership interviewees for my second visit.

In addition to the leadership of faculty development, I think it’s critical to get the faculty perspective. Because I am looking to triangulate my findings and not simply rely on what faculty development leaders say, I sought out faculty leaders who are *not* actively involved in faculty development to hear other voices beyond the most ardent supporters; I asked for suggestions for this group of faculty leaders at the same time I asked for the involved faculty leaders during my first site visit. In addition to these interviews, I was able to access internal

data at each research site, including needs assessments, evaluations of faculty development offerings, as well as patterns of participation, to see what faculty say they need and which opportunities they find appealing and valuable.

Gaining access. Using suggestions from trusted colleagues with an interest in faculty development and the Aspen Institute Community College Excellence Award materials, including criteria and methodology available online, I identified three appropriate sites. I made the initial contacts at all three institutions in fall 2016, and I called and emailed the directors several times subsequently and sent holiday cards in two consecutive years to thank them for their participation. They have been very gracious about coming to their sites to do my research because I have positioned the work as uncovering the secrets to their success—what process each site has gone through, and how leadership shepherded these programs to fruition. Because each site has been studied before through the Aspen Institute and interested faculty wanting to see them at work, they are used to having outsiders on campus. I have built a rapport with my contacts and shared with them my own journey as a faculty developer, first in the K-12 sector, and my current role as the creator and facilitator of a peer observation protocol that has been included in a faculty development summer institute at my home site. My familiarity with faculty development has helped me build relationships as colleagues with my contacts. Additionally, my position as a developmental English teacher helped me signal to my contacts that I really care about students and student success; I work with some of the most vulnerable students on my campus, and, to be successful, I need to have pedagogical chops. Further, I shared how my institution is currently undergoing transformational change because of a large reading and composition curricular redesign that nearly eliminates our developmental English pathway, so I have pragmatic interests as well as research interests in their process of change. All these aspects

of my positionality—my faculty development bona fides, my teaching role, and my leadership role facilitating change—helped me build trusting relationships with the faculty development directors. I have continued to maintain relationships with my contacts even after completing my site visits, including suggesting research materials to aid in internal evaluations as well as connecting faculty development directors in the same region to work collaboratively on larger regional projects. I plan to continue these professional relationships.

Data collection methods. The alignment of research question and data collection methods is encapsulated in Table 1, with further details to follow.

Table 1

Alignment of Research Question and Data Collection Methods and Sources

Research Question	Data Collection Method
According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what financial conditions facilitate the creation of an effective faculty development program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interviews with college president, academic vice-presidents/deans/directors/faculty leadership ● Review of budgets
According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what kind of relationship between administrators and faculty facilitates the creation of an effective faculty development program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interviews with college president, academic vice-presidents/deans/directors/faculty leadership ● Interviews with faculty leaders not involved in faculty development ● Job postings for faculty and administrators ● Review of employment contracts
According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what kind of campus culture facilitates the creation of an effective faculty development program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interviews with college president, academic vice-presidents/deans/directors/faculty leadership ● Interviews with faculty leaders not involved in faculty development ● Mission statements ● Internal needs assessments ● College website ● Faculty development program website

<p>What do community colleges do to institutionalize faculty development centers on their campuses?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with college president, academic vice-presidents/deans/directors/faculty leadership • Review of budgets • Faculty development activity evaluations • Faculty development activity enrollment patterns • Catalogs/websites with faculty development offerings • Strategic plan • Organizational chart
<p>What is the role leadership at multiple levels of the institution plays in creating and sustaining effective faculty development programs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with college president, academic vice-presidents/deans/directors/faculty leadership • Review of budgets, contracts • Interviews with faculty leaders not involved in faculty development

Interviews. My primary method of data collection was semi-structured interviews with various levels of administrators and faculty who are responsible for implementing faculty development programs at their institutions and additional faculty leaders. Because I am interested in how leadership impacts the creation and institutionalization of faculty development programs, I interviewed college presidents, the vice-presidents or deans in charge of faculty development, and the faculty development directors (some of whom are faculty and not administrators) to find out how their individual support (or opposition or neutrality) affected the implementation and the sustaining of faculty development on their campuses. I conducted interviews with administrators at each hierarchical level, which was approximately four interviews per site. I also interviewed faculty leadership who have been influential in driving the institutionalization of faculty development. Moreover, I interviewed faculty leaders who are *not* actively involved in faculty development to try to understand how faculty perceive the challenges and value of participating in faculty development, and how faculty development fits into the larger culture and vision of the college. The faculty perspective is important to substantiate or challenge the narrative provided by administrators. I interviewed four faculty

members at each site: two who are actively engaged in faculty development work as leaders, and two who are actively engaged in the work of the college but not active in faculty development.

While I recognize the importance of gender and race (as well as other social identity influences), it was not possible in the present study to center such factors in my selection of faculty participants; to do so would likely result in losing the central focus of the study—support for faculty development. Related to the role of gender and race is the reality that revealing such social identity factors in introducing my research participants and their comments would result in compromising their identities and violating the ethical norms guiding my study relative to offering a degree of anonymity to my research participants. With this in mind, I have randomly assigned gender to my research participants—a practice commonly employed in some qualitative research (when achieving an adequate level of anonymity is a concern)—and thus, it is unlikely for readers to know whether in fact the referenced gender matches reality or not. Obviously, if gender were a central factor in my analysis, such a strategy could not be employed. Similarly, I do not reveal the racial identity of my research participants as doing so would likely compromise their identity and make achieving an acceptable level of anonymity difficult. Again, as is the case with masking gender, this compromises my study's contribution to the role of race in analyzing support for community college faculty development programs. Future research could very well center such factors as gender and race (as well as other identity influences), but for the purpose of this study, they were intentionally masked.

I conducted 60-minute interviews in the offices of my administrator interviewees at their sites, and 30-45-minute interviews of my faculty participants, also in their offices at their sites. I recorded the interviews on a digital audio recorder and used my iPhone as a backup; I also took notes during the interviews. I learned about the history of the faculty development programs,

what challenges each institution faced, how stakeholders overcame those challenges, and what role the faculty development program plays in the larger strategic plan or vision of the institution currently.

I piloted the administrator protocol with the Dean of Student Success and the Academic Vice President, both of whom are knowledgeable about faculty development, at my home site. I added two questions and made minor changes to the wording of some questions based on their feedback.

Documents. Additionally, I reviewed a series of documents for each college that included budgets, faculty job postings, institutional mission statements, institutional research reports regarding student success and faculty and staff demographics, faculty development offerings, faculty development history and philosophy (posted on college websites), internal needs assessments when available, faculty development activity evaluations, faculty development attendance records, contracts, organizational charts, and strategic plans to further substantiate and clarify what I learned from administrators and faculty about faculty development at my research sites. Furthermore, I had already used information, primarily from college websites, to get to know each institution and to find a point of contact to act as a facilitator for my project.

Observations. Finally, as part of my site visits, I conducted walking tours of public settings. Additionally, I spent some time in the faculty development centers and the offices of the faculty development directors. I wanted to understand the design of the centers, whether they are open for drop-in faculty use, how often faculty congregate in the centers, signage for the centers, and where the centers are located on their respective campuses. These small details, while not connected explicitly to my research questions, helped me describe the cases, and added to my understanding of campus culture. I took pictures on my iPhone of public spaces to refresh

my memory but was careful to keep the sites anonymous by avoiding any details that would reveal the campus names or specific locations.

Data Analysis

I visited my research sites twice—once at the beginning of the fall semester, and once at the beginning of the spring semester. I scheduled most of my administrator interviews (president, vice-president/dean, faculty development director) for my first site visit, and then followed-up with faculty leadership in the early spring. I transcribed two of my 60-minute interviews from my first site visit, but then I sent the remainder of my interview recordings to a reputable transcription service with a strong confidentiality agreement. I then coded the transcripts using my theoretical propositions as data codes: financial conditions; the relationship between administrators and faculty; campus culture; life cycle of the institutionalization process; and leadership style (Yin, 2014). I also allowed for the data itself to generate additional data codes through a more inductive process based on reading and re-reading my data corpus. The deductive (theory-driven) and inductive data codes constitute the code book I used in guiding my overall analysis. Additionally, part of my coding scheme was looking for Kezar's (2012) suggestions for how to promote successful convergence of bottom-up and top-down leadership embedded in her work on kaleidoscope convergence. I adjusted my interview protocols as needed based on the initial data set, and similarly reviewed transcriptions and coded the second round of interviews. Concurrently, I analyzed documents, using the theoretical propositions and convergence strategies as my codes, but also looking for emerging themes from the documents, all based on articulating the process of institutionalization of faculty development, and particularly looking for campus culture around teaching and learning based on the Aspen Institute's (2013) guidelines and Fullan's (2011) drivers. Additionally, I created various memos

while I reviewed documents, during my site visits, and after reviewing transcripts to keep track of my emerging ideas about how these institutions make their faculty development programs work that helped me articulate findings and implications later in the study.

I looked at each case individually, and created an independent case study, and, once the initial cases were complete, conducted a cross-case analysis to find themes that are shared by all three institutions utilizing a literal replication approach—that is, seeing if each case predicts similar results across the cases (Yin, 2014). While much can be learned from each case, finding themes across the cases helped me develop stronger conclusions that helped determine more generalizable findings.

Ethical Considerations

While Yin (2014) suggests that anonymity is not desirable for a case study because it eliminates some of the critical (and often interesting) background information that helps build the case, my research sites are all anonymous. Even though the research sites, and specifically the leaders I interviewed, have been under intense scrutiny as part of the Aspen Institute Community College Excellence Award process, they were more comfortable sharing their experiences under pseudonyms. All participants were given pseudonyms, and their identities will be kept confidential. I wanted to get the whole picture of faculty development—including challenges—from all stakeholders, and I wanted to make sure that there will be no repercussions for participating in my study. I am also mindful that I need to be ready to give something to my participants in return for their help. I brought small gifts for each faculty interviewee, I took each faculty development director out to lunch on my first site visit, and I am going to prepare a case report for each site with the administrators in mind.

Finally, I prepared Memoranda of Understanding for all three institutions to clarify that the original data is mine. I kept three sets of my data, including audio files and transcription files: 1. on my laptop, 2. in Box via UCLA, and 3. on an external hard drive. There is password protection for all three storage sites. To conclude, I engaged in member checks with my interviewees to make sure that I accurately and fairly represented their perspectives.

Credibility and Trustworthiness

Perhaps the biggest credibility threat to my study is reactivity. The participants know that their institutions have been selected because they are outstanding; there is little incentive to be completely honest with me about how difficult the change process might have been. This reactivity concern is particularly potent for college presidents, as they are the face of public relations for their institutions. Additionally, some of my interviewees may not have witnessed or participated in the change process and may rely on hearsay. I was pleasantly surprised that all of my administrator and faculty interviewees were forthcoming with the challenges they faced or are facing in an attempt to authentically represent their institutions. Using pseudonyms and providing anonymity to the sites, I believe, alleviated the reactivity concern as well. To further address the reactivity concern, I triangulated both sources and methods. I interviewed three to four different levels of administrator, plus faculty leadership, and I checked those responses with interviews with less involved faculty leadership as well as internal needs assessments from each site when possible. I was very clear in my instructions to all interviewees that their responses are anonymous and cannot be traced back to them to facilitate more honest responses. I used interviews and document review to try to get a more holistic look at how faculty development has evolved and plays out at the different institutions and to increase the credibility of my study. I believe that visiting the institutions twice was also helpful. I got to see the sites after I spent a

lot of time reviewing interview and document data, which helped me know what I was missing and what to look for on a follow-up trip. I also used my second visit as an opportunity to do member checks on my first round of data collection.

I am also concerned about my own bias—I am a big believer in the power of faculty development and the importance of pedagogy that involves students in meaningful ways. I believe that the triangulation of sources and methods, as well as the member checks, helped me build a credible cross-case study. Additionally, I shared my evolving insights and data collection with trusted colleagues at my home site who do not share my enthusiasm for faculty development to help prevent my bias from entering in to the study. The second site visit was critical—I was more informed on my second visit and was able to answer questions from or clarify understanding of data from my first visit.

Summary

This study investigated faculty development programs in community colleges. The faculty development programs selected for this study have high participation of faculty across disciplines, including both adjunct and full-time faculty, and are permanent fixtures on their campuses instead of relying on grant funding or other temporary sources of funding that could eventually be phased out. Further, institutions in this study are improving student outcomes across their campuses, particularly of low-income students and students of color. Utilizing a multi-case study design, this study looked holistically and in-depth at three institutionalized faculty development programs at community colleges to try to discover what they are doing, and if it is replicable.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

This study investigated how three community colleges with institutionalized faculty development programs initially built and continue to sustain those programs. While the research sites are very different at first glance, they share three important commonalities: 1. a significant proportion of the faculty participate in faculty development activities annually; 2. the faculty development centers are a permanent fixture on each campus; and 3. each site is narrowing the achievement gap for students of color and low-income students. Making a direct connection between robust faculty development programs and improved student outcomes is beyond the scope of this project; however, investigating programs that have the potential to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the community college sector is still a worthwhile endeavor.

Because faculty development programs often span administration and faculty, institutionalizing programs can be challenging; buy-in is required from both top-down and bottom-up leadership to make faculty development programs thrive. Therefore, looking through the lens of educational leadership, this investigation sought to address the following research questions:

Overarching Research Question: How do community colleges create and sustain institutionalized faculty development programs?

- a. According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what financial conditions facilitate the creation of a faculty development program?
- b. According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what kind of relationship between administrators and faculty facilitate the creation of a faculty development program?

- c. According to administrators and faculty involved in faculty development, what kind of campus culture facilitates the creation of a faculty development program?
- d. What do community colleges do to institutionalize⁶ faculty development centers on their campuses?
- e. What is the role leadership at multiple levels of the institution plays in creating and sustaining institutionalized faculty development programs?

To answer these questions, I studied three different community colleges across the country with model faculty development programs: Bradley Community College, Pomelo College, and High Hill College (all pseudonyms). I visited each site twice, once to speak to administrators involved in faculty development before the fall semester began, and a second time when school was in session to speak to faculty—both heavily involved in current faculty development activities and uninvolved in current faculty development activities but still engaged at the college—at the beginning of the spring semester. The findings from this study will be presented in this chapter in four sections: the first three as case studies of each institution’s faculty development program, and the fourth section as a cross-case analysis of the similarities that exist between the disparate institutions’ programs.

A note on naming: all the faculty development centers at the research sites have unique names that serve to reflect their individual goals and philosophies. Using the actual names of the centers at my research sites would compromise anonymity. Therefore, I have used a more generic term for faculty development centers, a Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), that I picked up at the POD Network Conference in October 2017 in Montreal.

⁶ In this context, institutionalization is the process of embedding a program or center into the college permanently. To be institutionalized, a center needs to be a line-item in the budget, have a specific permanent location on campus, be a part of the culture, and be included in the strategic plan of the college.

Case Study 1: Bradley Community College

Situated in a large urban center in the Northeast, Bradley Community College is made up of four large buildings over four city blocks. Two buildings are connected internally, which can be confusing to a newcomer. Upon entering any of the buildings, students, faculty, staff and visitors are greeted by a uniformed security guard checking IDs, monitoring the comings and goings of everyone. But the signal of city living is not unpleasant; after checking my ID, the security guard kindly said, “Do you know where you’re going? Do you need some help?”

The buildings are large warrens of offices, departments, classrooms, and support space: computer rooms, the library, the admissions office and the offices of various special programs. They feel like what they are: converted warehouses and former factories that have been serving this working-class neighborhood—first as a place of employment, then as an institution of higher education—for decades. There are few spaces to “hang out”, a big challenge at most urban commuter schools. When I visited in January, an inside atrium in the largest building of the four was a popular place for students to sit and catch their breath. There is some outdoor space, but it’s only one spare garden in the interior of the two connected buildings, and only usable in spring and fall.

The diversity of the student body struck me when I visited. I saw students with their parents, their children, speaking various languages (some I did not recognize), all with a sense of purpose. Bradley’s student body is about 50% Latino, 20% African-American, 20% Asian, and 10% white. About 55% of the students attend full-time, while the remaining 45% attend part-time. The students are overwhelmingly immigrants or the children of immigrants. Additionally, over 2/3 of student families earn less than \$30,000 per year. Bradley’s student body has more students of color and more low-income students than the typical American community college,

and yet Bradley students outperform their peers: there is a 55.6% graduation rate in 6 years⁷ vs. a 39% 6-year completion rate nationwide (Fain, 2015).

There are just over 1,100 faculty members, about 400 of whom are full-time and about 700 of whom are part-time. Bradley's faculty is 64% adjunct, compared to 69% nationwide (The Century Foundation, 2013.) According to the provost, who is responsible for hiring, the college has made a commitment to hiring more full-time faculty, and has made strides in recent years, though the number of adjuncts still hovers near the national average. According to a draft of the 2016-2017 strategic plan, the full-time faculty teach 45.2% of the instructional FTEs (full-time equivalents—a metric used to aggregate part-time students into full-time students).

Bradley is part of a larger university system made up of both 2- and 4-year colleges. According to the associate provost, Bradley can leverage the clout and money of the larger system at times to help facilitate strategic initiatives on campus. Bradley is the only research site in this study that is part of a larger university system.

Another unique attribute of Bradley is the structure of its Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). It is not a physical space—it's people. There is no main office or gathering place that is open to faculty where faculty can just drop in and be together informally. Instead, the staff of the CTL are all in separate offices on the same floor as Academic Affairs. The administrators with direct responsibility for the CTL are all located on that same floor: the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Associate Provost and Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Director of the CTL, who is also the Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs. Scattered throughout the same floor as the administrators are the six staff

⁷ Graduation rates include completion of a certificate as well as completing a 2-year degree. The most recent data available is for all entering students in Fall 2010. This data point does not include early transfers to senior colleges within the system who leave without finishing a 2-year degree.

who manage the logistics of the CTL as well as support the faculty facilitators; some staff co-facilitate many of the seminars offered, but always as a support to a faculty member. Space is at a premium at Bradley, which is not usual for the urban setting. There is a room that was originally designated for the CTL when it was first established, with banks of computers and other technology conspicuously available because the initial grant that funded the CTL was targeted to technology. But this designated room is not near the Academic Affairs offices floor, nor is it adjacent to any of the staff. It is also used by other people and programs as needed, though it “belongs” to the CTL. When on a campus tour, the director pointed it out to me almost as an afterthought. There are more desirable meeting rooms next to the newly renovated library with spectacular city views that the CTL tries to book for their larger meetings and seminars above even their own designated space. Yet the lack of a physical space does not seem to detract from faculty participation. Reviewing the history of participation on the CTL website, the CTL has served anywhere from about 200 to over 400 faculty annually for over a decade. And most, if not all, new full-time hires for the last several years have participated in a new faculty orientation seminar put on by the CTL to help support acculturating to Bradley.

I interviewed three administrators and four faculty at Bradley. To preserve anonymity, I randomly assigned gender and used pseudonyms for all faculty: Andrew, Betty, Catherine and Dave. The administrators, also with randomly assigned gender and pseudonyms, are as follows in Table 2.

Table 2

Bradley Administrator Titles and Pseudonyms

Title	Name
President	Dr. Fred McMillan
Provost, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs	Tony
Associate Provost, Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs	Colleen

Campus culture. The overwhelming response—six out of seven interviews—to a question about the culture at Bradley specifically referenced the institutional mission. According to the campus website, Bradley’s mission is to serve their diverse student population: to help them succeed in the future. Colleen explained, “There’s a compelling quality to our students that for most of the faculty and staff translates into a passion. To try to do the work we all do as well as we possibly can because these students...need and deserve it.” According to Tony, newly hired faculty, many of whom have Ph. D.s, are called to work in the community college sector with Bradley’s specific student population. Additionally, the students are not viewed from a deficit model; instead, Colleen explained, “They’re such an amazing group that it’s really inspiring, it’s challenging, it’s both, so you want to make a difference, you want to help these students.” There seems to be a moral imperative at the center of the work at Bradley.

This feeling shared by all administrators interviewed was echoed by faculty. Andrew said, “So it is about the students’ success. I do believe that. I don’t think that that’s just something that’s said. I’ve seen it in action.” Catherine stated that being at Bradley meant “wanting to serve the needs of the students, being particularly sensitive to the challenges that students face, very caring.” She further believes that this care for students does drive some faculty to participate in CTL activities because Bradley culture dictates that instructors “want to bring to the table tools that they can use to help [our students] overcome a lot of these challenges.” There is an acknowledgement of challenge, but it is incumbent upon faculty to rise to that challenge. Dave, a veteran, had a slightly different spin: “It’s not easy teaching community college students who come from the city school system. So, anything that we can learn is beneficial. But I know some colleagues don’t feel that way.” Dave suggests being

mission-driven is not a universal feeling—that for some, teaching at Bradley is just a job. But that feeling seems to be the anomaly, not the norm.

Administrators and faculty report that Bradley is an innovative and experimental place, but that the dynamic environment can also be overwhelming. Patty described Bradley as “innovative, sort of experiential learning, in a way. And that’s baked into the history of the college.” Colleen shared that the college was founded as the experimental college of the university system, and it continues that legacy today with a focus on innovation and student-centeredness. Catherine described this same idea: “We’re not afraid to try new things, bring new ideas to the table.” But Tony disclosed that “the downside of all innovation is sometimes things get very, very fragmented and then we’re trying to pull things together.” That sense of fragmentation can cause additional stress to faculty. Dave suggested that “a lot of people are also, kind of, turned off to all of the things that are happening.” Andrew was a bit more diplomatic, weighing the plusses and minuses of innovation: “We’re not scared of anything. We’ll take on anything. There’s a lot of energy here...and I still...am excited by the campus, and I think that’s positive.” He further suggests that this energy makes it possible to continue a cycle of improvement and change. But Andrew also acknowledged, “Where I think we have challenges is that there’s sometimes a lack of a sense of cohesion.” There are many opportunities to try new things and space for creativity, but the constant cycle of change can also be demanding.

Financial conditions. Part of what has fueled the CTL since its inception has been grant money, and the various demands of specific grants may contribute to both the opportunity to engage in many different projects and the sense that a lot is always going on campus, mentioned by both administrators and faculty as indicative of campus culture. According to the CTL

website, Bradley has garnered support from multiple avenues out of the United States Department of Education, including Title III, Title V, and the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE). The institution has also garnered support from other sources such as the Ford Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Finally, Bradley has received significant support from state and university system grants to help start and sustain various projects on campus.

Tony, then an associate dean, wrote the first grant that launched the CTL: a Title III grant that became the first of a round of Title V grants. Colleen explained, “Part of the grant was to form a Center for Excellence in Teaching with Technology, and so he had the money for that.” Bradley has a track record of being very successful with grants, and that success begets more grants. But Colleen explained Bradley’s success this way: “So that gives us the resources, having those funds doesn’t necessarily guarantee that you do anything productive, but it gives you the opportunity.” Bradley was able to leverage outside money to create and pilot technology-based teaching seminars that brought groups of 20 to 50 faculty together at first in the early years. Dave said that he was really attracted to the first seminars because he wanted to learn how to use all the new tools at his disposal; what impressed him is that the CTL taught instructors how to use those tools “in a rich environment of teaching and learning.” The seminars were primarily about pedagogy, couched as learning how to use new technology.

The CTL is not run solely on grant funding, though outside funding is significant. Tony explained, “We do a very mixed stream of funding sources...Lots and lots of grants...but we also use university money as well, college money and university money.” Colleen, who was the first CTL director, shared that “we had a vice president at that time who was really excited about what we were doing...he was able, in addition to the grant funds...he was able to respond to my

requests for institutional funding.” The CTL still subsists on various grants, especially for special projects, but institutional funding has grown and solidified over time.

The primary institutional financial commitment to the CTL is in personnel, not projects. Patty explained, “And I just think over time, they were very strategic about creating college-based roles versus using soft money to create positions to support specific grants.” Tony clarified that many of the six full-time staff members were originally hired with grant money and were focused on a particular project; now, the college has moved the staff off grants and made them non-grant, taxable employees. The institutional commitment to staffing the CTL seems to align with the vision of the center as people, not necessarily a place.

The first grant that Tony wrote to start the CTL built in release time for faculty participants as an incentive. Since Bradley is typically running multiple initiatives and projects simultaneously, time becomes an important commodity, particularly for full-time faculty, who are responsible for 27 teaching hours annually and still have an expectation to publish, according to the most recent employment contract. But release time is expensive, and the CTL is almost a victim of its own success. Because so many faculty participate annually in various seminars and activities, giving release time for participation was not sustainable. Colleen explained, “We’ve been able to do stipends, release back the leaders, but we did start with a release time model, which I think might have been helpful in getting started.” The stipends range from \$1500 to \$2500, depending on the duration (typically a year) and intensity of the work. Additionally, Tony mentioned another unintended consequence of the CTL’s success: “The more successful you are with grants and the more release time, the more faculty you’re pulling out of the class.” There is a commitment at Bradley to have full-time faculty in the classroom as much as possible,

so it's a delicate balance to reward them for outside work to improve their practice that also takes faculty away from students.

The faculty reported that the payment system that had been in place at Bradley seems to be in flux. Dave shared, "...Now there's issues with payment for these kinds of workshops. But [the administrators], I think, are working that out. So, I really do think they try their hardest to get money to faculty, which is of course...a very big draw." Andrew echoed that concern, stating, "Now due to all kinds of administrative stuff, I don't think the stipends are going to be growing as much anymore." According to Betty, there is some conflict with the university system guidelines and stipends, so she reported that the CTL is looking at a modified release time model—buying hours toward the annual teaching load—or somehow being paid out in nonteaching hours which are subject to some limitations. Additionally, Betty reported that faculty can also use money earned in a seminar or workshop toward buying materials to support the learning in the workshop instead of taking the cash as payment. The multiple funding streams give the CTL a lot of flexibility, but the down side is working within all the varying parameters of the funders for incentivizing faculty participation.

Faculty incentives to participate in CTL activities are not just monetary. Catherine explained, "They're internally driven to want to participate." Colleen suggested, "I think what people get out of it is the more intrinsic satisfaction." Part of what motivates faculty to participate, then, is an authentic desire to improve practice. Dave also appreciated that he walked away with tangible lesson plans and assignments that he still uses in his classroom today. The work in seminars tries to be pragmatic so that faculty have takeaways they can implement immediately. In addition to the longstanding expectation of service to the institution, there is also a new component to the tenure and promotion process: the demonstration of leadership.

Faculty work in CTL activities, depending on the level of engagement, can then fulfill part of the leadership and service expectations. Andrew mentioned that, in addition to stipends and release time, “also the recognition piece, which is not maybe quantifiable, but certainly has to be mentioned.” The CTL, then, can be a vehicle for faculty to pursue authentic motivation to improve practice, advance one’s career, and to make some additional money or teach fewer hours.

The relationship between administrators and faculty. Bradley Community College is situated in a community with a long tradition of organized labor. They had just settled tense and overdue contract negotiations when I made my site visits. Bradley is a big institution with a large faculty and staff, and some faculty reflexively see the administration as the antagonist, some will feel differently depending on the day, but Colleen explained, “There’s, I think, a large, substantial element of the faculty who are deeply engaged in how we do stuff better, and who see those of us in the administration who are trying to do that as partners and allies.” Catherine echoed this sentiment, suggesting that the relationship between the Bradley administration and faculty was a “partnership...I think the goals that the administration has mirrors the same goals and objectives that the faculty have.” The administrators summed up the relationship between administration and faculty as not antagonistic. Tony explained, “In general, there’s not an antagonistic us versus them that you can see in some places...I really don’t feel that that’s the relationship or the culture.” Patty, a relatively new employee of the college, said that historically there had been some more hostile chairpersons to the administration, but that didn’t seem to be the case now. There seems to be an atmosphere of mutual respect.

Both administrators and faculty report concern over faculty workload, which could strain the existing working relationship between the administration and faculty. Tony explained that

the tension over faculty workload is two-fold: 1. Community college faculty in the system have the same contract as their 4-year college colleagues but teach 27 hours versus 21 hours for 4-year college faculty, and both are responsible for publishing; and 2. Advisement has just been added as a responsibility for Bradley faculty, on top of their teaching load and publication responsibilities. He stated that faculty report, “You know, we’re expected to advise, we’re expected to do this, we’re expected to do that.” Andrew echoed this sentiment about advising, stating, “Well, this is what the administration wants us to do, so this is what we’re doing. And that leads to an immense amount of frustration on the part of the faculty.” Dave put it more bluntly, stating, “I think a lot of it has to do with the feeling of faculty that they are overworked...And you can sense the frustration of faculty with, ‘You’re asking me to do too much.’” Patty described Bradley as having a culture of high expectations of its faculty, but those demands may hit a tipping point.

Administrators believe that faculty are critical for institutional change, which may be why faculty are tasked with so much. Tony described faculty as the heart of Academic Affairs, and Colleen went further, suggesting that it was the administration’s job to give faculty the opportunity to bring their vast knowledge and expertise to bear in a community context to leverage change through activities in the CTL. She explained, “If you really want change, you’ve got to do this and it’s got to be faculty-led...but you also need a foundation that allows for continuity, building and supporting faculty, [staff] doing the things that faculty might not want to do.” The guiding principles of the CTL include “respect faculty knowledge” and “respect faculty time.” Faculty didn’t explicitly state their central role in institutional change as the administrators did, but they did suggest their own power and influence. Betty stated, “So I think our voice, our experience...are strong, and it’s being received, and it’s being heard in terms

of designing and crafting and implementing professional development for other people.”

Catherine saw the impact of faculty a little differently, both inside and outside of the CTL:

You know, faculty themselves in applying for grants, for example, have been the impetus behind a new seminar, new workshop suddenly popping up. You know, in terms of faculty research, for example, suddenly that has been sort of the reason why a workshop has suddenly popped up, and we’re talking about even faculty getting together, sharing their own ideas based on research, and supporting each other in the work that they do has also had an impact then on teaching styles and things to consider.

Administrators and faculty see the faculty as change agents, and the CTL is one avenue to facilitate institutional change.

The role of administrative and faculty leadership. Tony, a key member of the leadership team for the CTL, began as a faculty member at Bradley. His responses to my interview questions were the most in line with the faculty responses when compared to other administrators; he appears to be an important piece of institutional memory. Tony began as faculty, moved to chair of his department, then assistant dean, moving up the ladder to finally land as provost. When asked about the history of faculty development at Bradley, Colleen explained, “Tony is central to the whole story. He wrote that initial grant, and his vision has guided and supported development of the center all the way along... he... would really like to be leading professional development all the time.” The sense that Tony is still really connected to faculty and that his faculty sensibility serves him in his current position was also stated by Dave: “And you know, Tony is a [humanities] person. That means a lot. So, that was a very wise move, I think it was on the president’s part.” Tony seems to have functioned as a kind of shepherd of the CTL and faculty development initiatives on campus, lending his faculty credibility to the venture.

In addition to Tony, one of the six CTL staff members began her career as a Bradley faculty member and transitioned to being CTL staff. According to Andrew, that strong faculty connection makes Linda particularly effective. He explained,

The strange thing is that although she works for the CTL now, Linda Jones used to be faculty, and she used to lead a lot of the seminars at the CTL, and I think that's possibly how she ended up transitioning to be at the CTL. And I found her to be extremely supportive, even as a seminar leader and fellow faculty. The first seminar that I ever did, she was one of the leaders, and she provided such a great environment for just fostering learning. That was such a positive experience that I kept going back... Whether she will acknowledge that or not, I don't know, but she's actually played a significant role, in terms of my own growth.

Faculty leadership, even in the guise of administration and staff, has been critical for the validity of the CTL.

Administrators and faculty also believe that presidential support is important for the CTL to thrive. Colleen described the president as “very, very supportive” but also “very demanding.” The result of this combination of support and the need for results was summed up by Colleen this way: “And so he has pushed us all, particularly around the impact on students.” Tony further explained how the president shored up institutional support for the CTL: “Ultimately, he approved the fact that we get lines in there [the budget] and actual staff, that's all his approval and support. Also, he believes very deeply in the importance and centrality of faculty.” Dave also praised the president, acknowledging his commitment to students as well: “The president is amazing. I mean, there are some people who don't think so, but I just think he has the students at heart and wants to do the best for them... And he is totally supportive of the CTL.” Support for the CTL starts at the top, and that support has helped make it viable over time.

But the CTL also needs support and engagement from faculty to continue to facilitate institutional change. Administrators believe that the CTL is a place to build capacity, deliberately including leadership development, in the faculty. Patty explained that about half of

the full-time faculty participate in CTL seminars and other activities annually, and that faculty members are critical co-leaders in that work. Further, she clarified, “Because we always have co-leaders as faculty leaders, and it is part of the reward structure for them, as service, and...they write about that in their annual reviews.” In addition to giving faculty opportunities to earn service credit, faculty leaders are given release time to facilitate seminars, but also to be participants in other seminars and activities. The release time is an opportunity to lead but also to develop one’s skills and practice further. Tony explained that he and his administrative colleagues are looking for opportunities to tap senior professors—those who have already earned tenure—to take on leadership responsibilities and rejuvenate their practice. He stated,

For senior people, we don’t just ask them to do anything. We’ve seen what they’ve been involved in, what their interest is, and we try to offer them something that’s more in their leadership capacity, maybe leading a seminar in an area that we know they’re interested in.

The mission statement of the CTL focuses on pedagogy and colleague interaction, but there is a line that includes “building capacities across the college” for faculty and students, though leadership development is not mentioned explicitly. However, faculty seem to understand that leadership development is a part of the CTL’s work. Betty described it as “the administration leveraging my strengths, I guess, and what I’m doing as appropriate to kind of help the college achieve its goals and further its strategic plan.” Betty noted that she was a known quantity to the administration, akin to what Tony said about leveraging the talents of senior faculty. There is no formal process to apply to be a faculty leader in the CTL.

Faculty believe that the process for finding and grooming potential faculty facilitators is not equitable, particularly when leadership is a key component of promotion and tenure. Dave presented the challenge this way:

And I think this particular term, the question of leadership came up in a couple of decisions that were made...Faculty are going, 'What the heck is leadership? I didn't get it because I didn't show leadership—what does that mean?' So I think faculty can be turned off to that, if they perceive that they are not being treated fairly.

Andrew was more specific about the role that the CTL can play in supporting faculty leadership: "Now, leading a CTL seminar would be a typical type of leadership, but if you are never being approached...For me, I'm big on equity. That means that everybody is not getting the same shot at being part of the thing." He speculated that it is more expedient for the CTL to rely on known faculty facilitators who already understand how things work than it is to train new faculty. But as leadership becomes more important to the promotion and tenure process, other faculty, particularly newer faculty, will need access to opportunities to lead. Catherine mentioned that the process to select facilitators "could definitely be clearer," but she also understood the challenge of faculty having so many opportunities to engage—how does one prioritize? Further, she said, "I think faculty...bring a lot to the table. Personally, I'd like for them to see themselves more in leadership roles...sometimes you want to see something, but perhaps you're the best teacher in terms of bringing it to the table." Both Catherine and Betty see it as incumbent on the faculty to distinguish themselves and advocate for leadership opportunities. Dave believed that the process to select facilitators for the CTL was probably top-down, "but I'm not exactly sure. Sometimes I question, as I said, why workshop leaders were chosen, what is their expertise." His understanding seems to support Andrew's idea that a lot of the same faculty are called upon to facilitate because they are well-known to the CTL. Dave would like to see more experienced and respected teachers leading seminars, "because we all know the wonderful teachers, I think we can learn from them...Those are the people I want to hear from. And everybody knows who

they are.” The current process for selecting faculty facilitators is opaque, which raises concerns about fairness and credibility.

The process of institutionalization. One defining idea at Bradley is the importance of integration—of the student experience, of roles and responsibilities across the college, of the CTL into the larger strategic initiatives of the college. Looking at the most updated organizational chart, the provost is responsible for the divisions of Academic and Student Affairs, two divisions that often are siloed at other institutions. Tony explained, “Over the past 4 or 5 years, we’ve been working on trying to get a much closer working relationship between the divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, so I have that responsibility as well.” He also has the Office of Institutional Research reporting to him directly. Tony’s role is to look holistically at all aspects of the student experience, including monitoring change and improvement through data analysis.

The other administrators in charge of the CTL also have duties that integrate multiple aspects of the institution. Patty explained, “My primary role is the center...And in some ways I would say, any research and publication on pedagogy...But as a dean position, my role is to support Academic Affairs and college-wide initiatives.” Colleen has a similar mixture of roles: “My role expanded then, so I have the CTL, I also oversee the First Year Experience... the strategic plan, institutional fundraising for academic projects, the President’s cabinet, and...last year they added in reforming the advisement system and our process there.” Tony summed up the challenge of integration: “As a leadership group, we’re trying to do that administratively and in many ways. It’s tough to integrate sometimes and synthesize at an institution and the bureaucracy in a huge place.” Andrew also shared that alignment had been a priority in the recent past, particularly of the divisions of Academic and Student Affairs. He, too, saw the

challenge of integration: “But I think that ultimately, even though we’re all interested in student success, it’s very difficult to move such a massive ship or whatever you want to call it, in a different direction.” The administration at Bradley is actively trying to integrate roles and responsibilities, particularly across Academic and Student Affairs, to create a more unified and meaningful experience for students; part of this larger alignment is the CTL. However, making a substantive organizational change is not easy in a large institution, and takes time to coalesce.

Both administrators and faculty believe that faculty development, specifically the work and activities of the CTL, is an integral part of the institution. The draft of the 2016-2017 strategic plan names the CTL explicitly as a primary vehicle for engaging and supporting faculty as they move forward on college focus area goals, such as the First Year Experience, advisement, global learning, and outcomes assessment. Colleen explained that the CTL “is integrated into the thinking of the institution...how we achieve what we do, how we achieve any kind of change...Most efforts at the college in some way reach out to and engage the CTL as part of the process.” Further, Tony shared, “I think we were able to grow the center because it was not this thing off to the side. It was very much part of the division’s goals.” Dave articulated why the CTL is a successful vehicle for change: “The whole collaborative nature of the particular session that I was in was amazing.” The ability to get faculty together to work across disciplines to wrestle with new ideas and institutional challenges seems to be effective at facilitating growth and change. Faculty value collaboration and community. Andrew shared a defining experience:

We were in a seminar, and my colleague and I, and another colleague, and started to realize that even though this person was in STEM and we were in [social sciences], we had such similarities in our work or our approach and ended up writing a cross-disciplinary article about what we were doing. So, you’re talking about conferences, presentations, publications are coming out of that, a way more feeling of community, that you are actually part of something bigger, connections where you can lean on other faculty, colleagues to ask questions, even commiserations that you could have.

Andrew not only learned from his work in the seminar but forged important connections to create a sense of community, both in a larger academic sense, but also in a more personal sense, that built his sense of agency.

Administrators claim that the activities of the CTL were designed specifically as opt-in and sustained over time. The employment contract stipulates that all professional development opportunities are voluntary. Tony echoed this fact, stating that “this is not where you go to get fixed, and also personnel and budget matter and reappointments, we also keep that a little bit separate.” Even though faculty don’t have to participate, other than the new faculty seminar, the CTL runs about 12 to 15 seminars annually. Colleen, who was the first full-time CTL director, explained that when the CTL first started, the initial seminar had good word-of-mouth, so other faculty were interested in participating. Colleen had a specific vision in mind of what the CTL should look like when it started:

I want this to be a process where people have to apply, I want it to be an open call. That you have to want to do this, not you’re being told to do it, and a semester is not enough. It has to be a more sustained process, something where people have time to learn and apply what they’re learning and see what it means and think about it and then try more things.

Tony allowed her to try this approach, it worked, and from that point on, all CTL activities and seminars were opt-in and sustained over time, typically a year.

Administrators and faculty report that the CTL has evolved over time to be not just a support for individual faculty, but a place where faculty have multiple opportunities to engage with the strategic initiatives of the college. Colleen explained that “part of what we try to balance...is how do you both...build effective programs that can address institutional priorities, strategic priorities, but also be open to faculty initiative around projects that like ‘oh, that’s cool.’” Patty illustrated how the CTL meshes its role as a faculty support and forwarding

strategic initiatives by asking, “How are you doing [global learning] in your classroom? What does assignment development look like? How are we supporting that?” The faculty also saw the shift at the CTL from more individual work to supporting larger institutional goals. Betty described it as a shift from “an individual faculty focus to now program focus,” though individual faculty support still exists. She also mentioned the inclusion of staff from Student Affairs into some of the seminars dealing with the First Year Experience to collaborate with faculty to construct a more seamless experience for students. Andrew noticed that

it’s grown over time in a sense, not just in terms of the number of offerings, but also in terms of the sophistication of those offerings, as opposed to just how to teach an on-line class, which is obviously important, moving more to focusing on the [student learning outcomes], and how to shape a course around those or things of that nature.

Andrew sees a deliberate shift toward larger institutional priorities. Finally, Dave couched his observations of the CTL in the idea of utility: “The CTL faculty are just so accommodating and open and willing to bend over backward to make their courses useful for you.” What is useful will include individual support but may also include how to implement some of the institutional goals successfully into one’s classroom.

Focus on pedagogy. Bradley prioritizes good teaching. While this idea may seem obvious in a community college whose sector mission is to teach, Bradley makes the centrality of classroom practice explicit. In the employment contract, faculty are to be evaluated on total academic performance, but “with special attention to teaching effectiveness,” and the first item in a nine-item list of possible elements of academic performance is “classroom instruction and related activities.” The CTL mission statement states that leveraging the talent of the Bradley faculty and practitioners across the country, the CTL provides opportunities for development of

“effective, student-centered pedagogies and scholarly approaches to teaching.” In the CTL’s guiding professional development principles, one states, “Focus on the classroom.”

Both administrators and faculty believe that CTL faculty development activities are grounded in faculty-centric inquiry around teaching practices. Patty described the central challenge of Bradley professors as “How do I address and differentiate for the range of students that I have here, that is much broader and wider than it is at other institutions?” Colleen explained the intention behind the design of seminars, one of the core activities offered by the CTL:

It isn’t there to give [faculty] “the answers” but is there to create a context for them to investigate or engage in an inquiry into their own experience informed by multiple layers of input from others, both within the room and beyond...To use their classrooms as laboratories, to better understand how learning happens and what the implications were for their own practice.

Betty explained how this vision plays out in practice in a seminar. She stated that the fall semester is the time to explore best practices around the seminar topic and discuss with the other participants, usually around 25, from different disciplines across the campus. The next phase, after learning more about the research around the topic, is to discuss current classroom practices and how one might integrate some of the ideas they’ve discussed into their classrooms. By the end of fall, participants have a plan for change; they will pilot prompts and assignments with colleagues in the seminar and solicit their input. In the spring semester, they implement their new activities, assess the results, bring the results back to the group, and then individually and collectively reflect on the change—what are the next steps? Betty recapped the process by stating,

You have an entire year and you’re meeting with people in a seminar that all you’re doing is focusing on your classroom and reflecting on that and asking questions about it and having other people ask you about it. I mean, you can’t get more intentional than that in terms of strengthening your practice, your

pedagogy...The center has really impacted my teaching and learning and what I do in the classroom. I think I've become a more reflective practitioner.

Andrew said that he also believed that the design of CTL seminars as described by Betty was effective; it gives faculty meaningful time to learn, pilot, and reflect. However, he did point out a potential conflict: "So are we meeting the need of faculty, or are people going to seminars because it's expected, from a tenure and promotion perspective, that you should attend something?" He questioned the motivation of faculty—will the seminar be as rich if faculty attend because they feel like they must instead of for an authentic desire to grow and improve?

Nevertheless, all four faculty believe that the CTL helped them become better classroom teachers. Andrew stated, "Most of what I've learned, in terms of being a college professor, has been on the back of all these things that I enrolled for at the center... You can actually evaluate your practice and hear from others." Betty, who was initially trained as a K-12 teacher, claimed, "I think who I am as a teacher today has been largely shaped by the CTL...being engaged...in the work of the center... has...opened up my eyes in terms of what we can do in a classroom to engage students." Finally, Dave shared how he was recently reflecting on a course he took in the early years of the CTL: "So incredibly helpful, and I enjoyed it. Learned a ton, learned a ton." If the central goal of any Center for Teaching and Learning is to improve instructor practice, Bradley's CTL seems to be meeting that goal.

Internal evaluation data from Bradley's CTL illustrates that improved student outcomes are also connected to CTL activities. Colleen explained that many of the grants Bradley has earned require outcomes reports on a regular basis. She and Patty gave me access to a recent report for a Career and Technical Education (CTE) grant focused on curricular revisions incorporating technology, and in targeted connected learning classes where faculty were trained and supported by the CTL, 84.7% of students completed the courses, compared to only 71.9% of

comparison courses. Additionally, 69.5% of students in the courses taught by CTL-trained faculty passed, versus 60.1% of students in the comparison classes. I found similar patterns of improved student outcomes in courses taught by CTL-trained faculty vs. comparison courses in archived grant reports on the Office of Institutional Research website. While most of the archived data showed gains for students with instructors trained and supported by the CTL, both in retention and pass rates, one experimental quantitative literacy course revealed lower student pass rates in the class taught by the CTL-trained instructors. The revelation of both successes and failures lends credibility to the internal data reports. While the data are not conclusive, there seems to be a connection between faculty engaging in CTL activities and improving student outcomes. Faculty themselves report that the CTL has made them better teachers, and the available data seem to support that claim.

Case Study 2: Pomelo College

The size and scope of Pomelo College is hard to understand until seeing it in person. The college is made up of six separate campuses with more on the way, according to the 2016-2021 strategic plan. The individual campuses range in size from one large building serving about 1,500 students, to the largest campuses comprised of multiple buildings on several acres serving about 18,000 students. Pomelo serves a large, metropolitan area in the Southeast, but the campuses are spread out among suburban communities and the downtown core. The campuses are fifteen to twenty miles apart; it is nearly impossible to visit all of them in the same day. I visited four of the six campuses over two visits; I did not have the time to visit all six. I went to the largest campuses, where most of my interviews were clustered, and two of the smaller sites closest to where I was staying. The ethos of the college, stated in the strategic plan and corroborated by the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) directors, is to meet the students

where they are—hence the continuous cycle of building campuses to be closer to growing population centers in the region so that students don't have too far to travel to get to school. All the campuses have acres of parking lots in this part of the country where land is affordable and everyone drives.

Despite the size and scope of Pomelo, the campuses feel welcoming. Upon parking my rental car at one of the original and larger campuses, I easily found my way, first by looking at a strategically placed giant map at the edge of the lot, and then because of clear signage everywhere I went. The various campuses reveal their age by their design. The original campus feels like the late 1960s when it was built, with brick facades, lots of right angles, and open breezeways. The interiors of the older campuses feel very much like Bradley—warrens of classrooms and offices. The newer campuses are all glass and light, with open atriums and high ceilings. All the campuses have clear Pomelo branding: the same merchandise in the student stores, the same banners and flags with their distinctive logo and colors all over the campus, so you know you are at Pomelo. At newer campuses, the support systems for students—tutoring centers, computer labs and the library—are deliberately adjacent to the support systems for faculty—the Centers for Teaching and Learning and cubicles with computers for adjuncts—to illustrate the college commitment to learning for all.

Walking around the two largest campuses while school was in session, I saw first-hand the diversity of the Pomelo student body. I heard Spanish, French, Portuguese and Farsi being spoken. Pomelo's student body of approximately 45,000 students is about 35% Latino, 15% African-American, 5% Asian, 30% White, and 15% other. About 40% of Pomelo students receive Pell grants, one marker of low income. According to IPEDS data published on the Office of Institutional Research website, 43% of first-time, full-time Pomelo students graduate (transfer,

complete a certificate, complete an A.A. or A.S. degree) within 3 years, compared to 29% nationally. Full-time students make up only about 36% of Pomelo's student body; the rest of the students attend part-time. Nevertheless, Pomelo is clearly closing achievement gaps—according to IPEDS completion data (including transfer, certificates and 2-year degrees) for Pomelo, of 10,000 completions in 2016, 30% were earned by Latino, 15% by African-American, 6% by Asian, and 38% by White students, closely approximating their relative percentage of the overall student body.

There are approximately 1,650 faculty and over 2,000 staff members serving the Pomelo community across all campuses. Full-time faculty comprise about 33% of the faculty, with part-time faculty making up the remaining 67%, slightly below the national average of 69% adjunct (The Century Foundation, 2013). What is astonishing about Pomelo is the rate of faculty participation in various institutionally-sponsored faculty development activities. According to the faculty development division's most recent annual report, just over 1,000 faculty members (unduplicated head count)—39% tenured or tenure-track, 51% part-timer, and about 10% annually appointed—participated in faculty development activities in 2015-2016. This high rate of participation—almost 2/3 of the entire faculty—has been replicated year after year for some time.

Each Pomelo campus has its own CTL by design. The CTL staff—ranging from one staff member to three or four, depending on the size of the campus and the size of the CTL—are available for drop-in visits from faculty from 8:00-6:00 every school day. Additionally, CTL staff support faculty facilitators as they design and implement workshops and seminars, including handling the logistics of the activity. The CTL staff are highly trained and specialized; for example, two I met had Ph. D.s—one in Curriculum and Instruction and the other in Higher

Education Administration. Unlike smaller institutions, the CTL directors do not work directly with the faculty as consultants or workshop facilitators; they are administrators to whom the CTL staff report and who work with deans and other higher-level administrators to support strategic initiatives and faculty needs. Not every campus has a CTL director; smaller campuses are clustered together under the leadership of one director. CTL staff work directly with faculty. Each CTL has banks of computers for faculty, particularly adjuncts, to use. There is also collaboration space (both open in a larger space and individual conference rooms) in one of the larger CTLs at Pomelo. Additionally, in a recent redesign, open office space for adjuncts was included; in a separate, quiet room, part-time faculty can use any open cubicle, which includes a phone, computer workspace, and extra chairs to meet with students. The prevailing idea is to make the CTL a place where a faculty member could come to get some support—for instruction, for technology, for social interaction, or just for some quiet work time in a comfortable, professional space.

I interviewed six administrators, one CTL staff member, and four faculty at Pomelo. To preserve anonymity, I randomly assigned gender and used pseudonyms for all faculty: Mario, Sue, Kevin and Clara. The administrators and staff, also randomly assigned gender and with pseudonyms, are as follows in Table 3.

Table 3

Pomelo Administrator Titles and Pseudonyms

Title	Name
President	Dr. Sandra Campbell
Vice President, Academic Affairs and Planning	Jim
Assistant Vice President of Teaching and Learning	Gwen
Tenure Eligibility Program (TEP) Director	Fiona
CTL Director 1	Sean
CTL Director 2	Steven
CTL Director 3	Dawn

I also spoke informally with four additional CTL staff members as I was getting to know Pomelo on my first visit. I learned from them that the CTL directors were not faculty-facing (that is, working directly with faculty), and then included an additional formal interview with a CTL staff member on my second visit to help further understand the faculty—and staff—perspective.

Campus culture. Because Pomelo is such a large institution, defining campus culture was complex for faculty and staff. Faculty members and Suzanne first launched into a discussion of their home campuses when asked about culture, with a discussion of the underlying Pomelo culture coming after a probing question. Each campus has a full complement of disciplines, but each campus has a “flavor” that reflects the special programs housed on those campuses (e.g., Edge is the “artsy” humanities-heavy campus and Webber houses extensive STEM and Career Technical Education [CTE] opportunities). Students have access to classes and programs on all campuses but tend to gravitate to the campus closest to home. The campus flavor therefore is also dictated by the student populations on campus as well as by the leadership style of each campus president. Administrators beyond CTL directors focused on the overarching Pomelo culture. Even though there is variation across campuses, there is a clear Pomelo culture.

According to administrators and faculty, Pomelo is a learning-centered institution. Pomelo’s vision statement, a complement to the mission, explicitly describes Pomelo as a “learning college.” Faculty tended to describe “learning-centered” as student-focused, but they are synonymous ideas. Dr. Campbell, who was at the forefront of building the current Pomelo culture, explained,

At the core, we like to say that we're learning-centered... When we write the budget, the preamble to the budget is always, "How does this contribute to learning?"...When I evaluate senior staff, the core question they're going to get is, "Tell me how your organization's going to add value to student learning next year."...We still ask the two big questions: How does this improve learning? How will we know? That's important to us.

Kevin echoed Dr. Campbell, stating, "I think the umbrella to the culture is that we're a learning-centered institution. I think underneath that is this idea that we need to be reflective practitioners." Pomelo's concept of learning-centeredness keeps students at the center of the work, and the need for faculty, staff and administrator reflection to facilitate improvement to that end. Gwen further clarified, "We're always in pursuit of doing better for our students. And to do better for our students means...better support of our faculty and staff. Because that's how students are served: not by organizations, but by people." Faculty need to be supported and equipped to do the heavy lifting with students in the classroom to support student learning. Suzanne explained the faculty-student connection this way: "The fact that we are student-driven is definitely something that always has to be at the front of what we're doing, whether...directly Pomelo students or...faculty, who are then being developed to work with students in a certain way." Mario distilled the Pomelo culture down to its essence: "We are working for the success of the students. As simple as that." Pomelo is not just student-centered; it's student success-centered, which thereby relies on faculty and staff expertise.

Another important facet of Pomelo culture is faculty development itself. In the 2016-2022 strategic plan, several initiatives—including building on-line course capacity, increasing student success in the most popular, high-enrollment courses, and improving adjunct onboarding—explicitly reference professional development (for faculty and staff) as the method to achieve the stated goals. According to administrators and faculty, faculty development is ingrained in Pomelo's culture. Kevin explained, "Our faculty development program...lays the

foundation for the culture here, and also articulates the expectations for faculty...A culture of constantly evaluating the efficacy of what we're doing in the classroom, and how to do that in a formal way." Sean went even further, stating that "faculty development is baked right into the culture here...There really aren't major initiatives that happen at the college without us being a part of supporting it." The faculty development division is also critical for facilitating strategic initiatives on campus as stated in the strategic plan. Gwen described a larger culture of development beyond just the boundaries of the faculty development division:

It's that faculty development happens in division meetings, it happens in courses and programs that we offer, it happens in initiatives because people want to learn more about work that's happening. We look at literature, we do surveys, we learn from data, our own and others'. So I would say the strongest thing would be the larger culture of development, and that it's not just one person, one place, one thing.

Faculty development is cultural; it's not dependent on any one person or even on the division but is instead of way of doing business at Pomelo. And this culture started with a small group of faculty before Dr. Campbell's tenure. She described how a group of faculty—some of whom have retired, some who are still teaching—started exploring essential questions about teaching and learning, and how she responded when hired:

Then there was this competing culture, sort of at the edge of the institution, started from these campus conversations using soft money from...DOE and others to ask questions about teaching, learning, student outcomes, authentic assessment, active learning pedagogies, all those kinds of things, and they were asking the right questions: 'Can't we get better results?' My job, when I came, was to say, 'I need to move the fringe culture into the center of the college.'

While Dr. Campbell helped institutionalize the idea and approach of faculty development, the focus on learning started with a small group of faculty who were then empowered to move their ideas to the center of Pomelo's institutional culture.

The final key component of Pomelo's culture as reported by administrators and faculty is collaboration, and, by extension, collegiality. The mission statement of Pomelo focuses on "learning in a collaborative culture." Sue mentioned that "the college does a lot of things to try to bring the college together, the faculty together with the administration and so forth." Steven went further, stating, "Collegewide culture is...deeply collaborative and it's incredibly collegial. It feels like people really do care about being kind to one another, and that's where the bar is set at being collegial." The value of collaboration also shapes leadership style to a certain extent, particularly in the faculty development division among Jim, Gwen, Fiona, the CTL directors, the CTL staff and the faculty facilitators. Dawn explained,

I would absolutely agree with the collaborative focus, the culture for the college, but I believe also on campuses is it's an expectation, it's not a choice, but for very good reasons...What happens, though, is that things move slower, but they're always better...because you're including different voices and you're putting brains together that would naturally be in one brain and...[the product] feels much better on the end.

Dawn seems to be describing constructivist leadership, where members of an organization in community co-construct products and programs, and where everyone in the community is seen as an equal member (Lambert, 1995). As Dawn reports, their model of constructivist leadership is not expedient, but it does lead to exceptional outcomes, and it embodies the cultural values of collaboration and collegiality. Gwen described her division's constructivist leadership tendencies this way: "We are collaborative, to the point where some of our consultants who have worked with us over time have said that it takes us a while to make a decision, but...when we make it, we get it done faster." Pomelo's faculty development division leadership style is a natural outgrowth of its culture.

The relationship between administrators and faculty. The cultural values of collaboration and collegiality also describe the relationship between administrators and faculty.

Mario stated, “I would say it’s a very friendly relationship between the administration and faculty” and that “[administrators’] doors are always open.” Clara described the relationship this way: “[Administrators] genuinely care about what they do. And that they want to hear from others, they want to know about others, and that says a lot...personal connection is pretty much the characterization that I’m trying to get at.” Dr. Campbell substantiated the faculty observations: “I know I love [the faculty]. I think we have a wonderful partnership, a mutual regard. It is not political. It’s highly collaborative.” The sense of care demonstrated from the top down seems to resonate with faculty. But there is some concern around the level of care as well. Clara also shared, “But there are so many more surfaces where we are not doing enough caring. Like inclusion and diversity. And it’s not just with our students, but with our faculty and staff.” Though there is a strong relationship between the administrators and faculty, there appears to be unfinished work around issues of equity.

Administrators at Pomelo believe that leadership is distributed, which shapes the administrator-faculty relationship. The current Pomelo organizational chart is wide but not deep, graphically representing the distribution of leadership. The chart includes all the campus leadership as well as the college leadership. The size and scope of Pomelo almost necessitates this leadership style. Dr. Campbell explained,

One of the adjustments I’ve had to make is that their campus presidents and their dean are much more the expression of leadership that they relate to than me, and that’s healthy and...the way it ought to be, as long as we’re aligned as leaders and living what we say we care about.

The culture of collaboration and collegiality, which plays out in the administrator-faculty relationship, seems to support distributed leadership. Gwen clarified how these values, relationship and leadership style intertwine: “If you think about what we would hope we are in terms of being collaborative and having an investment in moving work forward by listening to

the people who are closest to the work, then you can't exist in hierarchy." Sean explained how his move from another institution to Pomelo revealed Pomelo's belief in distributed leadership: "I think that extends also to communication across roles at the college, because in my previous experience, it wasn't as appropriate for an assistant to be addressing a dean from a different department...and see here, that just doesn't exist." There is not a strong hierarchy at Pomelo, and administrators, generally, have an open-door policy and solicit input from faculty and staff in meaningful ways.

It is worth noting that Pomelo is in a right-to-work state. The faculty are organized, but they do not have the political clout that faculty do at Bradley. I asked Dr. Campbell if she thought a strong faculty union at Pomelo would affect engagement in faculty development; she answered that it would depend on the leadership of the union, and their relationship with her and other administrators at the college. In an informal conversation with two CTL staff members, I posed the same hypothetical question: do you think a strong faculty union would affect faculty development? The staff members thought so. One, recently relocated from a strong union state, was very emphatic that it would. The relationship between administrators and faculty is built on collaboration, collegiality, and both constructivist and distributed leadership. Underneath this positive and constructive relationship, it is unclear if administrators and faculty have an equal balance of power.

As an illustration of the unclear balance of power, faculty are concerned that administrators—deans and above—who come from the ranks of Pomelo faculty can no longer retain their tenure in their administrative position. Kevin explained the former process of building capacity in the faculty:

For the majority of my time here at Pomelo, most of the deans were pulled from the faculty pool. They were mostly tenured faculty who retained their tenure as

deans, and I think that was extremely important, because they understood the tenure process, they understood the importance of faculty development... We have recently shifted from that. I'm not exactly sure why the decision was made, but somewhere along the way, someone made a decision that the deans will no longer be able to retain their tenure, which dissuaded many faculty members from becoming administrators... I think that has negatively affected faculty development.

Promoting from within created a team of deans (many of whom may be promoted further) who really understood the position of faculty and the opportunities available at Pomelo. Mario also raised this concern, and explained, "But I think one of the main concerns about the tenure-track faculty is that you lost your tenure-track position and then administration, something happens, they have to let go, and...that's not going to be good for them." Administrators do not have the same job protections as faculty, and therefore giving up tenure is a real risk. Sue was also concerned about how this change came about: "But we were told that was going to happen, and we were not actually asked to vote on that...I'm not interested in being an administrator, but I think that is wrong." The relationship between administrators and faculty may be tested as fewer administrators come from within, and faculty are concerned about the recent policy change.

Financial conditions. Administrators report that faculty development at Pomelo was initially grant-funded, primarily from the U. S. Department of Education (DOE) Title III and Title V grants with some supplemental foundation funding. Fiona described her interest in participating in the first round of grant-funded faculty development: "Let me hone my skills, and I'll try this Title V or Title III project. They're giving us some money, and I might as well do it, and try this thing called action research." She explained how she had been teaching for several years but felt "stale;" she was "feeling like I needed to refresh my skills. So that was all volunteer, and you got a little money for doing it." Fiona was driven by an authentic desire to improve her practice and appreciated getting paid for her work. She summed up the power of

external funding: “And that’s the benefit of the title grants is that you get the first adopters, and you get the people who are really interested.” Utilizing outside resources at first builds a community of practitioners authentically interested in their own growth and development. It allows the institution to gauge interest and outcomes without risking core resources.

However, Pomelo no longer relies on grants to fund significant portions of its faculty development program, including the Tenure Eligibility Program (TEP)—essentially a faculty orientation program that morphed into a formal induction program—and other CTL-based activities. Gwen explained, “It started with a lot of large grants and then it slowly became institutionalized and now it’s at scale. That took us about 20 years, 25 years, to build.” Over many years—and with stable and singularly-focused leadership—the institution has made a significant investment in faculty development. Dr. Campbell explained that the way she initially legitimized the fringe group of faculty focusing on teaching and learning when she arrived was by moving their work from “soft money” to “hard money.” She clarified, “And while there’s still grant money going into those things, we just pulled all that into the core budget and said this is an essential investment and not at risk.” Faculty, staff and administrators continue to write grants for special projects, but Dr. Campbell believes grant-funded work should be experiments. Academic support, which includes all CTL activities, including TEP, is the second largest line-item in Pomelo’s 2017-2018 budget after instruction. Dr. Campbell said, “You have to think of everything from instructional designers to the faculty development staff as a part of the core teaching and learning team. They’re not extra.” The bulk of the funding allotted to academic support in the current budget is allocated to personnel. Finally, Gwen summed up Pomelo’s approach to institutional funding: “But if your main investment is in your people, then you have to think about how you manage that investment...and we would say...employee development is

one of those main ways...And that that investment pays off with students.” According to administrators, the investment in the growth and development of faculty (and staff) is an investment in student success.

Administrators and faculty report that the financial incentives of release time and stipends are used to encourage faculty participation. Release time is offered to faculty facilitators, who partner with the CTL staff to be available for drop-ins as well as to develop and deliver seminars and workshops for faculty. Sean explained, “I think I heard 25 or 27 faculty fellows who are on release to work with us in some capacity...because we’re not doing our work without them. The deans support that by giving them release time, so everybody’s in partnership.” Faculty facilitators serve as critical mediators between faculty and the administration and staff of the faculty development division as well as the college. The primary incentive for the majority of faculty is a faculty incentive program—a stipend. According to the faculty development website, over a 2-year period, faculty can take a variety of workshops and seminars, though they must take a certain number of hours focused on pedagogy, and if they accumulate a minimum of 25 hours, they will earn \$750; if they accumulate a minimum of 50 hours, they can earn \$1500. New for the next 2-year cycle is a high-impact practices component, which can be done in addition to the current plan. For an extra \$1000 over the 2-year period, faculty can plan to implement and document the implementation of a core Pomelo high-impact practice, such as active learning. The extra money is compelling. Clara explained, “From my colleagues...I see that there is a need...just trying to make sure that they accumulate a certain amount [of hours] to ensure that they’re able to get this certain amount of money.” Adjuncts do not have access to the standard faculty incentive plan, but there is a special program for part-time instructors called associate faculty status. Adjuncts must complete 60 hours of faculty development (workshops

and seminars), after which they may apply for associate faculty status, which will increase their hourly salary. They must take a seminar that is for new faculty that focuses on pedagogy and Pomelo culture for half of their original hourly requirement. To keep their larger salary under associate faculty status, adjuncts must take 20 hours of faculty development in each subsequent year after the initial reward. Suzanne noted that for adjuncts in particular, “it’s not necessarily the amount of money because they are grateful to have the opportunity to get more money, and they see it as part of their long-term building.” Faculty development is also a way for adjuncts to build a career at Pomelo.

While the response to the stipend is generally positive—Mario reported that “it’s better than nothing”—there may be other ways to entice and compensate faculty participation. Sue thought a more permanent salary increase would be better than a stipend: “Instead of giving you a lump amount or something like that, just raise your pay level, an additional pay level...I think that’s a better incentive than cash.” Additionally, Kevin voiced some concern about meeting the needs of adjuncts: “For part-time faculty, I think we can do a better job of incentivizing professional development. We do a good job, but, considering their time restraints and financial situation sometimes, it’s difficult to offer things at times they’re available.” Meeting the needs of part-time faculty is a goal at Pomelo—it’s explicitly stated in the strategic plan. But working around the complex constraints of part-timers is proving to be a challenge.

Faculty believe that there are also non-monetary incentives for participating in faculty development. In the Pomelo faculty contract, part of a full-time faculty member’s assignment is ten hours of service to the college. Kevin explained that while governance or committee work qualifies, “I think a lot of people do some professional development for those ten service hours.” Further, he shared, “When I was a part-time faculty member...professional development was

seen by that community as a way to establish yourself at the institution.” Participation in faculty development is a way to meet the expected service requirements as well as to distinguish oneself, especially for part-timers. Suzanne explained another reason why some faculty participate: “A lot of our faculty members just like to learn, and so they just come and hang out with us, and...sometimes it’s not always tied to [money].” Clara echoed this sentiment, sharing some reflections of faculty who have taken seminars and workshops with her:

So it’s more just having that discourse with others and for them to see that it’s not just about the money, it’s about what you’re seeing from your students, and how you can reap a lot from just seeing that your students are growing.

The intrinsic motivation of faculty to participate in faculty development seems to be an outgrowth of the learning-centered, student-focused culture as well, though the financial compensation is welcomed.

The role of administrative and faculty leadership. Like Tony at Bradley, some key administrative personnel came from the ranks from faculty at Pomelo. Sean explained, “A lot of our administration has come from faculty lines. My leader, Gwen; her leader, Jim; our V.P.; Fiona, who leads the TEP, is a faculty member on full release.” Sean believes building leadership capacity in the faculty has been “a really neat way that we’ve grown up, and I think that helps with our faculty-administration relationships.” Sean goes on to say that once faculty have been in staff or administrative roles long enough, they often lose their faculty credibility. Nevertheless, the current group of administrators has not just institutional memory but also a keen sense of what it means to be a faculty member. Gwen describes her journey to administration this way:

I was about four and a half years as a part-time faculty. I was about a decade as a full-time faculty. I was a program chair for much of that time. And then I ended up in administration through a series of events...I wouldn’t say that at any point at that time I said I want to be an assistant vice president. I was just kind of called to

work, that called me to other work...I think that it's all in who you talk to...we are all standing on really tall shoulders.

Gwen demurs and gives credit to the pioneer faculty who began the teaching and learning conversation before Dr. Campbell's arrival, but her positive influence, as well as Jim's, came up in six of my interviews with administrators, faculty and staff. Additionally, some of the CTL staff began their careers at Pomelo as faculty, and the staff of the TEP are all still full-time faculty on release. Faculty experience seems to be an asset for administrators and staff at Pomelo.

According to administrators and faculty, the support of the president has also been critical. Her primary role seems to be as a model of what a Pomelo educator should be. Clara explained, "We really are earnest about caring for others. And I see this with our college president." Further, Kevin shared, "She's a great storyteller... I think most of our faculty are moved into areas like learning about what it means to be a learning-centered institution and participating in these conversations because she is so inspiring." It is no small feat for the president to have such an impact in a large and distributed organization. Sean credits her genuine interest in faculty and their development: "The fact that you can speak fluidly with our college president about...faculty development...speaks volumes to how we're supported and how we're seen at the institution...She sees the way that we can positively impact the organization." Dr. Campbell saw an authentic faculty community of practice examining teaching and learning existing on the fringe of Pomelo when she arrived, and she moved them to the center of the college.

While Dr. Campbell's influence is significant, administrators, faculty and staff believe that deans are important intermediaries to help connect faculty to faculty development opportunities. Dawn explained how deans function at her site:

The deans that we have on this campus are probably the biggest cheerleaders that I could ask for for professional development. I'm very fortunate in that I've been able to cultivate a relationship with each of them individually; I meet with them annually or more than that. We have discussions about their strategic plans, we talk about what's happening in faculty development. They personally refer people to me, they refer them to the center.

The CTL directors each made it clear that faculty development work is not related to evaluation in any way. They are very careful about keeping those realms separate so that the CTLs are purely for support. That separation allows deans to connect both faculty to the CTL and CTL administrators and staff to faculty who might be effective facilitators. Deans are like matchmakers. Clara further explained her close connection to her dean: "She understands. There's no judgment there. And she understands that we all have our flaws...she really appreciates...her faculty." Deans can leverage that relationship to help develop their faculty, as Kevin clarified: "I think the deans were a big proponent of pushing faculty into, 'Where can you grow? How can you expand?'" Suzanne noted that deans can also connect faculty to support the faculty might need or that might help further their career "because people don't see their dean is attacking them when the dean is like, 'There is this opportunity, maybe you want to go do this to... fill this part of your professional plan.'" She further clarified that being encouraged by one's dean doesn't lead to faculty resistance; it's just how many connections to the CTL are made.

Despite the influence of administrators on faculty development, administrators and faculty believe that faculty leadership is valued by the institution, and that faculty leadership has been elicited and supported historically. Dr. Campbell suggested that many other institutions of higher education, especially community colleges, see faculty as either "a kind of nuisance or a problem to be solved or a constituent to be won over somehow" as they think about the future of higher education. She believes they've got it wrong, and said, "It's really important for the

organization genuinely, truly from top to bottom, to understand the faculty are the solution. Whatever the problem may be, if it doesn't get solved by faculty, it's not going to get solved." Faculty tend to outlast administrators, and they have the power to implement or reject change within the walls of their classrooms. Any significant change led by faculty then has a chance to be institutionalized in ways that top-down initiatives might not. Dawn explained how faculty development initially came about at Pomelo: "It was faculty saying, you know what? We want to develop and get better at this. We want students to be successful." Sean explained how the faculty development division approaches faculty leadership: "Our faculty are our partners in our work, and we want to do what's right by them, because they're the reason why we're doing it." Clara validated Sean's sentiment, saying, "The director's always asking for our feedback...they're really intentional in terms of how they are structuring the committees and teams...we need to make sure we have faculty members' voice and say in terms of how we structure our PD classes." The administrators and staff directly responsible for the activities of the CTL work in partnership with faculty to assess needs and generate feedback for improvement. Additionally, Suzanne explained, "Because we really strongly believe in faculty...it's almost always a faculty person front-facing a course." While the CTL staff have a wide range of expertise, it is the faculty facilitators who lead workshops and seminars, while CTL staff take on a supporting role. The initial faculty development activity with which all new tenure-track faculty must engage is the Tenure Eligibility Program (TEP), and TEP was the first formal faculty development opportunity that became codified and institutionalized at Pomelo. TEP is faculty-designed, faculty-managed and faculty-led. Kevin explained, "I think faculty play a huge role. Most of our workshops are ideas from faculty...everyone on the TEP team is a

faculty member reassigned, even Fiona...by design.” Faculty are truly at the forefront of their own development, and their leadership is important.

Suzanne had a slightly different perspective on faculty leadership. She said, “The faculty are really who drives all of this, which I think can be really good and sometimes a problematic part of this.” Her concern centered around the idea that faculty don’t know what they don’t know; many community college faculty are content experts with little formal pedagogical training. They are not necessarily current with educational theory or practice, but there are many people working in the faculty development division that are experts, whose job is to keep current. But CTL administrators and staff don’t generate activities or workshops—the ideas must percolate from faculty. Suzanne explained, “I think sometimes our loving of clinging to everything that is purely collaborative, with everyone’s voice, is problematic, when there’s not always knowledge to back it up.” Her concern is also that as Pomelo gets larger, the “way of doing things” that worked in a more intimate setting might not work at scale.

The process of institutionalization. Administrators and faculty report that the current model of faculty development at Pomelo began as an authentic community of practice, then became an induction process, and then expanded into post-induction development opportunities based out of the CTLs. Gwen explained Pomelo’s evolution:

Most people, when they start out in development...would typically establish a CTL and say, ‘We’re going to start with the Center for Teaching and Learning,’ and everything is focused in on that center. We actually developed in reverse. We developed our faculty development model where it was a learning community first, and it became a place second.

The tenure eligibility process was designed by the faculty who were brought to the center of the college’s culture once Dr. Campbell was hired, and the faculty development division grew to support and then continue the work of the TEP, as well as to make similar development

activities available to contract and part-time faculty. The TEP is a formalized induction process that includes workshops and seminars to enculturate new faculty and develop their pedagogical expertise as they create a teaching portfolio. (It is the portfolio alone that is the artifact for evaluation for tenure. The TEP faculty development work is optional, though it is unlikely that a tenure-track faculty candidate would create a passing portfolio without support.) Further, Dr. Campbell clarified, “It’s all TEP on the front end and then there’s this whole universe of stuff...like [the faculty summer institute] and so on...that had to be pulled into a system.” The faculty development division now houses what used to be various independent projects into a cohesive whole that serves the entire faculty, from part-time to tenured full-time faculty, with over 450 distinct workshops and seminars in a 66-page catalog available.

Focus on pedagogy. When reviewing job postings for adjunct and full-time professors at Pomelo, it’s clear that teaching and learning is valued. An essential job function for adjuncts is to continue their professional development and growth; qualifications include a professional commitment to education and experience teaching in a community college; and knowledge, skills and abilities required include understanding learning-centered values, and the ability to teach both non-cognitive skills as well as discipline skills to a diverse group of learners. A full-time job posting included the above as well as experience in faculty or professional development to help support part-time faculty “in order to promote excellence and innovation in teaching, learning and technology.” A potential Pomelo faculty member can see the importance of teaching and learning before she even steps onto campus.

Additionally, the budget, mission and vision statements, and even the employee contract, explicitly support the idea that student learning is at the heart of Pomelo. One of the criteria for renewing a full-time instructor’s contract is “relevant student success results, as appropriate, for

the particular field of learning and the individual faculty member.” It’s not enough to simply talk about learning; evidence of student learning is important, too.

Administrators and faculty believe that teaching matters and improving classroom instruction is the foundation of the induction program and other faculty development opportunities. Dr. Campbell explained,

I think the conversation about what good pedagogy means, and what good practice is about, being a reflective practice...has been nourished for many years from great scholarship here. We’ve made time for it. We’ve had respected faculty leaders convene those conversations...That’s the real deal...That doesn’t happen overnight.

Pedagogy and improving practice is central. Gwen was more specific and stated that a content expert who can’t help students learn or a great teacher who isn’t a content expert won’t be successful because “quality teaching cannot be one without the other...But we have to create systems that value both of those things. And then resources to help people continue to develop in both of those things.” Fiona described what these values look like in practice. She explained that the first year of TEP focuses on two strands: getting to know one’s students well through a “deep needs assessment” and active learning strategies that can be deployed to address some of the student needs that arise. Faculty are asked “to stretch a little bit and learn.” And it seems to work. Sue said, “I actually credit being a successful teacher to what I learned at the TEP.” She went on to say two critical pieces of learning for her are that she needs to be flexible—“You’ve got to see where the students are coming from”—and that every student learns differently, but all students can learn. Mario said, “[TEP] does have its value.” Clara, after working with CTL staff and faculty, shared, “I need to really think about my own practice, I need to think about how I engage with students, and not be a hypocrite and to practice what I’m preaching to others.”

Faculty believe that the TEP and subsequent work in the CTL can improve teaching practice, which is a worthwhile pursuit.

Faculty also revealed some challenges they see in faculty development activities. Kevin mentioned that some of the faculty in the hard sciences “tend to be resistant to action research,” perhaps because it isn’t like a randomized controlled trial or similar. Mario corroborated this concern, stating that he didn’t see the technical aspects of his discipline in many workshops. Another concern, voiced by Sue, seems to be a misunderstanding of education jargon: “This is universal design for learning. What the hell does that mean?” This confusion seems to go back to Suzanne’s concern that some faculty are just not aware of current practices in education since that’s not their area of expertise. Finally, Sue also mentioned that some of her colleagues have said that “some of the seminars and trainings are downright sophomoric” with activities “with little colored pencils and complete this and cut and paste.” Active learning is a strategic initiative at Pomelo, and it could be that strategies different from lecture are suspect to some faculty. Suzanne also acknowledged that the quality of instruction in CTL activities can be uneven, especially as the faculty development division expands. Sean allowed me to review internal faculty evaluations of the two CTL offerings with the highest enrollment this academic year, and while faculty were generally happy, the quality of instruction does seem to vary. Most importantly, all respondents said that the seminars achieved their stated learning goals, and a typical response to a question about the most effective strategies in the seminar was “peer feedback and collaboration,” revealing the consistent Pomelo culture.

In short, Gwen’s own journey to her current position leading the faculty development division captures the centrality of pedagogy:

I came into that teaching position thinking I was a speech pathologist who was teaching. I left the 3-year process [TEP] as a teacher who was once a speech

pathologist. The change that I experienced, I then wanted to help other people experience, so I started saying, “How do I get involved in this thing called faculty development?”... And then that led to another thing... And now I’m growing a program. We’ve grown as a team dramatically in the last several years. If you take that as just one case... study of a person who didn’t really have a lot of teaching experience, came from industry, who was fostered by a person, then people, and then the system, and now I’m leading it. That is the story.

Case Study 3: High Hill College

High Hill College has a storied history. The first iteration of the college began over 100 years ago, and it has been a critical foundation for its community ever since. Located in a suburb of a large metropolitan area in the West, High Hill has been in its present location since the 1960s and was extensively renovated at the turn of the 21st century. Even though it is the oldest college in this study by far, it feels like a new institution.

High Hill is aptly named. As I exited the freeway to get to High Hill, I drove straight up. The main campus is perched on a sloping hill, with panoramic views of the local mountains. The campus has a wide-open feel; the buildings are not tall and are spread out over acres of lawns connected by meandering concrete and stone paths. All buildings were clearly marked, but I relied on my campus map to navigate. When I visited in January, they were having a heat wave; one improvement still to come is more shade on campus to give students, faculty and staff some respite from the sun. Because of the openness of the campus, even with classes in session, it felt peaceful, though the full parking lots, including desperate students circling for a space as the day progressed, revealed that the campus was alive with plenty of people.

Like Pomelo, High Hill is a multi-site campus. However, unlike Pomelo, two sites are distinctly satellites of the main campus, serving just under 5,000 students each, compared to closer to 15,000 students served on the main campus. The satellites do not have the full infrastructure available on the main campus, though the president suggested that he would like to

see the satellites become more stand-alone campuses fully serving their local communities. Like Pomelo, the satellites are far away from each other; it takes over half an hour to get to either satellite from the main campus.

I found lots of students clustered at the cafeteria and around the bookstore. While many students were hanging out with students of their own ethnic groups, I was struck by how many diverse groups of students were congregating together. The student body of High Hill is 60% Latino, 9% African-American, 6% Asian, 16% White, and 6% other. There are substantially more students of color being served by High Hill than the demographics of the service area would suggest. Additionally, 69% of High Hill students receive some form of financial aid. About 28% of High Hill students are full-time students, while the remaining 72% of students attend part-time. According to the Office of Institutional Research, High Hill's completion rate—including degrees and certificates earned—has increased well over 50% in the last decade, to a total of approximately 3,000 completions, about half degrees and half certificates, for the 2015-2016 academic year (the most recent data available). More impressive is the distribution of degrees and certificates. Of the total degrees earned, 60% were by Latinos, 6% by African-Americans, 7% by Asians, and 22% by white students. Of the total certificates earned, 57% were by Latinos, 7% by African-Americans, 6% by Asians, and 25% by white students. High Hill is closing the achievement gap.

There are approximately 950 total faculty across the three campuses at High Hill, about 210 of whom are full-time and 740 of whom are part-time. High Hill has a higher than average proportion of adjuncts: just under 78% part-timers versus the national average of 69% adjunct (The Century Foundation, 2013). There is a special on-line orientation for adjuncts that they must complete to help acculturate them to High Hill. The CTL director and the faculty senate

president are both concerned about the inclusion and support of adjuncts since they carry a substantial load of the instructional program.

The CTL at High Hill is located at the southern end of campus, at the bottom of the sloping hill. Unique to this study, the High Hill CTL is completely faculty-run: the director is a fully-released faculty member, not an administrator, and the staff is comprised of two half-time faculty and an administrative assistant. The CTL faculty and the CTL advisory committee recruit additional faculty members to help run workshops, seminars, and special programming, such as the faculty summer institute. The CTL is in a converted garage that used to house an auto tech program; it is a large, open space with high ceilings, industrial concrete flooring, and several small offices around the edge of the room. The bulk of the space is occupied by couches and end tables placed in strategic conversation groups. There are also computers available for faculty use as well as a conference room. Student workers at a standing desk greet faculty as they enter the space. The CTL feels like a faculty lounge on purpose—to encourage informal collegial conversations. However, the location of the CTL is problematic; it is far from the center of campus, and at the bottom of a long, sloping hill. It's not in a location where faculty drop in—anyone in the CTL is there on purpose. There are plans to move the CTL to a building closer to the heart of the main campus according to the CTL director and vice president of instruction, but the new space has not been modified, and the move that was supposed to happen this spring has been pushed to next year at the earliest. Despite the inconvenient location, the former dean of instructional services shared that the CTL serves between 35-40% of the entire faculty every year (unduplicated head count), and close to 68% of the full-time faculty annually, according to the 2016 strategic plan.

I interviewed four administrators—including the former vice president of instruction and the former dean of instructional services, two people who left their positions in the middle of my study but who were critical to the inception of the CTL—the CTL director, and four faculty at High Hill College. To preserve anonymity, I randomly assigned gender and used pseudonyms for all faculty: Elise, Ed, Rocio and Alex. The administrators, also with randomly assigned gender and pseudonyms, are as follows in Table 4:

Table 4

High Hill Administrator Titles and Pseudonyms

Title	Name
President	Dr. James Wilson
Vice President of Instruction	Mike
Former Vice President of Instruction	Scott
Former Dean of Instructional Services	Rose
CTL Director	Diane

Campus culture. The administrators and faculty of High Hill College believe that the institutional culture is caring and student-centered. Alex stated, “We’ve always talked about the High Hill family.” Dr. Wilson echoed that sentiment: “It’s a culture where I think people want to make sure their students succeed, and there’s a really strong family atmosphere.” Because of a long tradition in the community, High Hill has built up a lot of goodwill; according to Dr. Wilson, many local families have multiple generations with connections to the college, which facilitates that familial feeling. But it goes beyond history and tradition. Elise said, “Of all of the colleges I have taught at, this college for me is the most student-centric.” She went on to clarify, “I feel like here at High Hill, we really want students to learn.” And that sense of caring goes beyond students. Ed explained, “When I was an adjunct at High Hill, I felt more included than any other school I had taught at...that I wasn’t just a teacher for hire. If I had an opinion, it was a valued opinion.” Ed further explained that he was invited to department meetings and to

serve on college committees as an adjunct. High Hill feels like home for both students and faculty.

The vision statement of High Hill College states that the intention of the institution is to improve lives. The mission statement goes further to add that that improvement will occur in a “dynamic, supportive and engaging environment” of high quality instruction for a diverse student body. Rose echoed this moral imperative: “I think most of the people...are there for social justice and moral reasons...I think if you can talk about your moral purpose as a part of your work...it dignifies that work.” Scott went further, stating, “Once we solidified what the moral imperative was for us, things took off, and that’s where the courage came from to make some of those difficult decisions.” Once there was an institutional commitment to social justice through education as laid out in the vision and mission statements, administrative and faculty leaders had buy-in for systemic change.

Faculty and administrators report that the institution is risk-tolerant, which then leads to innovation. This idea corroborates the dynamic environment mentioned in the mission statement. Diane explained, “We’re not afraid to try new things, and then if it doesn’t quite work, then you know, let’s revamp it, or not do it, or do it in a different way, or whatever we need to do.” Rocio shared that High Hill is special for being willing to scrap initiatives that don’t work: “We’re willing to try stuff more than most schools, and we’re also willing to say it didn’t work...we won an award for a thing...and then...realized it wasn’t working...We dropped it, and now we’re redoing it in a different way.” She added that most schools would keep their award-winning programs because of the prestige. Rose shared that part of the ethos of the college became “we’re all going to dust off and move on, you know...I think that where we saw fault as a culture was in not engaging, not in the not risking.” Blame or fault is not part of the

institutional culture; innovation that helps students comes with some risk, but status quo is not enough for High Hill. Mike explained, “When this college decides to do something, they’re all in; we don’t do pilots, we just do it...I like being kind of not too tentative about things.” All major initiatives roll out at scale after significant collaboration and planning. Dr. Wilson described High Hill as “a learning culture”—research, prepare, plan, execute, then reflect and course-correct as needed.

There is a down side to innovation. Three faculty members shared that with so many important initiatives and ideas in play, faculty can be overwhelmed and unable to participate in meaningful ways in everything that interests them. Elise explained, “There is so much going on. I just feel like everybody, their plate is full. They are tapped out.” She went on to say that it is a sign of the times; for example, additional support for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) students is a new initiative that began this year in response to a political shift at the federal level. When asked what could be done to mitigate the busyness, Elise responded, “This is going to sound harsh, but [the administration] could stop going after grants for prestige, and make sure it’s what we really need...Dial it down...Pick the most important ones and stop coming up with new ones.” Like Bradley, the constant innovation and grant-funded initiatives can be dynamic but also overwhelming for faculty.

Another important facet of High Hill’s culture is that faculty and administrators report they are evidence-informed. Listening to data helps faculty and administrators evaluate the success and unintended consequences of initiatives they roll out and then to respond accordingly. Scott explained, “We were fortunate because we have a very, very strong culture of evidence-based decision making...The next step was then okay, here’s what the data is telling us. What are we going to do about it?” Rocio shared the decision-making process: “They were listening to

the data speak to how the change was not coming in the way that was intended...a group actually stepped up and looked at the data and said, 'That's not good for students. Shut it down.'" But Alex cautioned that there is a difference between being *data-driven* and *evidence-informed*, a mantra of the dean of institutional research. Alex explained, "We always say, we're informed by it, but we have to look at all the rest of the things that go with it...Because that's a big difference. A lot of people are driven by data, and sometimes that's a mistake." Data and evidence are a critical part of institutional learning, but not the only driver of change. High Hill tries to balance the use of data with other less quantifiable factors to make sure students are being well served.

Financial conditions. According to administrators, strategic use of new state funding for developmental education enabled the creation of the CTL. Once news of the new line of funding was available, Diane explained, "We were trying to figure out as a group...our goal was, we thought, let's use this money for some really big initiatives instead of lots of little initiatives, and what we decided to do was faculty development." It was a perfect storm: faculty development was on the minds of faculty and administrative leadership based on recommendations from their latest accreditation report; Dr. Wilson had recently been hired, and he was a big proponent of faculty development based on his experience in his previous district; and now, new money was available from the state. Dr. Wilson explained, "Until we got money from the chancellor's office...it was limited what we could do." Rose, who was leading the faculty group tasked with allocating the new grant from the state, shared that the money wasn't a huge amount, and "we wanted to do one reasonably-sized thing that would support the transformation of the college. And so pretty much all of our money went into the CTL." She reported that the state chancellor's office originally pushed back on High Hill's plan to use the developmental education grant money for a CTL, but once student outcomes began to improve, the state altered

the provisions of the grant to encourage wide-scale faculty development. High Hill did not start its CTL with federal funding (such as Title III and Title V) like Pomelo and Bradley, but instead relied on a state grant not explicitly tied to faculty development to get the center started. To supplement the state grant funding, Rose used private foundation money to “host”—she bought furniture, an espresso machine, a small refrigerator, and foodstuff to fill the refrigerator—because she couldn’t use taxpayer money for those items. Luckily, High Hill had just received an award for their student tutoring centers, so Rose had extra private money with no-strings-attached at her disposal. The original reassignment of the first CTL director—a faculty member on partial release—also came out of the state grant.

Administrators report that the CTL facility and the CTL director position are now supported by institutional funds. Rose explained, “About 3 years ago, the college decided to backfill with district dollars. So we didn’t have to use the developmental education grant money from the state to support the CTL anymore.” Scott shared that the transition off grant money was gradual: “It was just slowly trying to get it weaned off of grant and categorical or special funds, so that it’s institutionalized and there is district money going to it.” Dr. Wilson explained how the institutional commitment to the CTL reflects the larger values of High Hill: “It’s the commitment we made here to make it happen. It’s not something we cut...you know, companies do research and development. This is commitment to research and developing our faculty and staff.” The CTL is part of instructional services in the tentative 2017-2018 budget, and one of the values that drives the budget, stated in the executive summary, is “to support innovative and effective learning environments” for students. The CTL helps accomplish that goal and is funded accordingly. Additionally, the CTL director position is codified as a permanent faculty position in the current employment contract, and almost three pages are devoted to the position

description and the checks and balances in place to help ensure that the CTL director rotates and remains true to her faculty roots.

Administrators and faculty report that stipends and release time are used as incentives for faculty participation. Release time is used strategically; the two faculty who work in the CTL half-time are paid their faculty development time out of a Title V grant focused on various avenues of professional development. Additionally, all new full-time faculty who participate in the new faculty orientation—which includes a weekly Friday discussion group in the fall semester that may include workshops, collaboration time, or consultation with the three faculty who act as CTL staff—are released from one class, or three units, to participate. New faculty are expected to engage in classroom action research through the spring to earn their compensation (release time), and then to share their findings in a research poster session offered at the institutional opening day the following fall. Mike shared how he is often asked how High Hill gets new faculty to engage in the faculty development they provide. Mike answers, “I work at a college where we actually give them release time—that’s how you get them to go. And if you’re not making that investment, are you really supporting it or not?” For the larger faculty, the main incentive is a stipend. Seminars—which are more involved and happen over the course of several hours—are paid, but workshops that occur during the regular college activity hour are not. There are also stipends for the faculty summer institute (\$500) and faculty inquiry teams, groups that undertake a year-long project including research and development of interventions for the college (\$1,000). Rocio and Ed shared that there is a special pay rate that was negotiated for professional development written into the employment contract. Rocio believes that the stipends are a powerful incentive, not just for the actual money, but for the symbolism. She explained that the message is “your time is worthy, and we’re going to invest in your

development by compensating you and the time that you're putting in to participate." Dr. Wilson also framed incentivizing participation in faculty development as an investment in the college's greatest resource: its people.

Faculty report that there are also non-monetary incentives to participate in faculty development. Both Ed and Alex explained that the most important motivator for faculty is helping students. Ed stated, "I think the incentive is intrinsic versus extrinsic... For a lot of our faculty, they really do want to improve themselves, and by extension, improve the students of High Hill... so they really do it with the students in mind." Alex had a slightly more jaded response: "I think for full-time faculty who drink the Kool-Aid, they're motivated by students and they're motivated by really caring about what's going on." Elise suggested that peer pressure—or peer support—is also a big motivator. She explained, "My colleague down the hall, 'Hey, you guys! CTL workshop in five minutes! I'm walking down. Who's coming with me?'... Literally, I've gone with somebody because they did that...I think that personal touch, too." Elise went further and said that the peer support might be even more valuable than the stipend. Faculty may participate because they want to improve their craft or simply because they want to collaborate with friends and colleagues.

One point of contention between faculty and the administration is compensation or credit for workshops, which are not paid. The faculty believe that unpaid CTL activities should count toward the mandated professional development obligations outlined by the state; currently, they don't. Instead, faculty are required to attend several institutional professional development days at the beginning of each semester, but even then, they're not required to attend workshops hosted by the CTL and other divisions on campus. Ed explained the current dilemma:

Instead of just having 2 days of professional development at the beginning of the semester, where you cram in 5 hours a day of information and sometimes get

burned out on 10 straight hours of workshops over the course of 2 days, to have some of the CTL workshops count for professional development credit.

Elise suggested an alternative: “When I was at another local institution, we had where you could go to any workshop at any time of the semester and you submit your hours. We’re trying to get that for the CTL...That’s what we’re fighting for.” Alex also stated that being able to attend workshops at any time that doesn’t conflict with teaching responsibilities at any point in the semester makes more sense than front-loading professional development.

The relationship between administrators and faculty. Faculty and administrators report that their relationship is collaborative and collegial. Diane explained,

We have a good, positive relationship... We have a supportive board that doesn’t micromanage, we don’t have any major issues... I hear about some other colleges where they’re in a major mess... no one trusts anyone else and doesn’t work with each other, but that’s not the case here at all. Most of our committees have tri-chairs, with the faculty, classified and a manager.

Rose explained how this positive relationship originated: “Both groups strive for both transparency and mutual trust. Even when times were difficult... there was still a sense of shared purpose... I think most people can move beyond the disagreements and it doesn’t become a grudge.” Part of what may facilitate the collaborative relationship is the relative power concentrated in the hands of faculty. Mike shared an exchange with a dean wherein the dean was perplexed about why faculty seem to get their way. Mike responded, “The... faculty outlast us, they know that, they have more protection. So to some extent, they humor us when we try to actually assert any authority.” Dr. Wilson framed the situation a bit differently: “I think very congenial, very positive... We don’t have a lot of administrators. We made a commitment to stay lean... And they don’t see themselves just as someone’s boss but someone helping others to succeed.” The relationship seems very egalitarian, which allows for a balance of power. There is authentic support for real shared governance. Rocio explained, “All the shared governance

components are highly regarded and respected. The college, administrators, very mindful not to involve themselves in activities or planning to make changes institutionally without engaging faculty leadership in that.” The faculty and administration are partners in institutional change. Finally, Alex suggested that cultivating faculty, as Dr. Wilson suggests, is the right way to lead: “If you have an attitude of support for the faculty, and you listen to what [they] are saying, and you put some money where your mouth is, and you call out people and say what a good job they’ve done,” then one has been a successful leader. By modeling some humility, respect, admiration and support, the administration has been able to help facilitate a partnership with the faculty.

An important component in the balance of power is the faculty union. High Hill is in a state with strong unions, but the position of High Hill’s union seems different. Mike, who has been an administrator at several colleges in the state, noted that High Hill’s union helps push their faculty to be better. If a faculty member receives a weak evaluation, for example, the union directs the faculty member to the various support services available instead of fighting back in an antagonistic way. The faculty senate, faculty union and administration work as a team to support instruction. It is worth noting that part of the current employment contract states that the faculty will *not* strike, the key point of leverage (work stoppage) maintained by traditional labor unions; this commitment to avoid work stoppage is at the beginning of the contract, following the establishment of the parties. While the administration has reached out to faculty to include them in leadership, the faculty have met them halfway.

The role of administrative and faculty leadership. Like Pomelo, many of the key administrators at High Hill have come from the ranks of faculty. Further, the entire “staff” of the CTL is made up of full-time faculty members; there is an administrative assistant, but no

administrator nor staff who engages in faculty-facing faculty development. The move from faculty to administrator seems to help both the relationship between administrators and faculty and the sense of shared purpose at the institution. Ed explained,

Most administrators are former faculty, at least at our campus..... They understand what it's like, and they haven't forgotten what it means to be a faculty member, even though they're in this new position. I think they advocate on our behalf.

Rose also framed the move from faculty to administration positively: "I think one of the things that High Hill has been fortunate in, for the most part, is that people who populated a lot of those team management ranks were faculty." Rose and Diane were a part of the original seven-member faculty implementation team tasked with setting up a CTL. Another member of that initial team is one of the half-time faculty members currently working in the CTL. Rose was a faculty member for many years, then a department chair, and shortly after heading the implementation team in her capacity as a chair, was promoted to dean. The president placed the CTL in her purview on purpose for continuity. Diane is the second director of the CTL; she and her predecessor remain full-time faculty members per the employment contract, and the first CTL director went back to the classroom after a few years as intended. Dr. Wilson explained how the CTL evolved:

A whole cadre of folks who have really been around...Diane, Rose, Scott, all have made sure that we were intentional in putting people in the right place at the right time. All the schools were involved; all the deans were involved. The faculty chairs and coordinators were involved. So, in that sense, it's been, I mean, for me to stay out of the way and let them do their thing.

The CTL was nurtured by a small group of faculty, one of whom became the administrator directly in charge, and two of whom remain active leaders. Scott was primarily responsible for supporting Rose, his direct report, and the faculty team. There has been both a commitment to

continuity in the CTL and to promoting from within at the institution that supports building capacity in terms of skillset and career laddering.

Faculty and administrators report that presidential support is also important. When Dr. Wilson came to High Hill, he was interested in exploring a faculty development center because he has an interest in pedagogy (he began his career in education teaching in the K-12 sector) and because his previous district had a vibrant professional development program. Rose explained, “So he ended up being very predisposed to support that particular dimension of the college community. He helped us designate a space, and even though his Vice President of Instruction disagreed, he basically overruled her, gave us the space.” Dr. Wilson made an executive decision and supported the creation of the CTL with a designated space. He explained what he sees as his responsibility as the president: “So my approach to this was to provide resources, both people and time and money, and facility and space, let people do their thing. And they’ve really grown; it’s exceeded my expectations.” Dr. Wilson is more of a facilitator of the faculty-led creation of the CTL, rather than making a top-down directive to create one. Rocio shared how powerful presidential support can be:

If there’s a commitment from the top down, you’re going to have things like money for training, going to have things like well-developed programs...I think that’s kind of what strong leadership does for you, is aside from providing you with the resources to do what you have to do, they are also holding you accountable for putting together worthy professional development programs.

Dr. Wilson’s role is twofold: on the front end to facilitate the CTL work, and on the back end to ensure that the work is done well. The day-to-day work is left in the capable hands of faculty.

Dr. Wilson’s approach to leadership is emblematic of the institution. Administrators at High Hill believe that leadership is defined as building capacity in others. Dr. Wilson explained, “If you have good leadership skills, you teach others how to teach themselves. It’s like the

trainer-of-trainers thing...A good leader has had the impact of having someone understand and move on with or without them. And that's leadership." When Mike came on board at High Hill, his supervisor told him, "If you're not, as a manager, helping the people you supervise develop, you're not doing your job." Mike then thought, "I had never heard anyone say that at a college, so it was like, yeah, that is a big part of what we do." Growth and development is critical throughout the college: for students, for faculty, for administrators. Scott stated, "I took much more joy from watching people like Diane and Rose and others just blossom and grow. That made me fulfilled." Part of what makes an effective High Hill administrator is the desire to support and develop others.

Faculty and administrators report that the CTL is by faculty, for faculty, from design to implementation to oversight and administration. The idea for a CTL came from the faculty first, but Dr. Wilson's facilitation was critical. Diane explained, "He really empowered us to do it." Dr. Wilson echoed her response: "It's peer-driven, and they get a lot of activity throughout the year...but for me as a leader in terms of starting something—you get out of the way and let faculty run with it." In response to the acquisition of the developmental education state grant and the hiring of Dr. Wilson, a task force was created—outside of the existing professional development committee and manager in charge of faculty development—to look at the creation of a CTL with a "by faculty, for faculty" agenda. Diane shared, "The task force had all faculty from a wide variety of disciplines and schools on campus, key leaders and people were on that, and the only manager was Rose who would eventually...it would be under her as well." Rose shared that the first director of the CTL was a well-respected faculty member who was the chair of the honors department, which gave some instant credibility to the CTL as a place for enrichment, not as a place for remediation. The idea was to show that engaging in faculty

development was what successful teachers did, not as punishment for ineffective teaching. Scott explained, “The first thing is you have to find a faculty member who is well-respected within the faculty ranks.” Rose corroborated, “He really helped to get a lot of people in, and to start getting exposure to the CTL.” Rose explained that another thing the first CTL director did was to start an advisory committee. She stated, “That was all faculty, on the advisory committee, that was developing the material. I’m the only administrator who sat on the advisory committee.” Elise echoed Rose, saying, “It’s 100% faculty. I’ve never heard of an administrator tell us what to do at all. Yeah, everything from workshops to summer institute.” Ed added that “anyone [on the faculty] is invited to join it, adjunct and full-time.” Another strategy employed to keep the CTL faculty-led and in the forefront of campus conversation is direct ties to the faculty senate. Rose explained, “Every person who has had a leadership role as a faculty member, in the CTL, all have strong relationships with senate... As a result, they also were always bringing the CTL into the senate discussion, kept it visible.” Diane is an active senate member, participating on several committees, including the CTL advisory committee. But Scott explained,

Even though Diane is seen as the leader in the CTL, people know it’s not just her. She’s really good about bringing in other faculty leadership to put on workshops and to run things. She’s making everything happen that, in a lot of ways, that’s not about her, either. She wants the right people who the faculty are going to respect.

Like Dr. Wilson, Diane is also primarily a facilitator—helping engage faculty leaders in the CTL work. According to Dr. Wilson, the CTL is “ingrained in the ethos of the college” because of the “ownership and stewardship” of the faculty.

The process of institutionalization. Faculty and administrators believe that CTL activities are both drivers of institutional change and mechanisms for support of strategic goals and initiatives. The CTL works in three different capacities: 1. To create initiatives to address

institutional concerns; 2. To spread effective practices authentically to the faculty; and 3. To support existing strategic initiatives. These capacities are not discrete.

One of the most significant roles of the CTL, according to six out of nine interviewees, is the creation of new interventions to try to solve vexing problems. Rocio explained how faculty inquiry teams, sponsored and facilitated by the CTL, work:

From the idea phase, we have a problem, we need a solution. And identifying the stakeholders, that's probably the most essential part of getting faculty involved, is to know who has a vested interest in making sure that these issues are addressed institutionally, and then engaging those faculty, inviting them, and getting them involved in the process of brainstorming and researching and doing the literature review, and coming up with ideas, and going through a process of change institutionally that would help those faculty feel a sense of ownership.

The process for change involves identifying the key faculty players, and then engaging them in a year-long process of research, reflection, and problem-solving, ending with specific recommendations for the college. Those recommendations are then sent to administrators for action. Rose explained,

Some of the work the teams end up recommending ends up in the college's strategic vision and in the college's strategic planning. So there's a nice reciprocity between the work that gets done and the direction that the college is going. I think that's very unusual. A lot of times you see that kind of inquiry exist as a segment or pocket, rather than something that really drives institutional identity.

Faculty, through the CTL, are central to institutional change and can drive some of the strategic goals of the college.

Another critical role of the CTL is to spread new ideas and effective practices to the faculty. Diane shared some examples:

We've been able to influence [culture] through things like our affective domain work and now with our equity work we're doing—it spreads, I think, faster and better when you can provide some of those deeper learning opportunities and really see some transformation take place. And then they share that with their colleagues, and then it continues on.

The “spread effect” of CTL activities happens when individual faculty are transformed and then moved to share that powerful learning experience with others. Dr. Wilson explained, “The central component was our CTL. And we used that as a tool for spreading the gospel, so to speak. Make sure everybody is engaged and at the table.” The CTL has an important function for the institution at large—to facilitate the “spread effect.”

Finally, the CTL is also an important support for existing strategic goals and initiatives. Mike explained, “When we have something coming along like guided pathways, it is immediately how do we get the CTL involved, what can they do to support it, help us train people, help us get the word out.” Administrators try to engage the CTL as a way of educating and involving the faculty in institutional initiatives. The CTL is also engaged by the faculty to move initiatives forward. Elise explained,

It’s always part of the planning...how it links back...To me, I see it as support. Our faculty summer institute this year is going to be with supporting guided pathways...I feel like we’re always mindful of the initiative...and trying to support the mission and the vision and all that.

Ed added, “Our college, one of their outcomes is critical thinking...We use those as a framework for what we schedule and what we offer and how we create...Even in a workshop, it’s not lecture-based, it’s engaging, whether it’s through icebreakers or collaboration.” CTL activities act not just as ways for administrators and faculty leaders to engage the faculty in strategic initiatives, but the activities themselves also model some of the important initiatives of the institution. Further, the CTL is explicitly stated as part of the action plan for two out of five institutional goals in the most recent strategic plan.

Focus on pedagogy. At High Hill, faculty and administrators value good teaching. Rose, while still a dean, approached the faculty senate president and suggested that the senate construct

a set of principles that explain what the faculty stand for. Diane was on the senate at the time, and she helped to push the guiding principles agenda. The senate president fostered dialogue around what it meant to be High Hill faculty, and many of the resulting principles are around engagement and responsiveness, key foundations of CTL work. Two principles that relate explicitly to pedagogy are “Inspire active learning and critical thinking” and “Engage in innovative approaches to teaching.” Applicants for teaching positions at High Hill must speak to the faculty values in their written application. They are posted in the faculty senate meeting space and prominently displayed at the CTL.

Additionally, core portions of the strategic plan focus on pedagogy. One objective under the institutional goal of facilitating student success and completion is “Broaden participation in the activities that encourage reflective teaching practices.” An objective under the institutional goal of closing the achievement gap is “Implement a consistent opportunity for culturally responsive strategies in college training and professional learning.” Effective teaching practices, including the affective domain, are central to the work at High Hill.

Effective teaching practice is also the foundation of CTL programming, like the new faculty orientation, faculty summer institute, and faculty inquiry teams. Dr. Wilson shared his frustration with the minimum qualifications required to teach in a community college in his state, which focus on discipline knowledge, not pedagogical knowledge. And while High Hill has made inroads changing the baseline expectations for new faculty through the faculty-generated guiding principles, there are still many instructors without a strong foundation in pedagogy. He explained his strategy to deal with the challenge:

We don't hire that way, and so in the absence of that, you can complain or you can do something about it...It's a process of you do something about it by having on-going education and you have it done by people who understand how good

teachers teach, with the theory and the practice and the research, and you get the peers involved.

Mike shared the centrality of teaching at any institution of higher education:

No matter what you do at a college, if you're not trying to see that every interaction in the classroom between faculty and the student is high quality, then you're not...Anything you do out here, the buildings you build, the grants you get, et cetera, et cetera, it's not going to help your success rate...if we're not doing something to support the quality of what happens [in the classroom], nothing else is going to work.

The most important factor leading to student success that colleges can control is the quality of instruction. Diane sees part of the mission of the CTL as spreading good practice: "We want innovation and best practices and teaching...new ways of thinking about teaching to spread."

Rocio also suggested that CTL activities can help jar one out of complacency: "Don't let me settle in...saying, I know it all, I don't need any professional development, challenging me to stay current with my skill set, and to continue to share the values of the institution." Alex echoed this idea, acknowledging effective instructors have room to grow, too: "Because we all need to be thinking about how to do what we do better. I don't care how long you've been teaching, there's stuff you can learn." Finally, Elise shared how faculty development can also be a way to reignite a passion for teaching: "There is that excitement of always getting better, right? I'm never done. There is something...invigorating about that when you're sharing ideas with people and learning new professional development techniques and get to try it out...It re-energizes you." CTL activities focus on and model effective teaching practices and target all stages of faculty career development: new faculty who need a foundation in pedagogy; experienced teachers who may need to sharpen and update their skills; and "good teachers" who want to be even better.

While Diane works closely with the Office of Institutional Research, they have had a difficult time measuring the effect of faculty development on students. They have extensive faculty participant surveys after every activity, from a workshop to the faculty summer institute, and those survey questions include asking faculty how they are going to share what they have learned—again, the “spread effect” of innovative practices—as well as how they specifically plan to implement new ideas and strategies into the classroom. Diane gave me access to several recent internal evaluation reports, and faculty are generally satisfied with both the content and the quality of the facilitators’ instruction. Participation in CTL activities (unduplicated head count) has increased year-over-year for the last several years, according to the Office of Institutional Research, as documented in the 2016 strategic plan; there seems to be good word-of-mouth about activities.

Of the research reports I reviewed, two stood out because they had the closest connection to student outcomes. One was a research report on the 2014 faculty summer institute focusing on issues of equity, including stereotype threat and culturally responsive teaching strategies. Institutional research conducted a “post-post survey,” looking at the same issues from the pre- and post-survey bracketing the institute 6 months later. I noted that the growth in understanding of the new concepts was not sustained over time, though they still felt more confident and knowledgeable about student challenges and strategies to help students than they did before the institute. One of the open-ended questions asked what participants are still implementing in their classes 6 months later, and one representative response was about how one instructor’s class now has a family atmosphere, where students check on each other and work collaboratively to help each other succeed. This faculty member wrote, “It is fantastic to watch this happen.” Another revealing document was the 2016-2017 Faculty Needs Assessment; it included open-ended

questions about possible topics and what might help faculty attend. The assessment had 152 respondents, 80% of whom were full-time and 20% of whom were part-time. At the end of the survey was a question about how participation in CTL activities in the past had impacted participants and their teaching. The vast majority of open-ended responses were very positive, including the following: “Have inspired me to completely change my philosophy, approach and attitude towards teaching”; “It has been very impactful—I look at students and teaching in a different way”; and “Tremendous asset to my skillset—invaluable.” While there is no concrete data linking participation in CTL activities to improved practice and outcomes, the evidence that does exist—documented patterns of participation and self-reported change—support that the CTL does affect the quality of instruction at High Hill in a positive way.

Cross-Case Analysis

This study investigated how three community colleges with institutionalized faculty development programs created and continue to sustain those programs. While each research site is very different in terms of organizational structure, geographic location and institutional culture, they all serve large populations of students of color and low-income students, and their student outcomes reveal that they are also closing achievement gaps. The administrations and faculties at all three sites attribute at least some of their student success to faculty engagement in their Centers for Teaching and Learning. This cross-case analysis will focus on the similarities across the three research sites.

Campus culture. All three research sites had positive campus climates, but each institution has a unique culture. Bradley’s culture is focused on helping their specific student body—composed of immigrants, low-income students, and students of color—thrive. What struck me is that Bradley’s students are not viewed from a deficit mindset; instead, faculty, staff

and administrators recognize that their students have their own gifts and strengths, many of which have not been valued historically in higher education. Nonetheless, they see their job as leveraging the talents of their students to help them succeed in college. Pomelo's culture is not as focused on meeting the needs of their specific students but rather on making sure all students learn. How the student experiences Pomelo is at the center of their work. There is an expectation that all students will make progress toward their academic goals, and outcomes from faculty work and programs are regularly measured to find ways to improve. The culture at High Hill is almost like a blending of Bradley and Pomelo: there is a moral imperative to help students succeed in a caring atmosphere, and High Hill is also data-informed. The mission and vision statements of all three colleges accurately capture the lived culture of each institution.

Additionally, all three research sites value authentic inquiry, research, and reflection; while these values look different at each site, all the institutions regularly engage in a methodical and scholarly approach to teaching and learning that is evidence-informed. They believe that reflection, based on evidence of student work, is critical for instructor and institutional change.

While there isn't a single culture that seems to support the creation of a faculty development program, the common thread of student-centeredness that is both codified and lived exists across all three campuses. Additionally, there is an iteration of a cycle of inquiry, reflection and integration of learning into one's practice that exists to some degree across all the institutions.

Financial conditions. All three research sites began their CTLs with external funding: Bradley and Pomelo used federal grants targeted to professional development and Hispanic-serving institutions (Title III and Title V), and High Hill used a state grant targeted to developmental education. While Bradley and Pomelo used more traditional funding sources to start faculty development programs, High Hill used a novel approach to begin theirs that was

risky; they faced some pushback at first from the state. All three sites supplemented their government-sponsored start-up funds with private foundation grants. Once the CTLs could establish a pattern of success—through faculty investment and perceived student outcomes—they were all in a position to ask for institutional support. Over time, the responsibility for staff and the centers themselves has shifted to the institutions, though those commitments vary from site to site. Bradley supports six staff members and the director but does not support a regular space; Pomelo supports an extensive staff (one to three faculty developers per site, plus three campus directors) as well as a physical CTL on each of its campuses; and High Hill supports one full-time faculty member to act as director as well as the CTL space on the main campus. All three colleges continue to fund new and innovative programming, as well as some of the supplemental needs of the centers, through external funding, but the core resources for the CTLs come from the institutional budget.

All three campuses use a combination of release time and stipends to encourage faculty participation. Release time at all three sites is used primarily for faculty members who take leadership roles, such as designing and facilitating seminars and workshops and making themselves available for consultation with colleagues. High Hill also uses release time to allow all new tenure-track, full-time faculty to engage in a semester of Friday sessions to prepare a small action research project they complete in the spring and share out the following fall. Bradley also uses release time as needed for more intensive projects beyond just the faculty leaders. The faculty in charge of the TEP at Pomelo are all fully-released faculty members. But the most common incentive at all three sites is a stipend. The amount of money is helpful, but the stipends are deliberately modest to show that faculty time is valued, but not enough to do the work just for the money. Faculty at all three sites report that, at least to some extent, faculty are

intrinsically motivated, though the external motivators of leadership development for tenure and promotion, career advancement, service requirements, recognition (particularly for adjuncts trying to distinguish themselves) and positive peer pressure also play a role in faculty participation.

The relationship between administrators and faculty. All three sites report that the relationship between administrators and faculty is generally positive, and these relationships help make faculty development successful. There is a range of levels of warmth between the two groups across the sites that seems to be connected to the balance of power between administrators and faculty. At Bradley, where there is a long tradition of unionization as part of the culture, the relationship is described by administrators as not antagonistic—some faculty will see the administration as the enemy simply because they are management, though that does not seem to be the prevailing attitude according to the faculty. At worst, the relationship is neutral and not an impediment to faculty engagement in faculty development. At Pomelo, where faculty have the least amount of power, the relationship is described as collaborative and collegial, with evidence of both constructivist and distributed leadership. But it is not clear if the faculty are truly equal partners; the top-down leadership has been stable for many years, and it is hard to know if this relationship would continue under a different kind of leader. Nevertheless, the current relationship facilitates faculty participation in their own development. Finally, High Hill seems to be the most democratic site, and the relationship between the faculty and the administration is one of mutual respect and collaboration. The faculty senate, faculty association and the administration share responsibility for the development of faculty. While it is hard to determine exactly what kind of relationship facilitates the creation of a faculty development

program, the evidence from this study reveals that a neutral to positive relationship seems to help.

The role of administrative and faculty leadership. At all three sites, a few key leaders under whose purview faculty development falls came from within the ranks of faculty at those sites. Faculty members at all sites attribute some of the success of the CTLs to these leaders and their understanding of and empathy with the faculty position. The administrators in question are also big believers in the power of faculty development as a lever for institutional change. Tony at Bradley, Gwen and Fiona at Pomelo, and Diane and Rose at High Hill have all been instrumental in shepherding the growth of their respective CTLs and the integration and institutionalization of the CTLs into the larger process of change. They are all also known and respected as good teachers. It's interesting to note that Pomelo is no longer allowing tenured faculty to retain their tenure if they move to an administrative position, which dissuades faculty from considering an administrative role. Kevin already sees a negative effect on faculty development. Also, Rose is no longer at High Hill; her replacement as dean is a former department chair who is a big cheerleader for the CTL, but the new leader does not have Rose's institutional memory. It is unclear what kind of effect—if any—Rose's departure will have long-term.

At all three sites, presidential support is also important. Drs. McMillan, Campbell and Wilson show their support primarily through prioritizing their respective CTLs in the budget. The core funding for the centers is institutionalized in the college budget; they are no longer relying on external funding to stay afloat. Additionally, the CTLs are explicitly mentioned in the strategic plans as mechanisms to accomplish institutional goals. The presidents at all three sites also talk about the importance of faculty; for example, Dr. Campbell believes that faculty are *the*

solution to any problem at the college. Further, all three presidents acknowledge that pedagogy is critical, and recognize that the CTLs on their sites facilitate best teaching practices across their campuses. It is also worth noting that the upper-level management—presidents and their immediate reports—have been in place at the respective sites a long time, from almost ten years to almost twenty years. This stable leadership is exceptional. Through their discourse, budget and institutional planning, the presidents all make it clear that the work of the CTLs is critical and valued.

Finally, faculties and administrators at all three sites believe that faculty leadership—both at the inception of the centers and in the day-to-day working of the CTLs—is essential. All workshops and seminars are led by faculty at all three sites; there may be support staff engaged as well, but they are behind-the-scenes. The entire “staff” of the High Hill CTL are faculty members. Faculty voices—to different degrees—are elicited and included in all conversations around faculty development at all three sites; the faculty seem to have the most say at the institutions where they have the most political power, but they are key players nonetheless at all sites. The faculty leaders at all three sites are recognized—at least by the CTL directors and staff—as exceptional teachers, which is important for the credibility of the CTLs with faculty.

The process of institutionalization. A critical finding of this study is that Centers for Teaching and Learning at all three sites act as a nexus between authentic faculty interests and needs and institutional strategic priorities. The CTLs at all sites are where instructional and program improvement happen; it is easy to justify their funding because they are the change facilitators. They function well in this space—as change facilitators—because they are not driven by top-down leadership nor are they existing on the fringe of the institution; the CTLs are trusted and embraced by both the faculty and the administrations at each site. As the CTLs at all

sites have matured, they have moved from primarily helping individual instructors to helping instructors *and* thoughtfully planning programming to support institutional priorities. The CTLs at all three sites are integrated into the fundamental workings of their respective institutions. The catalyst for the rise of the importance of the CTLs was when they each began to support large institutional changes: college-wide outcomes assessment at Bradley, new faculty orientation at Pomelo, and affective domain work at High Hill. Once they demonstrated their worth both to individual instructors *and* to the institution at large, their value increased.

Focus on pedagogy. At all three research sites, teaching really matters. Each institution prioritizes what happens in the classroom over any other part of the instructional program, and it shows in the offerings of their CTLs. Many of the CTL activities at all three institutions model and support a rigorous and scholarly approach to teaching: identifying a problem or challenge, researching best practices to solve that problem, implementing newly learned or developed strategies and assignments, and then reflecting on student outcomes. New practices that work are then integrated into the instructor's teaching repertoire. Teaching instructors how to become reflective practitioners is one of the most important functions of the CTLs.

Beyond the centers, job postings, employment contracts, and even the school mission statements make explicit that effective instruction is the expectation for all faculty, both full- and part-time. While the CTLs have moved into supporting larger strategic initiatives, their angle on this work is to show how instructors can integrate the big ideas into classroom practice, such as when Patty at Bradley asks, "What does global learning look like in a classroom?" The CTLs have been successful marrying institutional priorities with specific classroom practices for instructors to implement and then reflect upon.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Based on the presumptions that faculty are critical to student success and that faculty in the community college sector are largely underprepared to serve the diversity of students they encounter, this study sought to examine how community colleges with noteworthy student outcomes create and sustain faculty development programs that engage a large proportion of their faculty across the disciplines. I looked at the data through the lens of educational leadership because institutionalizing a program that spans the administration and faculty can be challenging since buy-in is required from both bottom-up and top-down leadership.

This study is important because the community college is the quintessential American educational institution, embodying open and equal access, second (and third and fourth) chances, and the opportunity to vault into the middle class through hard work. While scholars debate whether the community college is truly an avenue for social justice (Murray, 2002) or rather a system that diverts already underserved student populations—notably, students of color and low-income students—out of more prestigious universities (Brint & Karabel, 1989), for any individual student, the community college offers almost unlimited potential for personal, educational and professional growth (A. Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

Another unique feature of the community college is its position as a bridge between the K-12 sector and the rest of higher education, particularly the 4-year sector. From its beginnings, the community college sometimes literally straddled these two sectors, housed on either high school campuses or adjacent to university campuses to offer lower-division courses (A. Cohen & Brawer, 2003). A colleague recently posed the question, “Are we grades 13 and 14, or are we the first 2 years of university?” I believe we are both and more. This study revealed that both higher education research and K-12 education research are salient to the community college sector. The

community colleges in this study institutionalized their faculty development programs through iterations of the kaleidoscope convergence framework (Kezar, 2012) and have been able to improve teaching and learning on their campuses by focusing on the “right drivers” (Fullan, 2011). Kezar’s (2012) research is focused on higher education while Fullan (2011) focuses his work on the K-12 sector, but both researchers’ work illuminates the findings of this study.

Discussion of Major Findings

Kaleidoscope convergence. To institutionalize a transformational change such as a wide-ranging faculty development program, both bottom-up and top-down leadership need to be engaged. Top-down leadership alone makes buy-in among the people closest to the work—such as faculty—difficult, and grassroots leadership is too frail to maintain change without institutional support. Using data from an earlier study looking at grassroots leadership in higher education (Kezar & Lester, 2011), Kezar (2012) explored how administrative leadership and grassroots leadership can converge to both broaden and institutionalize faculty change initiatives. As part of her later study focusing on what she calls kaleidoscope convergence, Kezar created a list of suggestions that function as a framework to help faculty leaders facilitate effective convergence with administrators. All three sites in this study went through the stages and strategies that Kezar outlines; her framework is validated by this study.

The first step in Kezar’s (2012) framework is to capitalize on opportunities. At Bradley, there was an authentic faculty need to understand and use newly (and widely) available technology. Further, a new president was soon hired who had an interest in faculty development, and the president supported Tony as he pursued different grants to start and then sustain a CTL. At Pomelo, there was a small cohort of faculty who were interested in redesigning their faculty orientation coupled with the hiring of a new president who was supportive of that vision.

Simultaneously, Pomelo earned some outside grant money to experiment with pedagogy. Similarly, at High Hill, there was recognition of the need for meaningful faculty development in a recent accreditation report concordant with the availability of a new funding stream from the state to facilitate large-scale change for developmental education. Additionally, a new president steeped in the value of faculty development was hired shortly thereafter. It is interesting to note that at all three institutions, the current president came on board right when the CTLs were emerging, and their leadership has remained constant as the centers have been institutionalized with their support. The confluence of events at all three sites led to the creation of faculty development programs.

The second stage in Kezar's (2012) framework is to find a translator, or middle manager, to shepherd the change initiative. At Bradley, that shepherd was Tony. He began his career at Bradley as a faculty member, and then rose through the ranks of the administration. He helped facilitate the creation of the CTL when he was transitioning from a department chair to an assistant dean. As he moved up to provost, the CTL has continued to be under his purview; he hired the first full-time director of the CTL, Colleen, and she is now Tony's second-in-command as associate provost. Key figures in the creation and institutionalization of the CTL moved from faculty and director respectively to higher level administrators, all the while facilitating the growth and significance of the CTL. At Pomelo, one of the original faculty members engaged in rethinking the faculty orientation as well as the first workshops available to experiment with new pedagogy became (and remains) the lead of the Tenure Eligibility Program (TEP). Similarly, the assistant vice president in charge of the faculty development division, Gwen, began her career as an adjunct at Pomelo and moved into administration after engaging in the TEP and follow-up faculty development opportunities. Gwen has been instrumental in expanding the personnel,

services, and reach of the faculty development division. While she was not part of the original group like Fiona, she has helped to shepherd faculty development at Pomelo since she first engaged with the program. Finally, at High Hill, two members of the original faculty team tasked with setting up a Center for Teaching and Learning remained critical facilitators of its growth and development. Once created, the CTL was deliberately put under Rose's purview as a dean because she was on the original faculty task force who designed it. Diane helped shepherd the growth of the CTL first as a member of the faculty senate and then as the CTL director. Under Diane's leadership, the CTL has expanded its offerings and institutionalized the faculty inquiry teams, which drive key parts of the college's strategic plan. While all the sites in this study did not have a consistent middle manager to shepherd the faculty development programs, they all had faculty leaders who became administrators who cultivated the programs as they rose through the ranks.

Because each site built capacity in their faculty, the need for Kezar's (2012) third strategy—sensitize leadership to the change initiative slowly over time and manage up—almost seems unnecessary. At all three sites, key faculty leaders *became* administrative leaders in charge, to some degree, of the faculty development programs they helped shape. It was serendipitous that the then-new college presidents at all three sites were already predisposed to support faculty development when they were hired. These new leaders did not come in and impose faculty development programs but instead allowed faculty to lead the way. Slowly over time, the leaders of the faculty development programs did convince higher-level administrators to institutionalize the centers and take their primary operating funding from the institutional budget.

The fourth step in Kezar's (2012) strategies is to secure membership on key task forces and committees related to the change. At Bradley, the primary administrator responsible for faculty development, the CTL director, is also the Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs. This organizational structure means that Patty is directly involved with all Academic Affairs initiatives; the CTL is always at the table in any discussion related to instruction. Similarly, the constructivist leadership style practiced in the faculty development division at Pomelo by Jim, Gwen, Fiona, the CTL directors, the CTL staff and faculty facilitators allows many voices to be heard and to shape the direction of offerings. Since faculty development is deeply ingrained in the institutional culture, most strategic initiatives are facilitated by the division in some capacity. Finally, the CTL at High Hill maintains close connections with the faculty senate intentionally to keep the center visible and engaged with all goings-on related to faculty at the institution. Diane serves on several senate committees, as do Elise and Ed. Currently, the CTLs at all three sites facilitate strategic priorities and institutional change; all strategic initiatives flow through the CTLs to some degree.

The fifth step in the framework is to negotiate and collaborate with other similar initiatives with similar goals. Currently at Bradley, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs have been working together to implement first-year experience programming. The CTL often partners with other divisions, particularly Student Affairs, to facilitate change. At Pomelo, according to Dr. Campbell, various initiatives involved in faculty development—TEP, the faculty summer institute, workshops for adjuncts and tenured instructors—used to exist independently, but now they've all been brought under the umbrella of the faculty development division for cohesion. At High Hill, an institutional focus on the affective domain originated in the CTL and permeated into programming in both Academic and Student Affairs. Further, the faculty inquiry teams, who

take on topics that affect the college in myriad ways, are housed and facilitated by the CTL. The CTLs at all three sites function as natural collaboration spaces for any initiative related to teaching and learning on their respective campuses.

Kezar (2012) also suggests that faculty leaders garner outside support at first as they pursue their change initiatives. All three sites began with external funding provided by government sources. Both Bradley and Pomelo initially used Title III and Title V grants from the U. S. Department of Education to begin their early work exploring progressive pedagogical practices. High Hill took a similar route, but instead of accessing federal start-up funds, utilized a state grant targeted to developmental education to start their CTL. Administrators of the CTLs knew they had arrived when their primary funding—dedicated staff and space—became part of the college budget and not reliant solely on outside funding.

Kezar's (2012) final recommendation is for faculty leaders to remain skeptical and even suspicious of top-down leadership. She further warns that a successful faculty-driven initiative could be hijacked by the college administration. At first glance, two key findings seem to render this concern moot at the research sites: 1. Many of the higher-level administrators in charge of faculty development rose through the ranks from within; and 2. The current leadership of all three sites has been stable and consistent over time. There is a strong faculty sensibility among many key players at all three sites. Additionally, the presidents of each institution are strong believers in and supporters of faculty development. Further, they are comfortable relinquishing a modicum of control to faculty to drive and deliver the offerings of the CTLs on their sites. But by retaining a significant amount of control over what happens at the CTL, faculty have leverage, sort of a hedging of bets, that could be skepticism or even suspicion of top-down leadership and which may protect the CTLs when the current presidents retire or move on. By

retaining control, faculty ensure that they drive CTL programming and keep the focus of the CTLs on authentic faculty needs as well as institutional priorities.

It is worth mentioning that the relationship between faculty and administrators on all three campuses is generally positive, and all three campuses value collegiality and collaboration to some extent. These factors—relationships and culture—facilitate the convergence of top-down and bottom-up leadership within Kezar’s (2012) framework.

The right drivers. Fullan (2011) juxtaposed the K-12 educational systems of countries with improving student outcomes according to Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) data—such as Finland and South Korea—with the systems in the United States and Australia, two countries with lower and falling student outcomes. He looked carefully at the policies and related strategies that were driving educational reform in the two camps and discovered what he terms the “right drivers” of systemic reform: focusing on the group, building capacity, systemic cohesion, and putting pedagogy first. While Fullan’s research seems an unlikely guide for community colleges, the research sites in this study used Fullan’s (2011) right drivers to institutionalize their faculty development programs. Further, he states that the goal of worldwide educational systems is the “moral imperative of raising the bar (for all students) and closing the gap (for lower performing students) relative to higher order skills and competencies required to be successful world citizens” (Fullan, 2011, p. 3). This stated goal is embedded in the missions, cultures and expectations of the research sites, and they are making progress toward this goal as measured in their student outcomes.

Focusing on the group is one important driver of reform. At the research sites, faculty development opportunities are optional and available to everyone, adjunct to tenured faculty. The faculty development programs at all three sites focus on helping all instructors improve their

practice through workshops, seminars, and other extended opportunities (such as faculty summer institutes and faculty inquiry teams.) Peer support and collaboration are central to all faculty development opportunities across the three sites. Fullan (2011) suggests that as teachers and leaders improve, the power of peers can be leveraged, and that seems to be happening at all three sites.

Building capacity, similar to focusing on the group, is another driver of reform. The CTLs at all three sites encourage leadership development; faculty play important lead roles both planning and implementing programming as workshop and seminar facilitators. It is no coincidence that key faculty development administrators at all three sites have come through the ranks of faculty (or, in the case of High Hill, remain faculty members). While not all CTL faculty leaders want to become administrators, their work in the CTLs gives them the skills and opportunity to work with higher-level administrators implementing institutional priorities, and, in some cases, creating strategic initiatives. They are primed for promotion.

Systemic cohesion versus a fragmented approach to policies and strategies is the third driver of reform. The CTLs at all three sites act as a nexus between authentic faculty interests and needs and institutional priorities. While there are still many different projects with different funding streams and participants happening at all three sites, the CTLs are the thread that ties everything together. On these campuses, the CTL is a one-stop-shop to help instructors improve their practice *and* for larger institutional change.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, putting pedagogy first is a driver of educational reform. The administrative leadership at all three sites recognizes that if there isn't a focus on classroom instruction, any other changes or improvements won't make any substantive change in student outcomes. In Fullan's (2011) work, he bemoans the focus on technology as a savior

instead of focusing on underlying pedagogy in worldwide educational systems. This technology versus instruction conundrum came up at all three sites as well. At Bradley, Tony cleverly disguised rigorous work examining pedagogy as training to use new technology; that first seminar launched the CTL. At Pomelo, the CTL staff were first introduced more as instructional designers, there to facilitate using technology in the classroom, but their role has expanded to include faculty development as well. Some CTL staff members are technology experts, but there are also curriculum specialists and other experts available to help with any faculty need. Finally, High Hill tackled distance education in their first faculty inquiry team, and the resulting handbook that focused on effective on-line pedagogy laid the groundwork for the institutionalization of this faculty-led institutional change mechanism. The community college sector of higher education prioritizes teaching; the research sites embody that priority.

Limitations

While this study has strengths—including rich, thick description and a multi-case study design—there are also limitations. This study would be strengthened with more time, more voices, and additional methods of triangulation.

I launched this project in the fall of 2016 with my initial contact of the faculty development directors at each site. Over the course of the 2016-2017 academic year, I became familiar with each site via informal conversations with the directors and poring over the websites of the schools, but I didn't visit until August 2017, and made only one follow-up visit in January 2018. I spent a total of 4 days at each site. Ideally, I would have spent more time at each site—both days on campus and parts of the semester—to have a fuller understanding of the sites. Further, a longitudinal study—following the continuing evolution of the faculty development programs over time—would strengthen this research. The demands of my job, the distance

involved, and the cost of travel—this study is mostly self-funded—made spending more time on each site and on the project challenging.

I would have liked to have conducted more interviews and even a survey to include more voices in this study. I was scheduled to talk to the president of Bradley and the vice president of Pomelo on my first site visits, but both interviews were cancelled at the last minute. I tried to reschedule when I returned in January 2018, but again was stymied due to personal reasons (both administrators were recovering from illness when I returned) and just being busy. I suggested phone or Skype interviews but was rebuffed. Further, I would have liked to include many more faculty voices, either through additional interviews or through a survey. When I began designing this study, I wanted to survey a small random sample of faculty to hear their thoughts about faculty development, but I realized I didn't have the capacity to analyze the volume of data that could be generated from such an endeavor, nor did I have the time to pursue faculty to complete the survey in the first place. I did my best to find a wide variety of faculty voices that had the potential to represent other similar faculty—both involved and not involved in faculty development—but a wider swath of faculty voices would make the findings more robust.

One glaring omission from this study is the voices of adjuncts. Most of the faculty I interviewed began their careers as adjuncts at their home sites, but all of them are currently full-time faculty. While Pomelo and High Hill are explicitly focused on finding ways to better support their adjunct instructors, there is a general understanding that the position of most adjuncts—working at multiple schools with different cultures and expectations—leaves them with very little time and energy to devote to their own development, let alone spend time with a researcher. It would be interesting to survey a broad group of adjuncts at the research sites to get

their perspective on the faculty development programs, especially since adjuncts outnumber—sometimes greatly—full-time instructors at all sites.

Additionally, I could have looked at more sites that fit my criteria to perhaps discover more generalizable findings and to further strengthen my conclusions. I would search out institutions with newer presidents or generally less stable top-down leadership to serve as a contrast to the existing research sites. It is difficult to determine how important the presidents are in the current study.

Further, a wider scope might have enabled me to make more direct connections between the faculty development programs at my research sites and their student outcomes, which underlies this study. I could have included observations of faculty development workshops and seminars, reviews of syllabi and assignments, reviews of student work, and even classroom observations to get a fuller understanding of the importance and result of the faculty development programs at my research sites.

Finally, there is the larger issue related to the shortcomings of case study design and the degree to which data and experience from case studies is generalizable. This study focused on three institutions and the process of institutionalization of their faculty development programs; what is learned from these unique institutions does not allow readers to infer that following the exact same processes will yield the same or similar results, as an experimental design might suggest (Yin, 2014). I cannot make assumptions of equivalency between other similar institutions and my research sites, and therefore cannot assume that what happened at the research sites will happen elsewhere, even under similar conditions (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Moreover, my interest in directly connecting improving student outcomes to faculty engagement

in faculty development activities might be better served using a quantitative approach that would allow me to “test the utility of an intervention” (Creswell, 2014, p. 20).

Recommendations

For further research. To more fully understand faculty development in community colleges and its effects, a longitudinal study of several institutionalized community college programs with a similar research design to the Tracer Project at WSU and Carleton College (Condon et al., 2016) is recommended. An extension of my existing study that included more time, more sites, and more methods of data collection and triangulation, including looking at specific instructor practice and student work, could yield more definitive answers to the question Goldrick-Rab (2010) posed about discovering the kinds of faculty development programs and activities that improve student learning.

Additionally, I did not center race and gender in my study. I chose to mask race and gender to provide as much anonymity as possible for my study participants, but that choice also leaves out the perspective that centering these and other personal identity factors might reveal. Further research might explore what effect, if any, race and gender have on the motivation for faculty to participate in faculty development, and how these and other personal identity factors might affect the development and sustenance of faculty development programs and activities.

Again, there are research designs other than case studies that potentially could shed more light on the challenges, obstacles and sources of success to building effective faculty development programs at community colleges. For example, a broad survey of administrators and faculty at a host of community colleges could inform how we understand faculty development and the successful implementation of such programs. Another option could be a mixed methods study using a similar research design to the study conducted by Elliot and Oliver

(2015); I would suggest adding an analysis of student outcome data in conjunction with the survey of student perceptions of faculty development outcomes, and I would also recommend looking at sites with faculty development programs with high faculty participation across disciplines beyond their focus on the Nursing and Radiological Technology departments. Quantitative and mixed methods research could further add to our understanding of how faculty development impacts student outcomes in community colleges.

For leadership and practice. The administrative leaders in this study who came from the ranks of faculty in their institutions are important for both the creation and evolution of the faculty development programs at their sites. Not all faculty members make good administrators, and not all faculty leaders want to move into administrative roles, but the leaders who made that move in this study are central to the success of the faculty development programs at their sites. It is of some concern that the relatively new Pomelo policy that faculty lose their tenure if they move to administrative roles dissuades faculty from considering that move. Sean ascribes much of the collaborative spirit and collegiality between the administration and faculty to administrators who were faculty. Building leadership capacity in faculty should continue to be a priority in faculty development programs.

In that same vein, administrators should be given opportunities to teach when feasible. Patty taught a course at Bradley last semester, and she reports that being back in the classroom gave her a fresh perspective on her role as the CTL director and the work they do that directly impacts students. Faculty who lead and administrators who teach can build a culture of empathy and keep stakeholders—faculty, administrators, staff and students—in close proximity to one another to create an authentic community.

Finally, teaching matters. From my research, I believe that a thoughtfully designed and faculty-led Center for Teaching and Learning is one avenue to introduce, share, model and spread successful instructional practices. Key components of a faculty development program, based on this study and existing research, should include the following:

Consistent staff available to the faculty. Staff could be faculty members themselves or administrators with deep knowledge of pedagogy. Even if there isn't a designated CTL, staff should be readily accessible, particularly if they are going to function as a one-stop-shop for faculty and institutional change.

Workshops or seminars to introduce faculty to best practices and to model those practices. Ideally, existing faculty members should facilitate these workshops; institutions should leverage the talent they have. Building capacity is important. But when an expert can't be found among the faculty, a temporary investment in an outside expert makes sense.

Coaching, consultation and collaboration. Once faculty have been exposed to new ideas, they need support with implementation. This support could be available through coaching: a faculty member and an experienced colleague looking together at student work or the experienced colleague observing a class and then giving feedback to the faculty member; consultation: drop-in support, with staff available to answer questions or engage in reflective conversation to help guide an instructor's thinking—one CTL staff member at Pomelo called herself an instructor's "thought partner"; or peer collaboration: sharing various assignments and strategies for discussion and reflection with a group of colleagues. All these strategies have been used to some degree at the research sites and in recent studies (Condon et al., 2016; Mellow et al., 2015; Perez et al., 2012); student outcomes suggest they work.

Reflection on evidence and integration of new learning. The only way to know if a new strategy or assignment is successful is to examine student work, student evaluations, or other student outcome data; this information serves as evidence of an instructor's practice and any change that may have occurred. After looking at student outcomes, an instructor is then prepared to evaluate if the new strategy or assignment was successful and how to modify it for future implementation. This same process can occur at the institutional scale as well, as shown specifically by High Hill. The cycle of inquiry—learning, implementing and then reflecting—begins again.

Pedagogy is central to all faculty development opportunities at the research sites and permeates the work of other institutional endeavors. I agree with Mike at High Hill—fancy buildings, prestigious grants and the like will not affect student outcomes if there isn't quality instruction in the classroom. Currently, there is a nationwide movement to streamline community college curriculum into guided pathways (Bailey et al., 2015), and this streamlining includes greatly reducing the remedial pathway, especially in the state of California. Part of the ethos of redesign is including high-impact practices like freshman seminars, service learning, learning communities and capstone courses. I posit that rearranging the chess pieces on the board alone will not greatly improve student success; part of any community college redesign should be a laser-like focus on effective pedagogy in every classroom.

Reflection

When I began teaching in a community college in 2004, I felt like an impostor. I had been trained as a high school English teacher and had spent the last 2 years of my K-12 career as an instructional coach. I was well-versed in pedagogy but knew little about teaching in higher education beyond what I had experienced myself and what I had gleaned from my father, a

professor at a research university. I felt compelled to revert to lecture and used the textbook I was given as the foundation of my course—even though I had never used a textbook in my classroom before. It was a much rougher transition than I expected.

Flash forward fourteen years, and I feel like I am more like the high school teacher I was in the late '90s now than when I first started teaching community college. In addition to many years as an adjunct, I worked for K-12 districts teaching administrators how to conduct evidence-based teacher evaluations; I learned so much about cutting-edge pedagogy from my second job that I incorporated right away into my community college classroom. I have come to understand that at least in a community college setting (and, I would argue, in higher education in general), knowing *how* to teach is just as important as knowing *what* to teach. And while I have some colleagues with K-12 training and experience, most of my colleagues have little to no pedagogical training. Thus, my affinity for faculty development was born.

My research confirms what I knew from my own experience: both K-12 and higher education research can inform community college practitioners. In both sectors, there is evidence that sustained, intensive, cohesive faculty development that focuses on classroom practice and engages faculty in peer collaboration can improve student outcomes. Looking at the best work in both sectors can help community college leaders and instructors create support mechanisms to help faculty become better teachers and thereby help students learn.

My research also demonstrated that this work is not easy. All three institutions took some real risks, especially with money, to invest in the faculty. Personnel costs make up the majority of any school budget—there is already a significant financial investment in faculty without adding development costs. But to make substantive improvements in student success, faculty must be engaged in reflective practice fed by innovative ideas.

Finally, I hope the tack I took in this study—blending the best of K-12 and higher education research and practice—encourages others to do the same. I believe that a learner, whether 3, 13, or 30, wants some of the same things: a caring instructor, some autonomy to explore, and a knowledgeable facilitator of that exploration. Of course teaching and learning looks different as people move through developmental stages, but the learner is the same person. Widening our perspective, especially in the academy, to include the best of all educational research and practice may help drive further innovation.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Administrator Protocol

1. Please tell me your role and responsibilities on this campus.
 - What is your role in fostering the development of faculty?
2. What is the history of professional development on this campus? (DO NOT ASK TO NEW ADMINISTRATORS.)
3. Tell me about some of the successes of faculty development on this campus.
4. Tell me about some of the challenges of faculty development on this campus.
5. What process did you undergo to institutionalize the Center for Teaching and Learning?
 - How did you find or negotiate space for the Center?
6. What financial conditions have facilitated or inhibited faculty development on this campus?
 - Did you begin with an initial grant? Which one? What activities/personnel did you support with the initial grant?
 - Have you institutionalized faculty development in your annual budget? How?
7. How would you characterize this campus's culture?
 - How does campus culture affect faculty development?
8. How would you characterize the relationship of the administration and faculty on this campus?
 - Does this relationship affect participation in faculty development? If so, is it in a positive or negative way?

9. Has any member of the leadership team (president; AVP/VPI/asst. provost; dean; director) contributed to the success of faculty development on this campus? If so, in what ways?
10. How have faculty leaders (such as Academic Senate, other shared governance bodies) contributed to the success of faculty development on this campus?
 - Who among the faculty should I speak to on my next visit? (BOTH INVOLVED AND LESS INVOLVED FACULTY LEADERS)
11. Who (external experts, faculty with expertise) primarily delivers faculty development activities?
 - How are these facilitators selected?
12. How does the Center for Teaching and Learning contribute to larger goals and objectives of the institution?
 - Is the Center part of the strategic plan of the college? How?
13. Is there anything else you would like to add or anything else I should have asked?

Faculty Leader Protocol

1. Please tell me your role and responsibilities on this campus.
 - What is your role in fostering the development of faculty?
2. How would you characterize this campus's culture?
 - How does campus culture affect faculty development?
3. How would you characterize the relationship of the administration and faculty on this campus?

- Does this relationship affect participation in faculty development? If so, is it in a positive or negative way?
4. What, if any, value does faculty development provide...
 - ...to your teaching?
 - ...to your career?
 5. How have faculty leaders (such as Academic Senate, other shared governance bodies) contributed to the success of faculty development on this campus?
 6. What role does the faculty play in crafting faculty development opportunities and activities facilitated by the Center for Teaching and Learning?
 7. In your opinion, what incentives are there to participate in faculty development? Are they sufficient?
 8. In your opinion, what challenges are there to participating in faculty development? What could be done—if anything—to mitigate those challenges?
 9. How—if at all—does the Center for Teaching and Learning contribute to the larger goals and objectives of this institution?
 10. Is there anything else you would like to add or anything else I should have asked?

APPENDIX B

STUDY INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

Building Community and Capacity: Institutionalized Faculty Development in Community Colleges

Jessica Krug, Principal Investigator, M.Ed., Doctoral Candidate (Ed. D.), and Dr. Rob Rhoads, Ph.D., Faculty Sponsor, from the Education Department at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) are conducting a research study.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are an administrator or faculty leader under whose purview faculty development falls or you are a faculty leader who is less involved in faculty development. Your participation in this research study is voluntary.

Why is this study being done?

This study will investigate institutionalized faculty development programs in community colleges to find out how institutions initially create and continue to sustain those programs. The definition of “institutionalized” in this context includes high participation of faculty across disciplines, including both adjunct and full-time faculty, and institutions that have made their faculty development programs permanent fixtures on their campuses instead of relying on grant funding or other temporary sources of funding that could eventually be phased out. Further, institutions in this study were selected in part because they are improving student outcomes across their campuses, particularly for low-income students and students of color.

What will happen if I take part in this research study?

If you volunteer to participate in this study, the researcher will ask you to do the following:

- *You will be asked to participate in one 30 to 60-minute interview in your office at your site.*
- *I will record the interviews on an audio recorder and use my iPhone as a backup; I also plan to take notes during the interviews.*
- *FOR ADMINISTRATORS: I hope to learn the history of the faculty development programs, what challenges each institution faced, how stakeholders overcame those challenges, and what role the faculty development program plays in the larger strategic plan or vision of the institution currently.*
- *FOR OTHER FACULTY LEADERSHIP: I want to try to understand how faculty perceive the challenges and value of participating in faculty development, and how faculty development fits into the larger culture and vision of the college.*

How long will I be in the research study?

Participation will take a total of about *a half hour- to hour-long interview, at your site.*

I will make two site visits, in August 2017 and in January 2018. I hope to meet with administrators in August, and faculty leaders in January.

Are there any potential risks or discomforts that I can expect from this study?

- *There are no anticipated risks or discomforts.*
- *BUT, just in case: All participants will be given pseudonyms or codes, and their identities will be kept confidential. I want to get the whole picture of faculty development—including challenges—from all stakeholders, and I want to make sure that there will be no repercussions for participating in my study.*

Are there any potential benefits if I participate?

You will not directly benefit from this study.

The results of the research may provide insight into how community colleges have engaged faculty in their own growth and development while simultaneously improving student outcomes, especially for low-income students and students of color, and may be useful for other community colleges trying to improve instructor and student learning. It could also add to the larger body of work about what kinds of faculty development programs both appeal to faculty and, according to college administrators and faculty, facilitate student success.

Will information about me and my participation be kept confidential?

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can identify you will remain confidential. It will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. All participants will be given pseudonyms or codes, and their identities will be kept confidential. I will keep three sets of my data, including audio files, transcription files, and questionnaires: 1. on my laptop, 2. in Box via UCLA, and 3. on an external hard drive. There is password protection for all three storage sites. All recordings will be destroyed upon completion of the study.

What are my rights if I take part in this study?

- You can choose whether or not you want to be in this study, and you may withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time.
- Whatever decision you make, there will be no penalty to you, and no loss of benefits to which you were otherwise entitled.
- You may refuse to answer any questions that you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

Who can I contact if I have questions about this study?

- **The research team:**

If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to the one of the researchers. Please contact:

Jessica Krug, PI, at krug_jessica@smc.edu or 310.xxx.xxxx, or Dr. Rob Rhoads, faculty sponsor, at rhoads@gseis.ucla.edu

- **UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program (OHRPP):**

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, or you have concerns or suggestions and you want to talk to someone other than the researchers, you may contact the UCLA OHRPP by phone: (310) 206-2040; by email: participants@research.ucla.edu or by mail: Box 951406, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1406.

APPENDIX C

RECRUITMENT COMMUNICATION

INITIAL RECRUITMENT EMAIL:

Dear _____,

My name is Jessica Krug, and I spoke to the CTL administrative assistant earlier today; she suggested I email you directly.

I am a doctoral student at UCLA in Educational Leadership, and my research interest is faculty development. I'm really interested in _____'s program, and I'd like to know more. Specifically, I'm interested in how to grow and sustain a robust faculty development program.

In addition to my studies at UCLA, I'm also an instructor at Santa Monica College, and I am an active participant in activities sponsored by our Center for Teaching Excellence. Initially, I wanted to come to _____ with the director of our Center to learn about your program, but then I thought I could do a more intensive project that would benefit both SMC and facilitate my progress at UCLA.

I would love to have the opportunity to explore options for a research project and a visit. I understand that you are new to your position; my request is not urgent. I would really like to connect with you when you have a chance.

I can be reached at this email address: krug_jessica@smc.edu. I am also available at my home phone: 310.XXX.XXXX, and my cell phone: 310.XXX.XXXX.

Thanks for your consideration,

Jessica Krug
English department
Santa Monica College

REFERENCES

- Amey, M. J. (1999). Faculty development: Looking towards the 21st century. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 7(1), 39–48.
- The Aspen Institute. (2013). *Building a faculty culture of student success*. Retrieved from <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/creating-faculty-culture-student-success>
- Austin, A. E., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2013). The future of faculty development: Where are we going? *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2013(133), 85-97.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20048>
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bass, R. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: What's the problem? *Inventio: Creative Thinking about Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 1-10.
- Belfield, C., & Bailey, T. (2011). The benefits of attending community college: A review of the evidence. *Community College Review*, 39(1), 46-68.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552110395575>
- Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1975). Components of an effective faculty development program. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 46(2), 177-211.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1980880>
- Beyer, C. H., Taylor, E., & Gillmore, G. M. (2013). *Inside the undergraduate teaching experience: The University of Washington's growth in faculty teaching study*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Brawer, F. B. (1990). Faculty development: The literature. *Community College Review*, 18(1), 50-56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009155219001800107>
- Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). The community college and democratic ideals. *Community College Review*, 17(2), 9-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009155218901700203>
- California Community College Chancellor's Office. (2015). *Management information systems data mart*. Retrieved from http://datamart.cccco.edu/Outcomes/Student_Success_Scorecard.aspx
- Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2012). *A matter of degrees: Promising practices for community college student success—a first look*. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED529070>
- Centra, J. A. (1976). *Faculty development practices in U.S. colleges and universities*. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED141382>
- The Century Foundation. (2013). *Bridging the higher education divide: Strengthening community colleges and restoring the American dream*. Retrieved from https://tcf.org/assets/downloads/20130523-Bridging_the_Higher_Education_Divide-REPORT-ONLY.pdf
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987, March). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 3–7. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED282491>
- The City University of New York. (2017). *University history*. Retrieved from <http://www2.cuny.edu/about/administration/chancellor/university-history/>
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American community college* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement. (2008). *High expectations, high support: Essential elements of engagement. 2008 findings*. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED526359>
- Condon, W., Iverson, E. R., Manduca, C. A., Rutz, C., & Willett, G. (2016). *Faculty development and student learning: Assessing the connections*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Coons, A. G., Browne, A. D., Campion, H., Dumke, G., Holy, T., McHenry, D., & Sexton, K. (1960). *A master plan for higher education in California, 1960-1975*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.
- Cooper, D., Rodriguez-Kiino, D., Scharper, A., Karandjeff, K., Chaplot, P., & Schiorring, E. (2014). *Practically speaking: community college practices that help (re) define student success: A practitioner primer*. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED548259>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). State of the profession: Study measures status of professional development. *Journal of Staff Development, 30*(2), 42–44.
- Delmont, M. (2014). Working toward a working-class college: The long campaign to build a community college in Philadelphia. *History of Education Quarterly, 54*(4), 429-464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hoeq.12078>

- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Dougherty, K. J. (1994). *The contradictory college: The conflicting origins, impacts, and futures of the community college*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- Doyle, W. R. (2010). The politics of higher education reform [Working Paper]. Retrieved from <http://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/DoyleWilliamR.pdf>
- Eagan, M. K., Jr., & Jaeger, A. J. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(2), 168–188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-008-9113-8>
- Eddy, P. L. (2010). New faculty issues: Fitting in and figuring it out. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2010(152), 15–24. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cc.423>
- Edwards, A. R., Sandoval, C., & McNamara, H. (2015). Designing for improvement in professional development for community college developmental mathematics faculty. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(5), 466–481. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115602313>
- Elliott, R. W., & Oliver, D. E. (2016). Linking faculty development to community college student achievement: A mixed methods approach. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 40(2), 85-99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2014.961590>
- Fain, P. (2015, March 9). Community college enrollment and completion data. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2015/03/09/community-college-enrollment-and-completion-data>.

- Fugate, A. L., & Amey, M. J. (2000). Career stages of community college faculty: A qualitative analysis of their career paths, roles, and development. *Community College Review*, 28(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009155210002800101>
- Fullan, M. (2011). *Choosing the wrong drivers for whole system reform*. East Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Centre for Strategic Education. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1814-9545-2011-4-79-105>
- Gaff, J. G. (1975). *Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty, instructional, and organizational development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gahn, S., & Twombly, S. B. (2001). Dimensions of the community college faculty labor market. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), 259–282. <http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2001.0002>
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goldrick-Rab, S. (2010). Challenges and opportunities for improving community college student success. *Review of Educational Research*, 80(3), 437–469. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654310370163>
- Grant, M. R., & Keim, M. C. (2002). Faculty development in publicly supported two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26(10), 793-807.
- The Higher Education Act of 1965, 20 U. S. C. § 304 (1965).
- The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, 20 U. S. C. § 513 (2008).
- Hines, S. R. (2017). Evaluating centers for teaching and learning: A field-tested model. *To Improve the Academy*, 36(2), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tia2.20058>

- Holcombe, W. N. (1997). Florida's community colleges: Reflections and projections. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 21(4), 351-363.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1066892970210402>
- Holmes, K., Clement, J., & Albright, J. (2013). The complex task of leading educational change in schools. *School Leadership & Management*, 33(3), 270–283. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13632434.2013.800477>
- Johnson, H. (2010). *Higher education in California: New goals for the master plan*. Retrieved from <http://www.ppic.org/publication/higher-education-in-california-new-goals-for-the-master-plan/>
- Kezar, A. J. (2005). Moving from I to we: Reorganizing for collaboration in higher education. *Change: The Magazine for Higher Learning*, 37(6), 50-57.
<https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.37.6.50-57>
- Kezar, A. J. (2012). Bottom-up/top-down leadership: Contradiction or hidden phenomenon. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(5), 725-760. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2012.0030>
- Kezar, A. J., & Lester, J. (2011). *Enhancing campus capacity for leadership: An examination of grassroots leaders in higher education*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kezar, A. J., & Maxey, D. (Eds.). (2016). *Envisioning the faculty for the 21st century: Moving to a mission-oriented and learner-centered model*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Lambert, L. (1995). *The constructivist leader*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Levin, J. S. (2006). Faculty work: Tensions between educational and economic values. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 62–88. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2006.0004>

- Maxwell, W. E., & Kazlauskas, E. J. (1992). Which faculty development methods really work in community colleges? A review of research. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, 16(4), 351–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361697920160404>
- Mellow, G. O., Woolis, D. D., Klages-Bombich, M., & Restler, S. G. (2015). *Taking college teaching seriously: Pedagogy matters! Fostering student success through faculty-centered practice improvement*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Murray, J. P. (2002). The current state of faculty development in two-year colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2002(118), 89–98. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cc.67>
- Nwagwu, E. C. (1998). How community college administrators can improve teaching effectiveness. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 22(1), 11-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1066892980220102>
- Oreopolous, P., & Petronijevic, U. (2013). Making college worth it: A review of the returns to higher education. *Future of Children*, 23(1), 41-65. <https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2013.0001>
- Perez, A. M., McShannon, J., & Hynes, P. (2012). Community college faculty development program and student achievement. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36(5), 379–385. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10668920902813469>
- Putnam, R. D. (2015). *Our kids: The American dream in crisis*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Rhoads, R. A., & Valadez, J. R. (1996). *Democracy, multiculturalism, and the community college: A critical perspective*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.

- Robinson-Neal, A. (2009). Exploring diversity in higher education management: History, trends, and implications for community colleges. *International Electronic Journal For Leadership In Learning*, 13(4), 1-18.
- Scott-Clayton, J. (2015). The role of financial aid in promoting college access and success: Research evidence and proposals for reform. *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 45(3). Retrieved from <http://publications.nasfaa.org/jsfa/vol45/iss3/3>
- Shugart, S. (2017, February 23). *Luncheon keynote address*. Address presented at 2017 Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) Conference at the Hyatt Regency, Garden Grove, CA.
- Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 153-184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-004-1598-1>
- Vaughn, G. B. (1985). *The community college in America: A short history* (rev. ed.). Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391875>
- Winston, G. C. (2000). *Economic stratification and hierarchy among US colleges and universities*. Williamstown, MA: Williams College.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Zumeta, W. M. (2011). What does it mean to be accountable? Dimensions and implications of higher education's public accountability. *The Review of Higher Education*, 35(1), 131–148. <http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2011.0037>