

Transitions: Becoming a College Teacher

Claudine Lowry

Walter Froese

Nova Scotia Community College

prepared for the

**2001 Pan-Canadian Education Research Agenda Symposium
Teacher Education/Educator Training: Current Trends and Future Directions**

May 22-23, 2001
Laval University, Quebec City

Abstract

This study investigated how well the Nova Scotia Community College prepares new faculty to become effective instructors.

The literature review revealed that community colleges generally do not devote many resources to good teaching, yet faculty identify teaching as the principal reason for choosing colleges. To be effective, instructional training programs require a concerted institutional response.

The survey and focus groups we conducted revealed that faculty share concerns similar to peers elsewhere, and that the Community College Education Diploma Program is a very effective way to help new faculty become more effective instructors while making the transition to a new occupation.

Table of Contents

Purpose	1
Background to Nova Scotia Community College	1
Background to The Community College Education Diploma Program	2
Methodology	2
Findings	3
• Literature Review	3
• The Survey	6
• Focus Groups	8
Discussion	9
Conclusions	10
Implications for Practice and further Research	11
Bibliography	12
Appendices	
• CCEDP Evaluation Survey (March, 2001)	15
• CCEDP Focus Group Guiding Questions	22

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to evaluate how effectively the Community College Education Diploma Program prepares new instructors to take on their roles as faculty members at the Nova Scotia Community College. In particular, we were examining how new faculty made the transition from their previous professional roles to the role of a faculty member, and how well equipped they felt themselves to be to assume that role. Since community colleges have traditionally focussed on teaching, it was thought that the findings from NSCC might be of general interest to other post-secondary institutions with a focus on teaching. We will argue that post-secondary institutions need to have better ways to prepare instructors to teach effectively.

Background to Nova Scotia Community College

The Nova Scotia Community College (NSCC) is a Province-wide system of training and education established in 1988 making it the youngest community college in Canada. The NSCC gradually gained its autonomy from the Province, incorporating itself as an independent institution with a Board of Governors in 1996. Under the new president, Ray Ivany, a strategic planning process initiated in 1998 resulted in a strategic plan that was approved by the Board of Governors in May of 1999.

The College operates on a philosophy of open access to Nova Scotians needing occupational training. While the level of programming is post-secondary, upgrading programs are available to those who have not completed their high school education, enabling them to enter the post-secondary programs. Customized training programs for business, industry, and government agencies form a major component of the activity on every campus. The 14 campuses making up this system were brought together as a result of the merger of existing vocational and technical institutions in the province. The restructuring of vocational and technical education was the result of a renewed commitment by the Province of Nova Scotia to the training and retraining of its work force.

The mandate of the College includes the offering of certificate, diploma, and advanced diploma programs in applied arts, apprenticeable trades, business, health, human services, technical and technology fields. Graduates of the College are competent and prepared to fill a wide variety of entry-level occupations relevant to the current needs of business, industry, and the professions. Over 13,000 students are enrolled on a part-time basis while maintaining their current employment. In addition, emphasis is placed on part-time learning opportunities for those requiring retraining when returning to the work force or changing careers.

The College offers more than 134 programs to a full-time student enrolment of approximately 7,000. In addition, many thousands of Nova Scotians enrol annually in a wide variety of occupational upgrading, continuing education, or general interest courses. In the year 2000 there were 553 faculty employed at NSCC. Of these faculty, 44 were classified as probationary, 413 regular and 96 as term. The average age of faculty was 45.8 and the average years of service were 5.8. (Years of service are calculated from 1988 although some faculty were

employed prior to that date in institutions that became part of the NSCC.) Male faculty (63.83%) outnumber female faculty (36.17). The gender imbalance reflects the history of NSCC with trades training. There are also 144 extension instructors of which 46% are female and 54% are male.

Background to The Community College Education Diploma Program

The Community College Education Diploma Program (CCEDP) must be completed as part of the conditions of employment for all new Faculty and Professional Support Staff at NSCC. Among other criteria, successful completion of the Program is required to move from probationary to regular status. The Program is usually completed in two years.

The CCEDP consists of ten half credits to be completed from an offering of about fifteen courses. There are required courses as well as electives and a month-long Summer Institute is also part of the requirements. Each course has thirty-nine hours of instruction. Up to five courses can be credited based on prior learning. The Program is articulated with several universities and shorter versions of the Program are recognized by the Government of Nova Scotia as meeting the requirements for the training of instructors in private colleges.

Several international training programs have been proposed and delivered based on elements of the CCEDP.

The CCEDP has evolved from other training initiatives to its present form. Until 1998 the Program was operated in partnership with the University of New Brunswick but since then has been led by Organizational Learning within the NSCC. Staff from NSCC and external resource persons are used to offer the courses. This study was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the CCEDP as part of a cyclical three-year review.

Methodology

The research was conducted from February through April 2001. The study is comprised of three components: a literature search, a survey and focus groups.

The literature search was conducted in order to compare current NSCC faculty training practices to those at other postsecondary institutions in North America. The search terms used were: community colleges; college teachers; technical education; vocational education; community college teachers, training of; community college faculty, training of; vocational teachers, training.

The survey instrument used was an electronic questionnaire. This format was chosen for several reasons. First, given the timeframe and budget, mail or hand-delivered distribution was not feasible. Secondly, with faculty at thirteen locations across Nova Scotia, distribution by e-

mail seemed more feasible. The surveys were sent from and delivered to our research department to ensure anonymity.

The survey was sent to all those individuals who had graduated from the CCEDP between 1998 and 2000, and all those enrolled at present. A total of 208 surveys were sent out including 42 sent by mail to former employees.

Several difficulties were encountered. The group e-mailing returned many messages as undeliverable. Despite assurances that the technical problem had been corrected, we had individuals reporting that they had not received their questionnaires. It also became apparent that some faculty did not check their e-mails regularly, and others paid little attention because of the volume of e-mails and survey "fatigue" at NSCC.

Of the forty-two surveys sent to former employees, none were returned so they were excluded from our response rate. Of the 166 remaining surveys, 64 were returned for a response rate of 39 percent. This was a disappointing return but we had a good cross section from our sample and only one small campus (three possible responses) is not represented in the responses.

We had planned three regional focus groups with a cross-section of participants determined by year of graduation, program of concentration and gender. We actually conducted four focus groups: one in the Annapolis Valley with representatives from three campuses; one in Halifax with representatives from three campuses; one at the Marconi Campus and one at the Pictou Campus. Due to the distances between campuses and the severe winter conditions we decided that we needed to travel to the focus group locations ourselves. In addition to the distances and weather, the research took place across March Break and then across one of the busiest times in the academic year which mitigated against time-consuming travel for respondents.

The moderators chosen to conduct the focus groups were not involved in the CCEDP.

Findings

Literature Review

The literature search revealed a paucity of Canadian research into community colleges and even less into the effectiveness of instruction at these institutions. Although there was more research available about U.S. community colleges, it is striking how little research into the quality of teaching is taking place in institutions that purport to have a focus on teaching.

One of the most often cited studies of Canadian colleges by Dennison (1996) does not devote even a section to the training of faculty. In a more recent study Grubb (1999) suggests that "many community colleges, as institutions, pay little attention to teaching. They fail to use their institutional resources to enhance the quality of instruction, so that good teaching emerges only in isolated and idiosyncratic ways" (p.2). He also points out that "The best institutions

have administrators who are committed to teaching and who have managed to orient every single policy in their college toward the improvement of teaching” (p.302).

Boice (1992) suggests that unless taught otherwise, new faculty will teach as they were taught, that is, focus on getting the subject content right. He goes on to suggest that faculty often lack awareness of teaching methods and focus instead on time management and defensive strategies, blaming the quality of students, invalid rating systems and heavy teaching loads for their own inadequate teaching performance.

With the increased call for public accountability for what happens in post-secondary institutions, it could be expected that colleges, one of whose primary functions is to teach, will be asked to demonstrate that effective teaching is occurring within their programs. Barnes (1997) suggests that “Such challenging times affirm a clear need for research on changes in teaching practices, since effective teaching and learning is the primary mission of community colleges” (p.8). This study is intended to contribute to such research.

One of the questions we asked was, “How does one become a teacher?” This is an important question for new and experienced faculty alike since the role of college faculty has changed rapidly in recent years. Dickson (1999) discusses the changing role of college faculty and identifies several important trends that are seen as a paradigm shift. One change is that faculty will be spending a larger percentage of their time performing functions outside the classroom. These changes amount to a new model for faculty: “Three important aspects of this new model are the ability to customize learning, the ability to provide collaborative learning experiences, and the diffusion of learning” (p.6). Communications technology will be central in implementing this new model and faculty will be required to synthesize disparate sources of information and to make connections among many sources of information to create new knowledge which transcends traditional disciplines. Faculty will be required “to act as synthesizers, knowledge navigators, designers of learning environments, facilitators, mentors to students and part-timers, classroom researchers... faculty members will have to develop new forms of expertise and give up other roles that currently consume their time” (p.7). Dickson also concludes that “each of the new roles that faculty members are expected to fulfill require some type of management skills” (p.8).

The faculty role in community colleges may be changing and becoming more demanding, yet often community college faculty feel they receive little respect and that their role remains undefined (Fugate & Amey, 2000). It is clear that one of the most important reasons attracting individuals to college faculty positions is the combined focus on teaching and service to the community. They conceptualized their role primarily as that of a teacher. It was also clear that unlike teachers in other institutions, college teachers “chose teaching following or in conjunction with another career” (p.4). Their biggest fear was burnout and the challenge of teaching a diverse student population was prominent. There was a clearly recognized need for the development of teaching skills in the first year and institutionally supported ongoing professional development as careers progressed. They also suggest that consciously designed initiatives to sustain academic and intellectual practises among faculty as a group, are important in creating and strengthening

the academic culture in a college. The faculty role is demanding and deliberate organizational practices have a significant impact on faculty development.

Another study (Perry *et al*) focussing on the adjustment of new hires to post-secondary teaching positions found that faculty who believe they have control over their teaching duties may engage in a variety of activities conducive to success and that “ multiplicity of purpose may exacerbate the adjustment process in the case of new hires” (p.5). It is interesting to note that new faculty in community colleges, compared to universities, reported higher job satisfaction, lower teaching related stress and fewer negative emotions about their teaching; However, satisfaction was lower in the second year and remained the same in the third year.

Higgins and Hawthorne (1994), in a study into career satisfaction among faculty at two year colleges, provide insights into which factors influence faculty perception of satisfaction. The top three factors contributing to satisfaction were the focus on teaching (96%), the self-directed nature of their work (86%) and the opportunity to help students (79%). The same authors find that “success in teaching appears to be focussed as much on the interaction with students as on the transmission of course content” (p.8). It was also considered important to allow faculty opportunities to demonstrate their talents in a variety of ways.

Galbraith and Shedd (1990) identified three broad categories of skills that are required to be successful as a college instructor: “ interpersonal skills, instructional planning skills, and teaching and learning transaction skills” (p.4). Interpersonal skills were expressed through such things as caring, listening, respect and passion for one’s work. Instructional planning skills included being able to assess the needs of students, creating clear educational objectives, organizing effective learning activities and performing valid evaluations of work. Learning transaction skills included the ability to create a positive psycho-social educational climate and providing “interactions that are active, challenging, and supportive” (p. 7). In order to continue to build these skills it was suggested “that all faculty should be engaged in a professional development plan that addresses the process of effective facilitation of adult learning” (p. 9).

Lecroy and McClenney (1992) identify three broad challenges facing community college faculty: diversity in the student population both in academic preparedness and cultural differences; fragmentation of the student body and faculty into part-time, full-time and many other variations; demands on faculty to take on new roles which lead to overwork. They also found that faculty “want more involvement and connection with one another and with the larger purpose of the organization”(p. 44). They found that for new faculty an adequate orientation was critical, whereas for mid-career faculty concerns about staying current in their fields needed to be addressed, and for senior faculty there was a deep felt need to share their expertise. Much of this faculty development occurs naturally within a discipline or a department. Various ways are suggested to initiate the kind of dialogue about their development that faculty appear to want.

Mann (1999) suggests that individual development needs to be connected to the development of the organization. He contends that with the various demands being placed on colleges there has been too little attention paid to human resource management issues. In order to address this oversight, he suggests conditions that are necessary in order to effect change and to sustain ongoing development.

The literature review confirmed many of the perceptions we had about trends within the Nova Scotia Community College. The literature confirmed that, despite some unique conditions at NSCC, the major issues at NSCC are very similar to those at other colleges in North America.

The Survey

The survey was intended to evaluate how effectively the Community College Education Diploma Program prepares new instructors at NSCC. The CCEDP is a condition of employment for new faculty.

The survey was divided into six sections: demographic questions, your current work, career transition to adult education, teaching effectiveness, transition to a learning organization and CCEDP structure and content. All calculations are based on sixty-four respondents.

The demographic data indicated that we had faculty from thirteen of our fourteen campuses responding to our survey with the response varying greatly by campus but averaging thirty-nine percent. The faculty represented eighty-one programs offered at NSCC ranging from academic upgrading to post graduate diploma programs. The largest percentage of faculty were in core programs, with customized training being the next largest and smaller numbers from apprenticeship and continuing education. There were forty-five percent from the ages 35-44, thirty-eight percent from 45-54, and fourteen percent from ages 25-34 . The split by gender was forty-two percent female to fifty-eight percent male.

Faculty in our sample represented thirty-seven different occupations. When the occupations were grouped, industry, manager in private sector, teaching and self-employment were the largest categories followed by health and the public sector. Educational background varied considerably with twenty-eight reporting undergraduate degrees; nineteen, a college diploma; sixteen, formal trades training; fourteen, journeyman; thirteen, graduate degrees; ten, professional designations and five, an education degree. Some individuals had qualifications from more than one category.

The reasons given for choosing teaching indicated that seventeen individuals enjoyed learning and teaching, and fifteen wanted to help people or impart knowledge. This represented half the sample. Of the remaining reasons five identified new challenges, and four each identified need for a change, belief in the program, and job availability.

When asked about the effectiveness of the CCEDP in making the transition into adult education, eighty-two percent either agreed or somewhat agreed that the CCEDP was effective. Eighty-nine percent agreed that the Summer Institute helped create an effective network of colleagues, and seventy-one percent indicated that they kept in regular contact with their classmates. Sixty-eight percent agreed that the mentoring program worked for them. Fully ninety percent considered teaching as their primary career after just a short time teaching.

Reporting on methods of instruction used, lectures were used thirty-one per cent of the time, demonstration and practice twenty-seven percent, workshops thirteen percent, independent study twelve percent, one-on-one nine percent, on-line four percent, and the remainder were

other categories. Business faculty used the lecture method almost half as frequently as other faculty, whereas Health and Human Services faculty used demonstration and practice much less frequently than other program faculty. Workshops were used twice as frequently in Business and Health and Human Services programs, and one-on-one instruction was used more frequently in Applied Media and Business. Independent Study was used significantly less in the Trades and Technology than in other programs.

A clear pattern emerged when faculty were asked to identify their primary role as a teacher. The four roles provided were: facilitator, coach, mentor and provider of information. There was also an opportunity to create other categories. Forty percent identified facilitating learning as their primary role, twenty-five percent identified mentoring, thirteen percent judged each role to be equal, thirteen percent chose coaching and eight percent elected providing information as their primary role.

Faculty also clearly indicated that they saw their role as many-faceted. Sixty-four percent saw all three of the roles: providing subject matter expertise; helping students learn program content; and, sharing expertise with the community through research and innovation as their responsibility. Seventeen percent identified providing subject matter expertise as their primary role, while eleven percent focussed on students learning program content.

When faculty were asked how they spent their time, teaching was highest with preparation time a close second. Consulting with students was third with consulting with employers, meetings and administrative duties about equal after that. In the second year of teaching, preparation time was shown to go down somewhat but time spent with students, employers and on administrative duties went up so that the total time spent went up.

In evaluating factors that help with the transition to NSCC, people within their department were the most important, followed by the CCEDP and other individuals at their campuses. When asked what was best about the CCEDP thirty-three percent of the respondents identified meeting other people and seventeen percent saw networking as the most significant positive element. Learning new ways of teaching, learning from colleagues and learning in general taken together represented twenty-seven percent of the responses. The negative factors that stood out were: being away from family (20%), the demands of the Program (8%), giving up summer vacation (6%), and accommodations (6%).

In identifying how effective the CCEDP was in preparing teachers, ninety-two percent agreed that CCEDP helped them become more effective teachers and eighty-seven percent would recommend the Program to anyone planning to become a college teacher. Eighty percent agreed that they could fully apply what they had learned directly in their teaching and seventy-eight percent thought there was a good balance between theory and practical applications. The courses that stood out as being most useful were Supporting Student Success at thirty-three percent and Facilitating Adult Learning at twenty percent approval. The course, The Contemporary Community College, was seen as helpful in understanding the NSCC and its context in society by eight-six percent, and seventy-eight percent agreed that the Summer Institute helped them understand their role in a complex multi-campus organization. Seventeen percent could not

identify a course that they perceived to be least useful, and the courses identified as being least useful represented individual preferences, with no significant pattern emerging.

Of the formats used to deliver courses, week-long courses were seen as highly effective by ninety-six percent and the month long Summer Institute was seen as effective by ninety-five percent. The least effective formats were seen to be the three Fridays and Saturdays at sixty-seven and on-line fifty percent, respectively. Eighty percent of the respondents felt the CCEDP formats provided enough flexibility to fit their personal needs, but ninety-one percent would prefer more choice in courses and only forty percent favoured more required courses. Seventy-eight percent felt that individuals should be able to develop their own plan for completing the CCEDP.

Focus Groups

There were four focus groups where three main themes were explored:

1. Establishing an identity as an instructor
2. Becoming an effective instructor
3. Becoming a member of a learning organization

The first theme dealt with questions intended to explore how faculty perceived their role. Although responses varied a great deal, distinct patterns did emerge. Individuals still had a strong identification with the profession from which they gained their subject matter expertise, but they were beginning to identify themselves as instructors, facilitators and faculty. Most individuals had not set out to be teachers so becoming an instructor was a significant career transition. They tended to shy away from the word teacher since it is associated with the public school teachers, and they saw their public image linked to the image of the College which they saw as improving. They saw themselves as professionals in the process of becoming instructors.

Motivation to become an instructor revealed a clear pattern of commitment to student learning. There was a sense of needing to give back to the community and sharing expertise with students. Helping students take responsibility for their own learning and helping them succeed in getting good jobs were seen as important. The rewards of teaching that were identified were almost all intrinsic although not having job security was a concern.

The second theme focussed on becoming an effective instructor and what could be done to improve the training of new faculty. Many individuals noted that they were experts in their field but were new to teaching and therefore needed very practical courses in all aspects of teaching. They suggested that instructors should not enter a classroom without adequate training and curriculum materials. Suggestions for practical topics included lesson planning, communication, evaluation techniques, dealing with difficult students, planning and classroom management issues. There was an appreciation for the skills needed to teach effectively and the hard work required to become an effective instructor.

Overall, respondents were pleased with the training they received through the CCEDP but some regretted the fact that because of the date of hire, the training came after they had taught a semester or more. They appreciated the mentoring program but some suggested that reduced workloads in the first semester in order to observe other teachers and to learn the craft, might be a good idea. They suggested that learning with their peers was enriching and created networks of support. Being a learner in the CCEDP focussed their attention on what a student might feel in their classes. Having the opportunity to think about, and to discuss important educational issues, was seen as an important element of the Program, especially the residential Summer Institute.

The third theme dealt with the transition to Nova Scotia Community College as an institution and as a learning organization. Respondents felt that NSCC had high expectations of them as instructors with many additional responsibilities outside the classroom. Often they were not provided with enough program materials making the job of a new faculty member very difficult. Many were pleasantly surprised at the level of the programs offered at the College. They were pleased with the amount of support through the CCEDP as new faculty, but were already concerned about ongoing professional development, especially in their subject specialities. Some felt that things were changing so fast that they never felt fully competent.

There were concerns that the NSCC was bureaucratic in its procedures, on the other hand, they felt the College strategic plan was clearly communicated. They felt that NSCC had come a long way in a short time but that public perception had not kept up with the changes. There were concerns about the number of term employees hired and what the College's commitment was to these faculty members. They felt it was wasteful to train faculty and then have them take their skills elsewhere.

Overall, respondents felt overworked in their first few years so that the teacher training sometimes became an additional task. However, there was a general recognition that lifelong learning is a necessity and in most cases it was perceived as a positive prospect. There was considerable concern though, that too many demands might lead to burnout.

In summary, faculty were committed to their new profession and perceived themselves to be in the process of becoming instructors. They needed practical applications to help them become effective instructors and the CCEDP generally met these needs. They were committed to lifelong learning but found the first year at NSCC especially demanding.

Discussion

The literature review demonstrated that trends in other community colleges were also found to be prominent at the Nova Scotia Community College. Several of these trends resonated quite loudly. The increasing call for public accountability is also felt at NSCC and it is being addressed on an institutional level at present by developing performance indicators and reporting instruments. Students also hold instructors accountable and the effectiveness of instruction is an important part of that accountability. It follows that since the effectiveness of instruction is a measure of performance, practices that ensure effective instruction takes place, need to be reinforced.

The changing role of faculty is a significant challenge at NSCC and this was identified in the research as well. Often the preparation of faculty focuses on survival skills in the classroom, when the classroom represents less than half of faculty responsibilities. Increasingly liaison with industry and the community is required and ongoing program development can be very demanding. Students have different expectations of faculty so that learning to adapt instructional approaches becomes very important. The changing technological environment is another trend echoed at NSCC.

The Community College Education Program offers courses such as, Interactive Listening, Supporting Student Success, Meeting Market Challenges, Information Literacy for Lifelong Learning as part of the attempt to address the broadened role for faculty. The research would indicate that this broader approach is valid as long as the focus on teaching is maintained.

The continually changing educational environment creates demands for the ongoing development of faculty. The research suggests that faculty professional development plans need to be focussed on improving performance in this increasingly complex educational environment. The experience at NSCC would confirm these findings.

The research also suggested that the diversity in students' level of academic preparation and socio-economic background was an increasing challenge and this was identified as a challenge at NSCC as well. This factor is of particular importance because faculty choose to teach at colleges primarily because of their desire to interact with students and to be of service. If faculty feel overwhelmed by the diversity in the student population, their satisfaction with their work might well decline.

The research also indicated that a concerted institutional response was needed in order to make effective teaching a priority. Although mandatory programs have their own issues, the NSCC has mandatory teacher training through the CCEDP, as part of its institutional response to provide effective instruction. The high approval rating for the Program would indicate the CCEDP is a success in meeting this main challenge. The research would also indicate that the recent creation of a department for Organizational Learning at NSCC has the potential to improve the institutional response in supporting instruction.

The CCEDP appears to be effective in helping new faculty make the transition to a new career and a new institution, but it is also clear that people in the departments where faculty work are very important in helping with this process.

Conclusions

We were able to establish through the literature review and our own survey and focus groups, that NSCC, despite its short history, is very much part of trends in evidence among community colleges in North America. Faculty at Nova Scotia Community College and in community colleges generally, choose to work in colleges because they want to teach. Faculty also recognize the need for training in order to become effective instructors, and as instructors they devote the largest portion of their work time to the teaching and learning process. Focussing

institutional resources on training instructors must be a priority if instruction is to be improved and the institution is to be seen as accountable for one of its key goals which is to foster learning.

The Nova Scotia Community College has been quite effective with its Community College Education Diploma Program in preparing new instructors for their new roles by allocating significant resources to training new faculty. Faculty found the Program very useful in learning how to teach, making lasting connections with colleagues and in making the transition to a new career and a learning organization.

Implications for Practice and further Research

Although the CCEDP was seen to be effective in preparing new faculty, it was also shown that program departments were very significant in helping new faculty. The question arises: how do departments support new faculty and how can we support their efforts?

It would also be worth researching whether the training received by faculty has a measurable impact on student satisfaction with their learning experience at NSCC.

The study provided general perceptions about teaching methods used by faculty and the roles performed by faculty. It would be useful to explore these roles in greater detail and to discover why there is a variation in teaching methods in different program areas.

Since autonomy is important in determining satisfaction with teaching, it would be useful to know more about what this might mean in terms of organizing the work faculty perform.

In light of the changing roles of faculty both as instructors and outside the classroom, how can faculty be supported in managing their new roles?

Considering the expressed need by faculty for ongoing professional growth, how can these needs best be met?

How can an organizational culture of lifelong learning be nurtured in a community college?

Bibliography

Alfano, Kathleen (1993, Summer). Recent strategies for faculty and staff development. Community College Review 21 (1), 68-78.

Barnes, Cynthia A. (1996). Toward a theory of community college faculty as learners. Doctoral dissertation, The Fielding Institute (University Microfilms No. 9729108).

Bell, Stephen (1992, Spring). Research activities and work satisfaction of community college faculty in Ontario. Review of Higher Education 15, (3), 307-325.

Boice, Robert (1992). The new faculty member: supporting and fostering professional development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bundy, Allen (2000, May-June). Basic skills problems at community colleges and how to resolve them. Change 32 (3), 44-48.

Dennison, John D. (Ed.). (1995). Challenge and opportunity: Canada's community college at the crossroads. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dickson, Robyn (1999, Spring). The changing role of community college faculty: implications in the literature. Community College Review 26 (4), pp. 23.

Falconer, Corinne (1991). Transition: on becoming a community college teacher. (Masters Project, Brock University) St. Catherines, ON: Brock University.

Foote, Elizabeth (1995, Fall). Clearing house for junior colleges: adjunct faculty in community colleges. Catalyst 2 (1), 21-23.

Fugate, Amy L. & Amey, Marilyn J. (2000, Summer). Career stages of community college faculty: a qualitative analysis of their career paths, roles, and development. Community College Review 28 (1), 1-23.

Galbraith, Michael W. & Shedd, Perry E. (1990, Fall). Building skills and proficiencies of the community college instructor of adult learners. Community College Review 18 (2), 6-15.

Grubb, W. Norton, et al. (1999). Honored but invisible. New York and London: Routledge.

Harnish, D. & Wild, L. A. (1992, Fall). In the words of the faculty: what difference does professional development make? Community College Review 20 (2), pp. 20-29.

Higgins, C. Steven & Hawthorne, Elizabeth M. (1994, Spring). The successful community college instructor: a profile for recruitment. Community College Review 21 (4), 27-37

Huber, Mary Taylor (1998). Community college faculty attitudes and trends, 1997. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Layne, Rosemary G. & Forester, Glenn (1991, May 21). The cutting edge: sharpening faculty skills in a changing world, National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development National Annual Conference on Teaching. Austin, TX.

Layzell, Daniel T & others (1994, November). Developing and viewing faculty as an asset for institutions and states. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Tucson, AZ.

LeCroy, N. A. & McClenney, Kay (1992, Fall). To walk on water: challenges for community college faculty. New Directions for Community Colleges 20 (3), pp. 39-47.

Lyons, Richard E. (1996). A study of the effects of a mentoring initiative on the performance of new adjunct community college faculty (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 1996).

Mann, Edward (1999). Utilizing organizational career development techniques for faculty development. ATEA Journal 26 (3), 8-12.

Manzo, Kathleen Kennedy (1996, August 26). Faculty development moving in right direction. Community College Week 9 (2), 10-14.

Miller, Anthony A. (1997, Spring). ERIC review –back to the future: preparing community college faculty for the new millennium. Community College Review 24 (4), 83-93.

Murray, John P. (1998, January-February). Faculty development in New York two-year colleges. Community College Journal of Research & Practice 22 (10).

Murray, John P. (2000, April-May). Faculty development in Texas two-year colleges. Community College Journal of Research & Practice 24 (4), 251-258.

Perry, R. P., Menec, V. H., Struthers, C. W, Hechter, F. J., Schonwetter, D. J., & Menges, R. J. (1996). Faculty in transition: the adjustment of new hires to postsecondary institutions. (Occasional papers in higher education No. 6). Winnipeg, MA: University of Manitoba, Centre for Higher Education Research and Development.

Professional and staff development. (1993, July). Educational Administration Abstracts 28 (3).

St. Clair, Karen L. (1994, Winter). Faculty-to-faculty mentoring in the community college: an instructional component of faculty development. Community College Review 22 (3), pp. 23-35.

Staff development needs assessment (1993). Santa Clarita, CA: College of the Canyons.

Stonbreaker, Kristen M. (1991). An analysis of selected California community college faculty members' perception of challenges experienced during the first year of hire (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, 1991). (University Microfilms No. 92-02452)

Sydow, Debbie L. (1998). Outcomes of the VCCS professional development initiative: 1993-1998. Richmond, VA: Virginia Community College System.

Talbert, Kevin (1992). Summer institute for faculty development. Washington D.C.: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Winter, Paul A. & Kjorlien, Chad L. (2000). Community college recruitment: an analysis of applicant reactions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational research Association, New Orleans, LA.

CCEDP Evaluation Survey (March, 2001)

Please reflect on your overall experience in CCEDP when answering the following questions. Individual answers will be dealt with in the strictest confidence.

Instructions for Completing this survey: There are three ways to complete and return this survey. Please use the method you are most comfortable with.	
OPTION 1 Reply by e-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open this document in Word • Navigate through tables to the answer spaces using “Tab” or your mouse, and type in your responses • Save your completed survey with a new file name • e-mail your completed survey as an attachment to: • Suzanne Drapeau, drapease@nsc.ca • When your response is received, your name will be removed from the correspondence to ensure the confidentiality of your response
OPTION 2 Complete in Word and reply by Mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open this document in Word • Navigate through tables to the answer spaces using “Tab” or your mouse, and type in your responses • Save your completed survey with a new file name • Print your survey on your printer • Return to: Suzanne Drapeau, Organizational Development, in the inter-campus mail
OPTION 3 Complete by hand and reply by mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open this document in Word • Print your survey on your printer • Complete the survey by filling in your answers in the spaces provided in the tables • Return to: Suzanne Drapeau, Organizational Development in the inter-campus mail

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS
In order to analyze survey responses, we require some demographic information about you.

1.	Please identify your current Campus.	CAMPUS NAME

Please check this box if you are not currently employed by NSCC.

2.	TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES		X
a)	In what school(s) do you currently teach? (mark all that apply)	Applied Arts & New Media	
		Business, Tourism and Hospitality	
		Health & Human Services	
		Trades & Technology	

2.	TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES		List Programs below				
b)	In what program(s) do you currently teach?						
2.	TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES		X				
c)	What kinds of programs do you currently teach? (mark all that apply)		Core Programs				
			Apprenticeship Programs				
			Continuing Education				
			Customized Training				
2.	TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES		List subjects below				
d)	What subject(s) do you currently teach?						
3.	In what year did you complete the CCEDP or CCTEP?		1998	1999	2000	Not completed	
4.	How many summers did you spend in residence while taking the CCEDP?		one	two	Three		
5.	Gender		Female		Male		
6.	Age		Under 25	25-34	35-44	45-54	55 or older
7.	Formal education completed immediately prior to employment at NSCC (mark as many as apply)					X	
	• Trades or vocational certificate						
	• Journeyperson certificate						
	• Community college certificate, diploma or advanced diploma						
	• Professional designation (e.g. CMA, CA)						
	• Undergraduate university degree						
	• Education degree						
	• Graduate degree						
• Other: Specify							

8.	Please check ONE box that best describes the nature of your life activity immediately before you began working for the NSCC		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Student		Homemaker	
Business owner		Employed in a not-for-profit agency	
Self employed		Teacher in P-12 system	
Public servant		Teacher in a private career college	
University teacher		In the military	
Teaching in another community college		Employed in health sector	
Management position in private sector		Sales/service position in private sector	
In industry: specify what industry		Other: specify	
9.	At the end of this academic year (June 2001), how many years will you have been employed by the NSCC?		# OF YEARS

SECTION II: YOUR CURRENT WORK			
10.	Using percentages please indicate the proportions of each method of instruction you currently use in your teaching	PERCENT	
	• Lecture Format		
	• Demonstration and practice of skills (e.g. welding, computer applications)		
	• On-line / internet courses		
	• Workshops and/or facilitated small groups		
	• One on one contact with students		
	• Facilitation of projects and independent study		
	• Other – specify		
11.	Using percentages please indicate how much of your time, on average is spent on the following activities. Please do this for both your first year of teaching at NSCC and the current year.	PERCENT IN FIRST YEAR OF TEACHING	PERCENT IN CURRENT YEAR, 2000-01
	• Preparation for teaching		
	• Teaching (all instruction methods)		
	• In meetings		
	• Administrative functions		
	• Contacts with employers		
	• Consulting with students		
	• Other – specify		

SECTION III: CAREER TRANSITION TO ADULT EDUCATION		AGREE	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	DISAGREE
12.	I was aware of the requirement to complete the CCEDP at the time that I was hired.				
13.	The CCEDP was effective in helping me make the transition from my previous employment to an adult education environment				
14.	I keep in regular contact with my classmates from CCEDP				
15.	The Summer Institute component of CCEDP helped me establish a network of colleagues throughout the NSCC				
16.	I now consider teaching to be my primary career				
17.	The mentoring course helped me make my transition to college teaching				

18. The most difficult challenge I faced in making the transition to college teaching was:

19. I chose teaching as a career because:

20. I chose to come to the NSCC because:

21. If you were not teaching at the NSCC, what would you be doing now?

22.	Please rank the following from MOST (1) helpful to LEAST (6) helpful in helping you make the transition to the NSCC?	RANK
	• Other faculty members in my department	
	• Other faculty members in other departments or campuses	
	• The people at my campus	
	• CCEDP	
	• Faculty Orientation	
	• Other: Specify	

23. The best thing about CCEDP was _____
24. The worst thing about CCEDP was _____
25. The best thing about the residence experience was _____
26. The worst thing about residence experience was _____

SECTION IV: TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS		AGREE	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	DISAGREE
27.	The CCEDP helped me become a more effective teacher				
28.	The courses in CCEDP provided a good balance between theory and practical applications				
29.	I have been able to fully apply what I learned in CCEDP to my teaching practice				
30.	The <u>Practicum</u> component of the CCEDP helped me put into practice what I learned in the CCEDP.				
31.	The <u>Supporting Student Success</u> course helped me to better understand my students				
32.	I would recommend the CCEDP to anyone planning to be a college teacher				

33. The CCEDP course(s) most useful to me were: _____
34. The CCEDP course(s) least useful to me were: _____

SECTION V: TRANSITION TO A LEARNING ORGANIZATION		AGREE	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	DISAGREE
35.	The <u>Contemporary Community College</u> course helped me understand the NSCC and its context in society				
36.	The Summer Institute component of the CCEDP helped me understand my role as a faculty member in a complex, multi-campus organization.				

37.	I see my primary role as a teacher as being a:				X
	• Coach				
	• Mentor				
	• Facilitator				
	• Provider of information				
	Other: Specify				

38.	I see my roles as a faculty member as including:	X
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing subject matter expertise 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helping students learn program content 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing programs /course content 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing my expertise with community / industry partners for our mutual benefit through research and innovation 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other: Specify 	

SECTION VI: CCEDP STRUCTURE AND CONTENT		Highly Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Highly Ineffective
39.	Please rate the effectiveness of the following CCEDP course formats:				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Fridays & Saturdays format 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online courses 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Week-long courses 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer Institute 				

		AGREE	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	DISAGREE
40.	The program structure and course formats have provided me with enough flexibility to fit my personal needs				
41.	More of the courses in CCEDP should be required courses				
42.	More elective courses should be offered in CCEDP				
43.	Each participant should be able to develop their own plan for completing the CCEDP requirements				

44. What new courses would you add to those already available in CCEDP?

45. Which, if any, of the CCEDP courses would you remove from the courses offered?

46.	If you were designing a CCEDP from scratch, what would an ideal program look like? Use the components below to help you.	
	Number of course credits in Total?	
	Years from hire date to complete?	
	Required Summer Institute Component?	
	Required courses?	
	Elective courses?	
	Course sequencing?	
	Any other suggestions you have to create an ideal CCEDP?	

THANK YOU

Please return your completed survey by e-mail, fax or intercampus mail **before March 9, 2001** to:
 Sue Drapeau
 Manager, Institutional Research
 Organizational Development Office
 NSCC, Central Office
 E-Mail: drapease@nscc.ns.ca
 Fax: (902) 491-3511

If you have any questions about completing the survey please call (902) 491-6765.

CCEDP Focus Group Guiding Questions

Becoming a Teacher / Identity as a Teacher

- ✗ If you were filling out your passport application, what would you write down as your “occupation”?
- ✗ Looking back on the teachers you have had, what were the characteristics you admired in them?
- ✗ Early on when you were thinking of possible careers, did you think you might want to become a teacher?
- ✗ What does it mean to you to call yourself a college teacher?
- ✗ What do you think the public at large thinks of when they think of a college teacher?
- ✗ Did the experiences in the CCEDP help you define yourself as a teacher?

Acquiring Teaching Skills

Looking back, what would you have wanted to know about the skills needed to teach, that you didn't know?

What were the most important skills you learned which have made you an effective teacher?

How did you acquire these skills?

If you could design a process, how would you have new teachers acquire effective teaching skills?

Transition to NSCC / Lifelong Learning

What was your impression of NSCC before you came to work here?

What surprised you about NSCC (things you did not expect) when you started to work here?

What particular challenges did you face when you began working at NSCC? (work / personal)

What does lifelong learning mean to you?

Looking ahead a few years, what do you see as the biggest challenges facing you as a college teacher?