2001

Examining the academic experiences of minorities preparing for the professoriate

Willie J. Heggins III
Iowa State University

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Examining the academic experiences of minorities preparing for the professoriate

by

Willie J. Heggins, III

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Higher Education)

Major Professor: John H. Schuh

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2001

UMI Number: 3016709

Copyright 2001 by
Heggins, Willie J., III

All rights reserved.

UMI®

Graduate College
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the Doctoral dissertation of

Willie J. Heggins, III

has met the dissertation requirements of Iowa State University

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Major Professor

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Program

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The critical need to understand the socialization experiences of prospective minority faculty is apparent today. If we can understand more about the experiences of new minority faculty members, perhaps the academy will be able to develop continued supportive strategies that enhance their development into the academic profession. The purpose of this study was to examine the academic experiences of the minority participants in the Preparing Future Faculty program (PFF). As a consequence of participating in the PFF program, the minority participants regarded that they felt ready for a faculty position, regarded that mentoring was effective, indicated that awareness of faculty roles and responsibilities were crucial, identified that cultural dissonance, inclusiveness, and an appreciation of a diverse faculty as issues of concern, and described the concept of "duality" in the socialization process as it pertains to the professoriate. Based on the data gleaned from this study, networking, mentoring, and research support stand out as major strategies for addressing the problems faced by prospective minority faculty. The respondents in the study suggested themes common to those of the literature, emphasizing an improvement in professional development opportunities for prospective minority faculty. Establishing awareness to the professional culture, understanding roles and responsibilities, and defining a relationship with senior faculty are efforts to improve recruitment, retention, and advancement for prospective faculty of color. From this study, the researcher has derived that faculty development initiatives should provide more emphasis on teaching, render service to departments and develop continued respect for the academic profession (e.g., teaching, research, and service).

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Rationale

This study examined the preparation of minority faculty within selected institutions of higher education. Although substantial research has been conducted on faculty preparation (Gaff, 1997; Slevin, 1992; Tice, Gaff, & Pruitt-Logan, 1998), this study focused primarily on initiatives/plans to encourage the expansion of minority faculty in underrepresented academic disciplines at several public and independent colleges and universities in the Midwest.

Examining the academic experiences of minority students participating in the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program was the focus of this study. This program is spearheaded by a joint collaboration between the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and the Council of Graduate Studies (CGS). AAC&U is the leading national association devoted to advancing and strengthening liberal learning for all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitators, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning.

The Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) is dedicated to the improvement and advancement of graduate education. Its members are colleges and universities engaged in research, scholarship, and the preparation of candidates for advanced degrees. As the largest national association organized specifically to represent the interests of graduate education, CGS offers many opportunities for deans and graduate school personnel to exchange ideas and share information on major issues in graduate education with emphasis on developing ways to better prepare doctoral students for employment as faculty members.

The PFF program provides doctoral students with opportunities to observe and experience faculty responsibilities at a wide range of academic institutions with diverse missions and student bodies. Since its inception in 1993, PFF has developed a variety of strategies for supporting doctoral students who aspire to enter the professoriate. For example, The Compact for Faculty Diversity initiative was launched in 1994 by the New England Board of Higher Education, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. These programs were established to support students of color committed to careers in college teaching.

Few recent issues in higher education have been the subjects of such heated and ongoing debate as the dialogue on the meaning and appropriate place of diversity issues on the college and university campus (Musil, Garcia, Moses, & Smith, 1995). Accusations of covert ideological agendas, sloppy or self-serving scholarship, and indulgence in special interest group politics have been widespread (Ouellett & Sorcinelli, 1995). These and other tensions can hinder efforts to address diversity in faculty development programs.

Ouellett and Sorcinelli (1995) suggested that for many faculty development programs, resistance emerges from at least three basic sources. The first is unresolved issues arising from unskilled prior efforts. The second is a tendency to overemphasize the role of teaching students and, consequently, to underrate the importance of faculty and doctoral students' interactions with one another. The last common source is confusion regarding how racism (and other forms of social oppression) manifests itself on college and university campuses today).

With the major emphasis on examining the experiences of minorities preparing for the professoriate, the literature review for this study focused on examining the historical

content and the evolution of faculty development, faculty diversity in higher education, faculty development, mentoring, values underlying hiring at colleges and universities, affirmative action, gender equity, diversity on college campuses, and career development models also were examined. The next section provides the purpose and research questions for the study.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the academic experiences of the minority participants in the PFF program.

Research Question

What types of experiences does PFF provide to prepare minority doctoral students for the professoriate?

Guiding Questions

This study focused on five fundamental questions:

1. What has it been like for PFF participants of color to be students at Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs)?

2. To what extent does participation in the PFF program facilitate the development of people of color as faculty members?

3. What are the experiences of the PFF participants of color in trying to secure a faculty position?

4. What role do mentors play in the development of PFF participants as potential faculty members?

5. What are the experiences like in the working relationship between PFF participants and White professors?

Developmental Models of Faculty Careers

An interest in how faculty careers change and develop over time leads some faculty members and researchers in higher education to explain career changes as part of a developmental process (Cytrynbaum, Lee, & Wadner, 1982; Mehrotra, 1984). Two developmental frameworks have been used to integrate a broad range of changes in attitudes, goals, and performance as part of a process used to explore faculty development: adult development (based on developmental psychology), and career development (based on vocational and organizational sociology). Some adult development models present a series of psychological stages that focus on critical decisions or transitions.

Current interest for this study initially centered on the work of Erik Erikson (1963) who contended that individuals pass through life stages in a fixed order. Each stage has an age range that, while permitting some individual variation, sets the time frame within which the stage will be experienced. Erickson's model covers the entire lifespan in eight growth stages. Each stage focused on the resolution of two conflicting values, one supporting positive ego growth and the other leading to stagnation and internal conflict. Unresolved issues carry forward and increase the pressures felt in subsequent stages.

Only three of Erickson's stages relate to mature adulthood: intimacy vs. isolation (the crisis of young adulthood), generativity vs. stagnation (mature adulthood), and ego identity vs. despair (old age). However, Erickson's work has strongly influenced both career and adult development theories by contributing key concepts and models based on alternating periods of crisis and resolution (Munley, 1977).

In contrast, career development models link stages to work-related transitions rather than individual growth. These models emphasize organizational rather than individual

growth as well as emphasize an organizational rather than personal view of career change

focused on "common elements in career histories" (Super & Hall, 1978, p. 353). Super and

Hall (1978) consolidated several approaches into a five-stage model that includes

exploration, establishment, advancement, maintenance, and decline. Stages relate to career

events like organizational entry or promotion, but usually are defined in terms of the number

of years an individual has spent in a particular career or organization. As in adult

development models, the stages are considered to be a process based on transitional changes

within the working environment (Super & Hall, 1978).

Although some adult and career development models use time (age or number of

years in a career) to mark stage transitions, it is possible to link these two types of stages into

a single formulation. In fact, many discussions of developmental approaches mix

psychological and organizational factors (Clark, Corcoran, & Lewis, 1984; Lawrence &

Blackburn, 1986).

While other models have been proposed, particularly in adult development, the ideas

of Erickson and Super and Hall have had the most impact on work in higher education (Brim,

1976). These models suggest that the academic career can be described in terms of a series

of stages experienced in fixed order within specified time periods. Within this study, the

researcher utilized the career development model as the theoretical framework in guiding the

exploration of series of stages experienced by minority doctoral students preparing for an

academic career.

Developmental Models of Faculty Development Programs

Traditional approaches to faculty development seem to not be meeting the current

needs in higher education (Gaff & Lambert, 1996). Programs seeking to assess both the

nature and quality of diversity training will find that Banks (1995) offers a useful model for understanding curricular reform. While this model was developed with curricular reform in mind, it provides a standard that faculty development programs can use to gauge their progress (Ouellett & Sorcinelli, 1995).

Banks (1995) suggested four approaches to reform: the contributions, the ethnic additive, the transformation, and the decision-making and social action. In the contribution approach heroes, cultural components, holidays, and other discrete elements related to ethnic groups are added to the curriculum without changing structure. The additive approach consists of the addition of content, concepts, themes, and perspectives to the curriculum, with its structure remaining unchanged.

In the transformation approach, the structure, goals, and nature of the curriculum are changed to enable students to view concepts, issues, and problems from diverse ethnic perspectives. The social action approach includes all elements of the transformation, as well as elements that enable students to identify important social issues, gather data related to them, clarify their values, make reflective decisions, and take actions to implement their decisions. This approach seeks to make students social critics and reflective agents of change.

The contribution approach represents the least intrusive intervention since acknowledgement of individuals or singular events are added to the existing curriculum in order to celebrate diversity. At the other end of the curricular reform continuum, the decision-making and social action approach requires critical analysis, integration of multiple viewpoints, and action for greater social equity. The next section focuses on providing a definition to terms that were used throughout the study.

Definition of Terms

Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) programs – a federal initiative that seeks to better prepare graduate students for research, teaching, and service responsibilities.

Cluster – a partnership consisting of a doctoral university working with a variety of other institutions, such as liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and comprehensive universities.

University-Wide Activities – each cluster of PFF institutions is responsible for developing and testing new models for supporting graduate students in their current responsibilities and preparing then for new ones.

Mentor – each participant has a mentor who is a faculty member at the cluster institution who serves as a close person-to-person contact focusing on developing experiences for faculty roles.

Minority- encompasses racial/ethnicity, gender, disabilities, age, and underrepresented disciplines in academe.

Diversity – all of the elements of one's social identity including race, ethnicity, gender, economic class, sexual orientation, religion, and age.

Diversity Issues – issues related to enhancing diversity within higher education.

Limitations

Despite gains in recent years, the faculties of colleges and universities remain overwhelmingly white, as is the largest proportion of doctoral students in the pipeline (Gaff & Lambert, 1996). According to a recent survey conducted by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), participants in the PFF program are not that diverse. Eighty-two percent were white, 11% African American, 3% Asian or Pacific Islander, 3%

Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano, and 1% American Indian. These demographics suggested that the potential pool of minority PFF participants were limited at the proposed site locations.

The researcher attempted to not allow personal biases or generalizations about how other institutions were preparing people of color for faculty positions to have an influence on this study. In terms of credibility, the roles the researcher assumed within the culture and the researcher's identity and experience were critical to the scientific merit of the study. Doing fieldwork raises many questions with regards to the researcher's biases. As an African American doctoral student attending a Predominately White Institution, it is quite apparent to me that the proportion of minority faculty members is less than that of non-minority faculty members. More importantly, the number of minorities working toward a doctorate degree also is disproportionate to the number of whites.

Northwestern University, Lake Forest College, Oakton Community College, the University of Minnesota, St. Olaf College, Macalester College, and St. Cloud State University were the settings used in this study to analyze the preparation of minorities for faculty positions. The next chapter will examine scholarly work that provides a rationale for the merit of this study.

CHAPTERTWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

<u>Introduction</u>

This literature review focused on examining the historical and evolution of faculty development, faculty diversity in higher education, mentoring, values underlying hiring at colleges and universities, affirmative action, gender equity, diversity on college campuses, and career development models. The overall purpose of this chapter was to examine scholarly work that provided a rationale for the merit of this study.

The efforts of any college or university to meet its responsibilities (e.g., research, teaching, and service) are largely dependent on the effectiveness of its faculty. To describe the American faculty and how their characteristics and roles have evolved in recent years will be discussed in the following sections.

<u>Historical Content</u>

For more than 350 years, since the founding of Harvard College in 1636, college teaching could best be described as a temporary odd-job taken on by fresh graduates as a way station on the road to some other career (e.g., ministry, business, law, medicine, government, etc) (Veysey, 1965). During the past 150 to 175 years, however, an extraordinary change has occurred in the role of faculty, which has accompanied the sweeping economic, social, and technological/scientific shifts of the past century (Finkelstein, 1984).

Faculty professionalization in the nineteenth century meant the beginnings of specialization in teaching, that is, faculty were hired to teach in a particular field rather than lead a cohort of freshman through the entire prescribed baccalaureate course (Carrell, 1968). Associated with specialization of teaching was the notion that academic staffs should have

formal preparation through graduate education. Until the last quarter of the nineteenth century this training was available only in European Universities (Tobias, 1982). The time dedicated to preparation meant that college teaching no longer made sense merely as a temporary position but would ordinarily require and sustain a lifelong career commitment (McCaughey, 1974). Furthermore, the concept of academic as expert provided the basis for subsequently advancing claims to academic freedom and faculty professional autonomy (Scott, 1966; Tobias, 1982).

Unfortunately, there are less flattering contemporary views of faculty performance. For example, *Profscam*, by Charles Sykes, opens a "bill of indictment" with this evaluation of college faculty: "They are overpaid, grotesquely under worked, and the architects of academia's vast empires of waste" (Sykes, 1988, p. 5). Sykes goes further to describe the contemporary professor as "...mobile, self-interested, and without loyalty to institutions or the values of liberal education."

From a historical perspective, college and university professors always have been the objects of both love and libel. Rice (1996) contended that Martin Luther referred to universities of his time as "asses' stalls, dens of murderers, temples of Moloch, synagogues of corruption, and nests of gloomy ignorance" (p. 85). With this as a framework the next sections will examine issues related to the evolution of faculty development, faculty roles and responsibilities, and issues confronting the contemporary college professor.

Evolution of Faculty Development

The foundations of American scholarship were established in the eighteenth century at Harvard, where the results of scientific research were published in American and English journals; and by 1818 the *American Journal of Science and Arts* was founded as a learned

journal by Yale's Benjamin Silliman (Brubacher, 1977). The primary role of the professor in early American colleges was a teacher authority, parental substitute, and spiritual exemplar. A large portion of the faculty in antebellum American colleges was composed of clergyman, consistent with the conception of liberal education as a means of cultivating religious piety and moral rectitude (Rudolph, 1990).

The rise of the modern university in the last quarter of the nineteenth century ushered in further changes in the role of the faculty and an emphasis on scholarship (Rudolph, 1990). The two world wars of the first half of the twentieth century, separated by the Great Depression, Korean War, cold war era, space race, and the Vietnam War, all brought additional calls on faculty expertise in both basic and applied research (Rudolph, 1990). Thus, faculty entered into new roles in the pursuit of scientific and technical invention and in the application of these findings to our society. The balance of attention among the three basic roles of faculty in teaching, research, and service produced a major tension in the closing of this century (Rudolph, 1990).

Historically, the Ph.D., and most other doctoral degrees, had never been a degree aimed primarily at preparing people to teach, and until more recently had almost nothing to contribute formally in the new way of instructional methods, preparation, or curricular insights (Kennedy, 1997). The difficulty is that many Ph.D. faculty find themselves in faculty assignments in which research and scholarship are expected, but a primary duty is also teaching – a complex art form for which some new Ph.D.s are not well prepared (Bogue, 1991).

In a 1997 *Change* article on "The Heart of a Teacher," Parker Palmer noted that "As I teach, I project the condition of my soul onto my students, my subject, and our way of being

together (p. 15). He accents the art form of teaching and the importance of professor identity and integrity as follows: "Reduce teaching to intellect and it becomes a cold abstraction; reduce it to emotion and it becomes narcissistic; reduce it to the spiritual and it loses its anchor to the world" (pp. 15-16). Donald Kennedy writes in *Academic Duty* (1997) that "If we ask...about the influence of teachers rather than about what they do, we realize that in many ways they are functioning as moral teachers, making a difference in the way students choose to conduct their lives" (p. 60).

A professor unfamiliar with Bloom's *A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (1956) may continue to live on an elementary and primitive level of instructional expectation. A professor unfamiliar with the literature of Kolb (1976) and Gilligan (1982) on learning styles and ways of knowing may miss an opportunity to link more effectively with the learning readiness of his or her students. A professor unfamiliar with the work of Howard Gardner (*Frames of Mind,* 1983), Robert Sternberg (*The Triarchic Mind,* 1988), or Daniel Goleman (*Emotional Intelligence,* 1995) may miss the idea that there are any ways to be smart and that learning research is causing individuals to reframe their notions of intelligence.

In the 1990s, a renewed accent on teaching by national organizations, publications, and networks has supported efforts by some universities to better prepare doctoral students as teachers (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). The establishment of centers for instructional development in many colleges and universities is another evidence of concern for improving teaching. Although teaching responsibilities are highly valued by stakeholders within and without the university, there remains the question of the extent to which those earning the doctorate are systematically prepared to teach, and are appropriately recognized and rewarded for this role.

Critics of the "teaching vs. research" dilemma claim that professors spend the majority of their time engaged in non-instructional activities, and public perceptions and expectations of higher education are centered first and foremost on the teaching responsibilities of faculty (Bogue, 1991). On the contrary, the majority of the faculty members who took part in a 1989-1990 study conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA reported teaching as the activity consuming more of their work than any other single professional activity.

The researchers found that about one-third of college and university faculty members reported that they spent 16 hours or less per week on teaching, while about one-fifth reported spending 34 hours or more per week teaching. The other approximately one-half reported spending 18 to 32 hours per week on teaching. Data on other student-centered activities, advising, or counseling show almost three-fifths of respondents indicating that they spent 4 or fewer hours per week advising or counseling students, with another 30 percent reporting between 4 and 9 hours – a total of just under 90 percent reporting less than 9 hours per week (*The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac*, September, 1995, p. 22).

These numbers are somewhat misleading, however, in that the roles and responsibilities of faculty in various different types of institutions vary greatly. For example, faculty in a research or doctoral university are expected not only to remain current with the professional literature in their field and actively contribute to it, bit also have responsibilities for advising graduate students and directing their dissertation research, the latter activities being highly labor intensive (Huber, 1992). The contemporary pressure for a more effective balance between faculty responsibilities in teaching and research may be felt most keenly in

research universities and in those comprehensive universities who are "on the make" (Gaff & Lambert, 1996).

For research and comprehensive universities, one suggestion to help in achieving a more effective balance is for universities to arrange a "fifth rank," a distinguished teaching professor (Boyer, 1987, p. 127). Most American colleges and universities appoint and promote on a four-rank system of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Beyond these four ranks, however, many universities already recognize distinguished appointment beyond full professor via endowed chairs, endowed professorships, or other similar appointments. While most such appointments usually accent the research record of a faculty member, there is no reason why these appointments cannot also recognize teaching expectation and performance (Bogue & Aper, 2000). In the role and work of faculty, Bogue and Aper (2000) asserted the following:

1. There is an important variance in the investment of time among the major role expectations of teaching, research, public and professional service, and institutional governance as a function of institutional type and mission; and

2. There is an important tension between the expectation for how faculty will primarily invest their time and talent and the manner in which they are rewarded and recognized. Teaching is the central and fundamental work of every campus, else one could argue that students were at best incidental or at worst a nuisance in the life of our colleges and universities. Yet reward and recognition of faculty often center on research, publication, and grant acquisition, focusing less on the work of teaching (p. 163).

Boyer (1990) sought to transcend the dichotomy of teaching versus research and to open our understanding of scholarship by suggesting that the scholarly work of the faculty

revolves around four core elements: advancing knowledge, integrating knowledge, transforming knowledge, and applying knowledge. The traditional view holds that teaching is intimately connected with research and scholarship, and that part of the role of the faculty was service to the greater community – most clearly exemplified in the creation of the land grant universities (Bok, 1993).

A follow up to Boyer's work is a 1997 monograph entitled Scholarship Assessed (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997). That work suggests the application of six standards for evaluating any work of scholarship:

1) clear goals

2) adequate preparation

3) appropriate methods

4) significant results

5) effective presentation and

6) reflective critique.

The status of teaching and the definition of scholarship are issues of continuing debate and those who live within a college or university is not expected to be uncomfortable with the debate. Even though this monograph, and the previously cited monograph on scholarship reconsidered by Boyer, argue persuasively for a more encompassing view on the nature of scholarship as well as the question of whether faculty and academic administrators will find that argument persuasive remains.

These arguments over principles fundamental to the life and welfare of the faculty are made more interesting and livelier by the growing diversity of faculty voice. A recent survey carried out by the American Association for Higher Education (Rice, 1996) provides clarity

about this calling for faculty: newly appointed faculty say their choice of an academic career is based primarily on the "joy of teaching," the opportunity to interact with students, and the opportunity to participate in shaping society's next generation. This movement of new voices and perspectives in the academy will be discussed in the next section.

Faculty Diversity in Higher Education

Before examining the barriers to faculty diversification, it is worthwhile to put the issue of employment equity into a historical context. Law, custom, and tradition sanctioned the exclusion of minorities from higher education. Exclusionary employment and student admissions practices were so complete that Olivas (1988) described these practices and learning environments as "segregated citadel(s)" (p. 6). As a gatekeeper of social and economic progress, exclusionary educational policies systematically perpetuated the unequal stratification of race/ethnic groups in American society (Cross, 1986). Consequently, education became the prime battleground in the struggle for full equality and civil rights.

The disagreement over the methods of redistributing social and economic advantages to minorities in the workforce mainly involves two hiring policies that reflect a bifurcation of group interest: affirmative action and meritocracy. At the heart of the controversy is the question of how to settle past and present inequities — "what is fair in the allocation of education and employment opportunities?" (Hartigan & Wigdo, 1989, p. 4). Blackwell (1987) and Harvey (1986) claimed that African Americans comprised about 4% of total faculty which represents a decrease from an estimated high level of approximately 6% in the late 1970s. A major problem with the 4% figure is that it includes all African American faculty employed at historically black colleges and universities. When that number is disaggregated from the total number of African Americans holding faculty positions in

postsecondary education, African Americans account for approximately 1% of the faculty in predominantly white institutions (Harvey, 1986).

Diversification in terms of minority representation in American higher education continues to be an issue, with African Americans representing less than 6%, Hispanics less than 4%, and Asians less than 5% of the American professoriate (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2000). In the case of both Hispanics and Asians, these levels represent modest incremental increases during the past generation. As far as African Americas are concerned, it represents a stabilization, with little prospect of substantial increases especially in light of the sharp decline in the number of U.S. African Americans earning Ph.Ds in the 1980s (Carter & Wilson, 1989).

To provide some data, the number of doctoral degrees awarded nationally between 1977 and 1994 increased by 30% (from 33,232 to 43,185) among all students. Ironically, the increase was only 7.3% among African Americans (from 1,253 to 1,344) (Patterson, 1997). According to the U.S. Department of Education (1998), during 1997, there were 45,394 terminal degrees awarded in higher education. Only 2,607 were awarded to Asian Americans, representing 5.7%, 1,847 were awarded to African Americans, representing 4.1%, and 1,098 were awarded to Hispanics, representing 2.4%.

The literature has duly noted sharp distinctions between the positions of affirmative action and merit advocates along with their respective perceptions about the causes of minority shortfalls (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Those who support meritocratic principles of hiring believe that faculty positions should be awarded to individuals on the basis of merit and justified by such academic qualifications as an earned doctorate, research and publication records, teaching ability, and experience. Simply put, proponents argue that, regardless of

race or gender, the opportunity to compete for faculty positions should be the same for all applicants. Based on this view, advocates of the merit principle believe that the crux of the minority faculty problem lies solely in the shortage of minority scholars who are qualified for faculty openings (Bowen & Schuster, 1986).

Proponents of affirmative action policies agree, in part, with the merit principle, the supply-side analysis of minority shortfalls, and even the equal opportunity hiring solution (Washington & Harvey, 1989). Because of historical inequality in education and faculty employment, advocates of affirmative action believe that "inequality of opportunity" overrides the intent of the principle of "equality of employment opportunities."

Through the 1970s, a plethora of lawsuits, administrative rules, and statutes addressed the challenge of achieving greater representation and balance in the demographic spectrum of the faculty. Though there were many well-intentioned efforts to find a balance between the need for genuine integration and affirmative action to increase the racial and gender balance of the faculty, there was also concern that demographic characteristics were overshadowing issues of merit in hiring as well as promotion and tenure decisions (Wilson, 1979).

To increase the number of minority faculty, affirmative action proponents contended that merit must be defined differently. Although the prestige of the recommending source, selectivity of the institution, number of publications, and years of postdoctoral research experience are valuable assets, they do not always predict or guarantee teaching ability, creativity, or the full range of knowledge and scholarship that are essential to the mission of undergraduate education (Washington & Harvey, 1989).

Bowen and Sosa (1989) concluded that the "the most important questions of policy pertain to graduate education" (p. 53). The most compelling case for making personnel

adjustments in faculty staffing patterns is that the nation cannot afford to squander its human resources, particularly in a changing labor market. Bowen and Sosa (1989) estimated the total demand (e.g., net new positions and faculty replacements) for new faculty positions will range between 131,826 and 153,243 between 1992 and the second decade of the twenty-first century. To offset predicted faculty imbalances, minorities and women will be important sources of talent. Faculty shortfalls will be greatest in the humanities and social sciences (Bowen & Sosa, 1989).

The federal government has an enormous stake in advancing minority graduate education and faculty diversity based on issues related to equal opportunity representation to include all groups, especially those who have been victimized by past discrimination. Affirmative action programs are most effective when there is a clear and unequivocal institutional commitment to their basic principles (Reed, 1983).

Recent data present a more encouraging picture of the composition of the faculty (Magner, 1996), indicating that more than a third of all faculty members are in the first seven years of their careers. Still, the composition of this new faculty population is predominantly Caucasian and tenure rates show men gaining tenure at far higher rates than women. The largest gains for any single racial or ethnic group are for those of Asian heritage. The largest gains for any demographic component of the faculty population were among those who are not U.S. born citizens. Further, the new faculty tend to be less likely than their older counterparts to hold tenure-track positions or to reach in the core arts and science fields of the modern university (*Chronicle Almanac*, 2000).

Graduate education does "transcend state boundaries" (Bowen & Sosa, 1989). The most critical remedy is for the federal government to invest in education and training

programs and restore support for minority graduate education. Higher education, too, has a vested interest in a diversified faculty based on equal opportunity representation. The production of minority doctorates can and must be increased to help meet future faculty and workforce needs. Institutions will have to respond to the needs of a growing number of minority students who will be headed for college in the twenty-first century. In sum, an institution's best route to improving institutional quality is defined by its ability to produce desired student and faculty outcomes (Wilson & Justiz, 1988).

While a range of state, regional, and national programs have emerged in recent years to enhance the number and proportion of underrepresented populations moving into academic life, the data reveal some successes, an encouraging trend for women, and also some disappointments, a not so encouraging record for African Americans. Clearly there is ample leadership challenge remaining in enhancing the diversity of the American professoriate.

A moment of continued opportunity is now presenting itself as American higher education embraces the twenty-first century. The large number of faculty appointed during the rapid-expansion years of the 1960s and early 1970s are already taking retirement and others will follow over the next five to ten years (Magner, 1996). Finding replacements for these faculty members should offer additional opportunity for initial appointment and for promotion of new and younger faculty from all sectors of the population.

Faculty Development

Faculty development has long been an integral part of higher education's strategy for self-renewal and increased vitality. Although sabbatical leaves were available in American universities from the early 1800s (Riegle, 1987; Schuster, 1990), faculty development typically has been concerned with the advancement of subject matter competence and the mastery of one's own discipline as it related to teaching (Sullivan, 1983).

In more recent times, professional development for faculty has continued to focus primarily on cultivating greater expertise in a specific discipline and has been limited mainly to activities such as orientation of new faculty, visiting professorships, academic leaves, and reduction of course loads (Gaff & Simpsom, 1994; Schuster, 1990). More recently, it has been expanded to include workshop presentations, travel, and teaching effectiveness programs (Baiocco & DeWaters, 1995).

Supposedly, these strategies were directed at better ensuring the survival of the faculty member at the institution. According to Schuster (1990), the 1970s were a pivotal time for changes in faculty development approaches. Changes in demographics and declining numbers of students, rising costs, and altered professional expectations began to affect significantly the institution climate in which faculty worked (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995).

McMillen (1987) described traditional faculty programs as "...becoming marginal to what's really important on many college campuses..." (p. 15). To be truly effective in contemporary society, faculty development programs were required to integrate all aspects of development: personal, professional, and organizational (Schuster et al., 1990). Faculty development programs were no longer specific to individual faculty fields of expertise or

teaching skills but also were related to "...faculty wellness and institutional quality of life and opportunities for personal growth and career renewal" (Hubbard & Atkins, 1995, p. 120).

A study by Reigle (1987) concluded that, although representative of different aspects of the topic, a number of descriptors are used interchangeably with the term "faculty development." Among these include: (1) *instructional development* that emphasizes the development of faculty skills involving instructional technology, micro-teaching, media, courses and curricula; (2) *professional development* that emphasizes the growth and development of individual faculty in their professional roles; (3) *organizational development* that emphasizes the needs, priorities, and organization of the institution; (4) *career development* that emphasizes preparation for career advancement; and (5) *personal development* that emphasizes life planning, interpersonal skills, and growth of faculty as individuals (p. 54).

Socializing future faculty to the values of education begins with a simple fact: 102 universities produce 80 % of all U.S. doctoral degrees awarded annually (Gaff & Lambert, 1996). These few universities operate as a funnel through which the vast majority of faculty members in America's 3,500 diverse types of colleges and universities must pass. A serious consequence of this funnel effect is that doctoral graduates are socialized into the values of a research university and frequently remain out-of-tune with the values of institutions where they are likely to be employed (Gaff & Lambert, 1996).

Based on a program-wide survey during the Spring of 1995 of doctoral faculty members involved in PFF, Gaff and Lambert 1996 contended that graduate faculties responsible for preparing the future professoriate are unaware of the values of different types

of academic institutions or occasionally hostile to places their students will seek employment (Gaff & Lambert, 1996).

Both graduate faculty and graduate students often operate as if the academic positions that newly minted PhDs secure will resemble those of a research university. In fact, fewer than 10% of PhDs end up in research universities (Gaff & Lambert, 1996). With this in mind, new college faculties typically are confronted with the need to design new courses, teach a diversity of students, advise about education and careers, contribute to institutional initiatives ranging from curriculum to using technology, and to serve on faculty committees. Ironically, many of these attributes are not introduced during doctoral work.

Doctoral education, which is where preparation for faculty work is primarily acquired, has not changed significantly to take account of these new realities (Committee on Graduate Education, 1998). For too many graduate students, preparation for a faculty career still means essentially learning the content of a discipline, developing expertise in a specialization, and conducting a research project presented in a dissertation. Future faculty members must broaden their horizons, which includes preparation for teaching and professional service along with conducting research.

Research universities, especially, are the focus of efforts to change academic practices. Initiatives are broadening the definitions of scholarship and its assessment (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; Rice, 1991), changing the reward structure (Diamond & Adams, 1993), redefining faculty roles (Rice, 1996), encouraging post-tenure review (Licatta, 1998), emphasizing teaching and learning (Shulman & Hutchings, 1998), and supporting graduate teaching assistants (Marincovich, Prostko, & Stout, 1998).

The personal and professional well-being of faculty and the organizational structure of institutions have been affected by the changing nature of higher education. Mid-career and senior faculty, under these circumstances, are encouraged to "…expand their views and to continuously grow professionally" (Millis, 1994, p. 455). Both the faculty and institutions must not only seek out the means to rekindle faculty energies and forestall burnout but they must also develop strategies that promote opportunities for life-long learning and self-renewal activities (Millis, 1994).

PFF is an initiative that focuses primarily on re-examining the traditional forms of faculty preparation. Contemporary approaches to faculty development are more committed to addressing issues of vitality and renewal that expanding personal awareness (Hubbard & Atkins, 1995), strengthening relationships among colleagues (Gaff & Simpson, 1994), supporting stated institutional missions (Schuster & Wheller, 1995), and dealing with both the faculty member's and institution's "capacity to survive" (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995).

Gaff and Lambert (1996) contended that doctoral students should begin to develop professional competence in the major responsibilities that faculty members experience, namely, teaching, research, and professional service. Prospective faculty also should have learning experiences in the different settings in which the profession is practiced (e.g., colleges and universities with different missions, student bodies and faculty responsibilities); and learn about the complexities of teaching and service in course work, workshops, and seminars.

College and university administrators must recognize that faculty, at various stages of their lives and careers, have different objectives in faculty development that require diverse strategies (Weldman & Strathe, 1985). Additionally, faculty, at some personal and

professional risk, must be willing to self-assess their shortcomings and to engage in revitalizing professional development programs (Schuster, 1990). As indicated by Hynes (1984), faculty development is a continuous process "...leading us ever beyond today's accomplishments" (p. 32) and such initiatives should primarily come from an evolving plan.

Mentoring

One of the most important interventions that prospective minority faculty members can use is mentoring (Busch, 1985). The concept of mentoring dates back to the ancient Greeks and the virtues of mentoring have withstood the test of time (Jacobi, 1991). Since Daniel Levison's 1978 description of the mentoring process in *Seasons of a Man's Life*, considerable attention has been given to definitions of the mentoring process (Busch, 1985) and mentoring functions (Kaufman, 1986). Doctoral students who aspire to the professoriate need new forms of mentoring (Gaff & Lambert, 1996).

Shandley (1989) described mentoring from a higher education perspective as an intentional process involving the interaction between two or more individuals. He stated that mentoring is a nurturing process that fosters the growth and development of the protégé. Furthermore, he concluded that mentoring is an insightful process in which the wisdom of the mentor is acquired and applied by the protégé. Shandley viewed mentoring as a supportive, oftentimes protective process.

Mitchell (1998) defined mentoring as leadership. He described four characteristics of good mentoring.

a) *Teaching*: Mentorship is the ability to transfer skills and knowledge as well as the ability to encourage others to reach beyond previously assumed limits of understanding, perspective, and will.

b) *Common Vision*: Mentors foster the development of not one but many people who share a vision and interpret it in their own ways.

c) *Seasoning*: Mentors put novices into increasingly challenging situations in order to develop their habits of mind and instincts, while at the same time standing ready to reach out with a helping hand.

d) *Growth*: Mentor/mentee relationships are those in which both are challenged, and through which both grow and develop (p. 48).

Primarily, two types of mentoring, formal and informal, are used in post-secondary education. Formal mentoring are designed to increase enrollment and retention of minority and other students, as well as increase student satisfaction with the academic experience (James, 1989; O'Brien, 1988). Informal mentoring is an ad hoc, spontaneous relationship, established by two or more individuals for the benefit of those involved. The extent to which informal mentoring is applied in higher education is unknown; however, evidence does support the notion that informal mentoring positively influences establishment of formal mentoring initiatives (Jacobi, 1991).

Although doctoral students typically learn to conduct dissertation research under the direct supervision of an accomplished researcher, they seldom receive the benefit of similar support and supervision to learn about the complex of professional activities called "teaching" and "service" (Stewart, 1994). Stewart concluded that many graduate students need more technical support for their teaching, as well as a relationship with a faculty member for the purposes of discussing issues and solutions to problems that may arise.

Doctoral students traditionally have multiple advisors during their doctoral studies. At most programs, doctoral students have a research advisor and they also may have a separate dissertation director. Other professors may serve, formally or informally, in a

mentoring capacity. These relationships are focused exclusively on developing expertise in the conduct of research.

The range of advisors available to doctoral students is limited, and the relationships are sometimes more hierarchical than collegial (Kennedy, 1997). Students often perceive research advisors as controlling their academic future and, as a result, are reluctant to question their opinions on how to prepare for an academic career (Marincovich, Prostko, & Stout, 1998). Students sense that they are subject to constant evaluation and believe that certain topics, such as discussions about teaching and service, are not welcome (Marsh & Dunkin, 1997).

One of the innovations of PFF is the conception of an additional kind of advisor: a faculty mentor in the same or a closely related field but at a different institution. The PFF mentoring experience involves close person-to-person contact with a faculty member in a partner institution focusing on a range of faculty roles. Gaff and Lambert (1996) concluded that this mentoring relationship is more reciprocal than the students' other advising relationship, allowing for more informal dialogue between the faculty member and the student. This process creates a stronger sense of involvement and stimulates a range of exciting dimensions in the mentoring relationship.

The Values of the Hiring Colleges/Universities

Gaff and Lambert (1996) interpreted "hiring" institutions as liberal arts colleges of varying selectivity, comprehensive universities of different sizes, technical and community colleges, and other special colleges (e.g., women's and historically black institutions). New faculty members must redefine scholarship at these institutions as not only a means of discovery, but also of integration, application, and teaching and learning. With such diversity

within the classroom, the focus on student learning is becoming more widespread, making new demands on the faculty (Anderson, Gaff, & Pruitt-Logan, 1997). More importantly, faculty today must possess the ability to make connections among interdisciplinary programs. Graduate students from outstanding departments and universities will find themselves unlikely to get an academic position or to succeed in one if they are not capable of dealing with these new realities (Evans, 1997). Anderson, Gaff, & Pruitt-Logan (1997) indicated that adaptations to these important changes can be accelerated by preparing students who, when they become professors, are already introduced to the work, attitudes, and responsibilities of the profession.

Preparing Future Faculty programs provide two kinds of learning. First, they introduce graduate students to those aspects previously discussed through reading, study, and discussion. For example, courses and seminars are offered on college teaching, discussions are held about key concepts such as academic freedom and tenure, and students study the specific issues involved in teaching a discipline.

Secondly, PFF provides opportunities for graduate students to become acquainted with the professional lives of faculty members at institutions markedly different from the research universities where they are earning their degree. These include liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and community colleges. Faculty members at these institutions serve as mentors, giving participants an opportunity to observe and experience the challenges in organizing undergraduate classes and in teaching a heterogeneous mix of students.

Gaff and Lambert conducted program-wide surveys of doctoral students in PFF programs during the spring of 1995 and again in 1996. Survey responses of 357 graduate students who participated in PFF over the past two years revealed the extent to which they

valued the understanding of lessons learned about the prominence teaching plays in faculty life. When asked why they decided to participate in PFF, students most often said they wanted to learn about faculty roles and explore their interest in becoming a professor. Students also wanted to enhance their teaching skills and learn about institutions other than research institutions.

Students also reflected on what they had gained by working with mentors at different colleges, especially when mentor relationships were helpful and free of some of the pressures of judgement felt back at their home departments. Typically treated like junior faculty members, the students were able to gain a sense of the complexities, problems, and gratifications of the academic profession through their exposure to a number of different settings (Anderson, Gaff, & Pruitt-Logan, 1997). Students indicated that their participation in PFF strengthened their interest in an academic career, enhanced their ability to compete in the job market, and assisted them in understanding the job search process.

Unfortunately, PFF students who responded to these surveys represented a fairly homogeneous group. Regarding race and ethnicity, 82% were white, while the rest belonged to other ethnic minorities: 11% African American, 3% Asian or Pacific Islander, 3% Chicano, Latino, or Hispanic, and 0.6% American Indian or Alaska Native. If Howard University (HBCU) were not a partner institution within the PFF structure, the percentage of African Americans would have been lower. Because the need for diversity in the faculties at American colleges and universities is so great, this issue will be a tremendous challenge for PFF organizations.

Despite gains in recent years, the faculties of colleges and universities remain overwhelmingly white, as the largest proportion of doctoral students in the pipeline is white

(Stewart, 1994). To enhance minority participation in graduate education, the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) adopted in 1997 a statement on inclusiveness (Building an Inclusive Graduate Community: A Statement of Principles). In essence, this statement reaffirms the belief that seeking talented students from groups historically underrepresented in graduate education and encouraging them to pursue advanced degrees serves the best interest of higher education and the nation at large.

Faculty members at research institutions and at partner institutions indicated that involvement working as defined with graduate students in PFF enhanced their professional development (Gaff & Pruitt-Logan, 1998). For those serving as mentors on the partner campuses, benefits could be seen through their satisfaction in contributing to the professional competence of a graduate student colleague. In essence, the professors indicated that their relationship made them more reflective about their own teaching (Gaff & Pruitt-Logan, 1998).

Each partner institution was encouraged to develop its own specific activities for program implementation. Gaff and Lambert (1996) stated that traditional doctoral study prepares graduate students to be better students, in the classical sense of that term-to conduct studies. PFF prepares students to be better teachers, to the extent that the assignments are meaningful and support is provided. The overall objective of PFF programs is to prepare doctoral students to become better professors (Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998).

In conclusion, the challenge ahead lies not in rewriting the past or reformulating the basic premise of educational opportunity, but in developing more proactive policies that help serve the public good by advancing diversity and fostering the public culture so that everyone is able to participate. PFF programs must make special efforts to point out to all students of

color the importance of the professorate and its impact on diversifying the curricula. Future research focusing on the outcomes of diversity within the faculty will lead to a stronger base of evidence targeted on the multiplicity of "diversity issues" confronted by institutions of higher education, state systems, and other organizations.

<u>Affirmative Action</u>

The historical, philosophical, and legal analysis of affirmative action and its relationship with access and opportunity for minorities in higher education is critical to re-examine. This exploration of affirmative action provides a framework for minority participation in higher education. Despite some attacks on affirmative action, support for it still exists in the higher education community.

In the spirit of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt's executive order that Negroes be accepted into job training programs in the 1940s, President John F. Kennedy's 1961 Executive Orders 10925, 11246, and 11375, created the Presidential Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity and ordered contractors doing business with the federal government to end discrimination in jobs and take positive steps to redress the absence of minorities in the workforce resulting from past societal discrimination (Urofsky, 1991). From a policy perspective, research has indicated that certain discussions about affirmative action begin by framing the topic in terms such as "controversial" (Clayton & Crosby, 1992), "contentious" (Wilson, 1995), "explosive" (Eberhardt & Fiske, 1994), "misunderstood" (Fleming, Gill, & Swinton, 1978), or a "disaster" (Sowell, 1989).

Sidney Hook, for example, wrote in 1971 that "the effect of the ultimata to universities to hire blacks and women under the threat of losing crucial financial support is to compel them to hire unqualified Negroes and women and to discriminate against qualified

non-blacks and men" (p. 43). More than 20 years later, Dinesh D'Souza (1995) argued that "minorities should not receive special consideration" (p. 255).

Conversely, Bernice Sandler proclaimed in 1975 that affirmative action resulted in the "revision of standards and practices to assure that institutions were in fact drawing from the largest marketplace of human resources and ensuring that they do not inadvertently foreclose consideration of the best qualified persons by untested presuppositions which operate to exclude women and minorities" (p. 139). Currently, research suggests that affirmative action "is justified as a corrective for discriminatory practices" (Francis, 1993, p. 40).

The American Council on Education, in conjunction with 22 other higher education associations, sent a letter on September 13, 1995, to college presidents, signifying its continued support for affirmative action. In the letter, the associations stated that affirmative action is "a useful and important tool that helps colleges and universities achieve the goals of equal opportunity, educational quality, diversity, and inclusion" (American Council on Education, 1995). Currently today, the merit of affirmative action continues to be one of the hottest conversations in higher education circles nationwide. For example, in 1997, Barbara Gruter sued the University of Michigan claiming that she was denied admission in favor of less qualified minorities. The institution argued that building a critical mass of minority students benefited students from all races and prevented minorities from feeling isolated on campus.

Although the arguments related to affirmative action have remained similar over the past two decades, the context in which such arguments have been framed has changed. Whereas affirmative action was once based on the liberal political notion that governmental

policies might be developed that help create a just community, the language of minority equity has been replaced by the conservative demand for equity of individuals. Although the present context is undoubtedly important, all too often the discussion about affirmative action belies an understanding of the historical precedents that helped to create such a policy.

History of Affirmative Action. Brest and Oshige (1995) offerd a succinct definition of affirmative action's intent when they wrote, "An affirmative action program seeks to remedy the significant underrepresentation of members of certain racial, ethnic, or other groups through measures that take group membership or identity into account" (p. 856). Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, or national origin. Title VII of the Educational Amendments of 1972 dealt with, among other issues, gender-based admission policies (Stromquist, 1993).

The Department of Labor ordered all federal contractors to draw up acceptable affirmative action plans that included goals and timetables to resolve deficiencies that existed within the organization. They defined "deficiencies" as lack of employment or promotion of, or lower rates of pay and compensation for, specific groups. It is important to also understand that these goals were not quotas but "targets" (Stromquist, 1993).

Who benefits directly from affirmative action policies has varied over time. Broadly speaking, African Americans, Hispanics, Asian and Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans always have been included as target groups. Two years after affirmative action came into existence, women were added as a specific group. In the 1970s, affirmative action's scope broadened to include the disabled as well as veterans. In essence, affirmative action within institutions of higher learning came into existence because campuses were historically White male-dominated centers of learning (Stromquist, 1993).

When women or students of color entered an institution, they often did not participate to as full an extent as their White, male counterparts in the core and preferential activities of the college or university (Horowitz, 1987; Wright, 1990). Alternatives were available, of course, such as traditionally black institutions or women's colleges. But as Wilson (1995) has noted with regard to traditionally black institutions, they were "not only segregated, but systematically limited in curriculum and underfunded as well, restricting access and opportunity in various fields" (p. 2). On the contrary, women's colleges were geared primarily toward the wealthy (Wilson, 1995).

Philosophical Basis of Affirmative Action. Over the last 30 years, authors such as Francis (1993), Crosby (1989), and Sandler (1975) have articulated three reasons for the creation and implementation of affirmative action. The first, compensation, refers to redressing *previous discrimination*. Correction, the second rationale, pertains to the alteration of *present discrimination*. The third, diversification, concerns the importance of creating a *multicultural society*. As Seymor Martin Lipset argued in his book *American Exceptionalism* (1996), Americans have a long history of emphasizing equality of opportunity rather than equality of results.

Accordingly, in Lipset's view, "white opposition to various forms of special governmental assistance for blacks and other minorities is in part a function of a general antagonism to statism and a preference for personal freedom in the American value system..." (p. 141). This preference is, of course, not limited to whites. Lipset pointed out that it was also expressed by black abolitionist Frederick Douglas, who (in typical fashion) "ridiculed the idea of racial quotas, as 'absurd as a matter of practice,' noting that it implied blacks 'should constitute one-eight of the poets, statesman, scholars, authors and

philosophers'...and might promote 'an image of blacks as privileged wards of the state'" (p.
148).

To summarize the ideas behind affirmative action, taking into consideration the
reasons provided by prominent scholars, affirmative action can be seen in two ways: process
and outcomes. When procedures that ensure equal treatment are absent, it is viewed as
process-based discrimination. For example, examining the number of Native American
faculty members in a department and finding none, is a product of outcomes-based
discrimination. To claim process-based discrimination, evidence must show how the
structures in use have generated unfair outcomes.

The assumption from a philosophical basis is that if there is change in the process
then discrimination will be eliminated or at least reduced (Francis, 1993). In general, more
disagreement has arisen over outcomes-based solutions than over process-based solutions,
because outcomes often rely on strict numerical targets that seem like quotas to critics of
affirmative action (Crosby, 1989).

Putting these philosophical bases about affirmative action into practice, it is critical to
re-examine the basic premise of public postsecondary education throughout the 20th century.
Thus far, researchers have conceived of education as a major vehicle for those who have
been disadvantaged by societal circumstances (Crosby, 1989; Francis, 1993). Offices of
admissions have used multiple criteria for admitting someone into the academy, and have
assumed that such criteria are of benefit to society, to the institution, and to the individual.
No one, for example, has pointed out that giving preferences to legacies inevitably privileges
White applicants, since students of color in the past have been denied access to mainstream
universities. Instead, individuals automatically think of the "perceived" benefits and rights of

particular populations. The next section will highlight three rulings that have had significant impact on affirmative action and higher education. In addition, some current cases that will have an impact on higher education in the future are examined.

The Law and Affirmative Action. In 1978 the Supreme Court reviewed the concepts of race and quotas in admissions, the importance of ethnic diversity, and the reality of reverse discrimination. Allan Bakke, a White man, sued the University of California-Davis, for what he claimed was unfair practice: The medical school held 16 positions open for minority applicants. The Supreme Court agreed with Bakke that the University of California-Davis could not hold these positions for minority applicants. Justice Powell, writing for the majority, agreed that the institution had a reason to want to diversify its student body; of consequence, race could be considered as a factor in a candidate's application. However, a specific quota violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Powell based his decision, then, on the idea that diversification is good; the idea of previous discrimination was rejected (Simmons, 1982).

The University of Maryland has awarded up to 30 scholarships to African American freshmen annually since 1979. The scholarships were based on merit and they covered tuition, room, and board. Daniel Podbersky, a Hispanic resident of Maryland, sued the university for discrimination by claiming that his academic record would have made him eligible for a Banneker Scholarship. Officials at the University argued that they needed the program to recruit African American students to compensate for the state's past policies of segregation.

The lawyers pointed out that the scholarships often went to middle-income African American students from out of state (such students had not suffered from Maryland's

previous discriminatory policies). Consequently, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit ruled that Maryland's program was illegal. The President of the institution argued that the program was indeed legal and fair. His argument stemmed from the perspective that the African American population of the state was 25% and that the percentage of University of Maryland students who were African American was less than half of that number. In May 1995, the Supreme Court rejected the university's appeal in the case and let stand the lower court's ruling. Even though this case focused specifically on the state of Maryland, the Fourth Circuit's jurisdiction ruling impacts North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia.

In March 1996, the Fifth Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled on what is perhaps the most sweeping decision ever made concerning affirmative action on college campuses. The ruling pertained to the admissions policies at the University of Texas Law School. The use of race in admissions, said the appeals court, "is no more rational on its own terms than would be choice based upon the physical size or blood type of applicants" (Jaschik & Lederman, 1996, p. A26). After the ruling, four White applicants sued the law school in 1996 because they were rejected and minority applicants had been accepted.

A review of the admissions files pointed out that the White applicants did indeed have higher admission scores than some of the minority applicants who had been admitted. The law school asserted that the White students had mediocre records and that the use of race as one criterion for admission was allowable. The Fifth Circuit disagreed with the university and ruled on behalf of the students. The Fifth Circuit's jurisdiction ruling impacts Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas (Jaschik & Lederman, 1996, p. A28).

In September 1997, the Supreme Court also refused to hear a challenge to the Ninth

Circuit's decision, in <u>Coalition for Educational Equity v. Wilson</u> requiring implementation of

California's anti-affirmative action public referendum, Proposition 209. Through this

referendum, the citizens of California voted to ban all gender and racial preferences in public

education and government contracting. Consequently, California's public institutions of

higher education are not permitted to take race or gender directly into account, unless and

until a showdown in the Supreme Court results in reaffirmation of the lawfulness of

affirmative action in admissions. The Ninth Circuit's jurisdiction also covers Alaska,

Arizona, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington (Jaschik &

Lederman, 1996, p. A30).

The successful challenges to affirmative action in Maryland, Texas, and California,

and new court cases emerging in the states of Georgia, Michigan, and Washington, raise

questions about whether public and private colleges and universities, both inside and outside

of these states, may continue their practice of expanding access to underrepresented

minorities and women through its student body and faculty. The Supreme Court has

established a fragile balance that has allowed affirmative action plans to continue, on the one

hand "as a means of redressing deep social dislocations and, on the other, ideologically

destabilizing such plans so as to prevent their slide into a regime of racial and ethnic

entitlements" (Post, 1996, p. 4).

The Effects of Affirmative Action. Aside from philosophical stances on affirmative

action, a legitimate question may be asked about the policy's effectiveness. Does a policy

accomplish its intended objective? In this case, has affirmative action succeeded in

diversifying the academy?

As with virtually every aspect of affirmative action, the interpretation of its success or failure is a contentious issue that in part depends on how one interprets the data. Frankly, it is unanswerable insofar as multiple variables come into play with regard to why someone has entered and graduated from a particular institution. It is critical to point out that affirmative action is not the sole cause of someone's employment or admission to an institution, but rather a contributing factor.

To provide some examples of the effects of affirmative action over the past decade, college enrollment and degree completion have grown for African Americans at both Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and at Predominately White Institutions (PWIs). For example, African American student enrollment at HBCUs has increased by 27%, from 166,402 in 1985, to 210,876 in 1994 (*The African American Education Data Book,* Volume 1, 1997). In addition, African American student enrollment at PWIs has increased by 33% from 828,500 in 1984 to 1,104,200 in 1995 (*The African American Education Data Book,* Volume 1, 1997).

Gender Equity in Education

Civil rights laws historically have been a powerful mechanism for effecting change in the United States (Flansburg & Hanson, 1993). Twenty-five years after the passage of Title IV, substantial progress has been made, particularly in overcoming the education gap that existed between men and women (Cole, 1997).

Women are now graduating from college in record numbers and their numbers are actually larger than those of men. By 1994, women were earning bachelor's degrees at the same rate as men, with both at 27 percent. In 1971, however, only 18 percent of women had completed four or more years of college compared to 26 percent of men. 2006 project

women may earn 55 percent of all bachelors' degrees (National Center for Education

Statistics, 2000).

In 1992, women also earned the majority of associate's (296,800) and master's

degrees (191,000), reversing the 1977 pattern of men earning the majority of them (207,500

and 161,800) respectively. During the period 1972-1994, the percentage of first-professional

degrees earned by women also rose dramatically, from 7 percent to 43 percent of all law

degrees, from 9 percent to 38 percent of all medical degrees, and fromm 1 percent to 38

percent of all dental degrees (U. S. Department of Education, 1997).

In certain non-traditional areas such as business, women's degrees increased

dramatically, from 8 percent in 1962 to 47 percent in 1992. Women are also increasing in

the sciences. For example, in the biological sciences, women earned only 28 percent of

college degrees in 1962 but increased their proportion to 52 percent by 1992.

The gap between men and women earning master's degrees in the life sciences, physical

sciences, engineering, and computer sciences also has narrowed over time. In 1950, only 175

women received a bachelor's degree in engineering compared to more than 52,000 men. By

1966, women were earning a greater number of engineering degrees, but the proportion of

the total was still less than one-half of 1 percent. By 1991, it had risen to more than 15

percent (National Statistics of Educational Statistics, 2000).

As the number of women who study the sciences increases, so· does the proportion of

women who receive graduate degrees in those fields. In 1993, women earned 20 percent of

doctorates in science and engineering, up from less than 9 percent in 1973. More

importantly, at all levels (e.g., bachelor's, master's, and doctoral), women's rates of receiving

degrees have risen significantly in the fields of mathematical, physical, biological sciences, and engineering (U. S. Department of Education, 1997).

The sciences, particularly the biological sciences, have manifested a long history of depicting woman as man's inferior (Benjamin, 1991). Benjamin (1991) stated that despite major changes in the nature of scientific theories and in attitudes toward methodology in the sciences, the general scientific view of woman's nature remained surprisingly constant from the biology of Aristotle in the classical period to the biological theories of the twentieth century.

Given the historical exclusion of women from disciplines of science as well as the current numbers of women scientists as a profession presents the tasks of developing strategies to embrace this new perspective within the curriculum (Longino, 1990). One area identified by Sue Rosser (1990) as crucial to transforming the science curricula involves attention to female approaches to problem solving. Rosser argued that a study of the work of women scientists reveals differences in observation, hypothesis formulation, data collection, use of scientific information, and the development of theories and conclusions. Specifically, Rosser identified seven observational differences in the practice of women scientists:

1. inclusion of nontraditional observations such as interactions and relationships;
2. devotion of more time to observation and collection of more observational data;
3. viewing the personal experiences of women as valid scientific data;
4. a predilection to research leading to solutions of problems of social concern;
5. avoidance of military research;
6. acceptance of the scientific worthiness of areas traditionally deemed "feminine";
7. a recognition of the importance of gender in framing hypotheses; and
8. investigation of problems of global scope (Rosser, 38-44).

Rosser (1990) also noted that women in the sciences are more likely to use both qualitative and quantitative methods, apply interdisciplinary methods, employ interactive

methods, and develop theories that are relational, interdependent, and multicausal. Rosser contended that a gender-friendly classroom will be one that includes and fosters these types of methods and approaches in the teaching of science.

As more women graduate, the pool of available talent grows, which in turn leads to greater numbers of diverse faculty members who will be able to mentor future students who fall in these categories. At best, we can conclude that colleges and universities are more diverse today than they were when affirmative action was instituted.

Diversity on College Campuses

In the beginning, American college students were relatively young, almost entirely white, dominantly male, and culturally European in ancestry (Bowen, 1978). Throughout the last half of the twentieth century, this heritage of student clientele has evolved in dramatic ways. In essence, the story of increased access and diversity in American college students must be counted as one of the most dramatic changes in the profile of American higher education (Ravitch, 1983). Over time, enhanced educational opportunities for women, racial and religious minorities, and the poor have been won slowly and painstakingly (Ravitch, 1983). One of the catalysts for change was the voice of students seeking a place in higher education and asking that the college experience be relevant to their needs and aspirations (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

From a historical perspective, changes in the student population of the early colleges are exemplified by the poor, aspiring clergymen who came to the colleges of New England around the turn of the nineteenth century (Allmendinger, 1975). The establishment of land grant colleges, founded in large measures to provide educational opportunities for the sons and daughters of the agricultural and industrial classes of the middle and late 1800s, was a

landmark event in increasing accessibility to those previously excluded (Blackburn &

Conrad, 1986).

In the aftermath of World War II, the federal government assumed a major role in

increasing access to higher education through the GI Bill. In response to the Soviet Union's

1957 launching of Sputnik, the federal government initiated a series of grant and loan

programs based on need (Bowen, 1978). This combination of creating and expanding the

mission of state universities, increasing the numbers of both private and public colleges,

establishing two-year colleges within physical and financial reach of most Americans, and

providing both state and federal programs of financial aid, marked the commitment to

enhance access to all students (Rudolph, 1990).

From a policy perspective, there is support for affirmative action because of the

perceived contribution it makes to diversity on college campuses. Research findings support

this contention (Astin, 1993; Pascarella et al., 1996). Astin (1993) examined the impact of

college student outcomes over a four-year period with 24,847 students from 217 different

institutions and found that students from all racial and ethnic backgrounds benefit from

institutions that have a visible commitment to diversity. Initiatives such as institutional goals

or commitment to policies to increase minorities in the student population and minorities and

women on the faculty, positively affected student's self-reported growth in cultural

awareness and their commitment to the goal of racial understanding.

Similar findings on the impact of diversity on college campuses were reported by

Pascarella and his colleagues (1996) in a three-year longitudinal study of 3,840 students. A

nondiscriminatory racial environment at the institution, on-campus residence, participation in

cultural awareness workshops, and extent of involvement with diverse student peers had a

significant positive impact on students' end-of-the-year openness to diversity and challenge.
These results have significant implications for how diversity is an integral component on
college and university campuses and provide support to affirmative action policies in higher
education. As it relates to the curriculum, diversity within the faculty has the potential to
create various approaches for engaging student learning from multiple perspectives.

Research suggests that unfortunately, African Americans continue to experience
difficulties on some campuses. Data on matriculation and graduation in the 1990s suggest
that many universities recruit large numbers of minority students who never graduate. Even
with special programs and other efforts intended to support them, their retention and
graduation rates remain low at many institutions (*Chronicle Almanac*, September 1996). The
American Council on Education's Fifteenth Annual Status Report on Minorities in Higher
Education (1995) indicated that although African-American students are making progress in
both access and graduation, they still lag behind white students. Recognizing that African-
Americans represent the largest pool of minorities in higher education, although much
progress has been made in a century and a half, much remains to be achieved.

Career Developmental Models

The Life Career Rainbow (Super, 1990; Montross & Shinkman, 1992) portrays the
development or unfolding of the life career of a person from birth until death. The two
outside arcs of the Rainbow show the name of the life stage and the approximate ages of
transition from one stage to another. It cannot be overstressed that these ages are not precise
endings and beginnings of stages, but rather, are ages at which transitions are often noted.
Some of these stages come earlier than others and many recycle through several stages as

they make transitions, change jobs, or reenter the labor market (Super, 1990). Thus, the

Rainbows depict the person's career in terms of a life span.

Career development is an on-going process from birth to death, but traditionally

individuals are not accustomed to thinking of declining and dying as development. Maturity

is a state usually thought of as the peak of development, but a career may not have no peak,

one peak, or several peaks (Ohler, Levinson, & Hays, 1996). Career maturity has been

defined as the individual's ability to make appropriate career choices, including awareness of

what is required to make a career decision and the degree to which one's choices are both

realistic and consistent over time (King, 1989; Ohler, Levinson, & Hays, 1996). Career

maturity also can be defined as the extent to which an individual has acquired the necessary

knowledge and skills to make intelligent, realistic career choices. It is the readiness of an

individual to make an informed, age-appropriate career decision and cope with appropriate

career development tasks (Luzzo, 1993).

Developmental career assessment ascertains the individual knowledge of the stages of

occupational careers, of the structure and functioning of the world of work (e.g.,

opportunities and requirements), and of the principles, processes, and data of career decision-

making (Super, 1990). These constitute vital aspects of career maturity. Developmental

career assessment identifies the focus of a person's career concerns and the developmental

tasks he or she confronts. It ascertains the values placed on and sought in the occupational,

study, family, and other roles that constitute a career (e.g., the essentials for self-fulfillment).

It also assesses the levels of vocational maturity in a second way, examining attitudes toward

planning and toward inquiry into educational, occupational, familial, and other career roles.

In essence, it estimates the possibility of stability and change in the individual over time.

Super and his colleagues (1988), at Teachers College, Columbia University,

developed the Adult Career Concerns Inventory (ACCI), which measures career

development or adaptability by providing an assessment of career planning attitudes or

planfulness, an important component of the multidimensional quality being measured, and

implements the life span aspects of the Career Rainbow. The ACCI is the unidimensional

state-of-the-art career measure for older adolescents and adults, based on the longitudinal

Career Pattern Study (Super et al., 1988).

According to Super (1990), career maturity consists of five dimensions: exploration,

establishment, advancement, maintenance, and decline. King (1990) suggested that it

consists of a number of lifelong processes; however, the nature of these stages varies from

person to person. Demographic variables of socioeconomic status and age have positively

correlated with career maturity in the general population (King, 1990).

Heal and Rusch (1995) identified 12 factors that affect career choice and place certain

populations at risk for experiencing career choice difficulties. These risk factors include low

intelligence, poor education, cultural isolation, low self-esteem, functional limitations, non-

traditional interests, social isolation, low/high intelligence compared with family/peers,

primary caretaker, and primary economic provider. These factors place women, racial/ethnic

minorities, and individuals with disabilities at particularly high risk for career choice

problems. Research suggests that the best predictors of post-school employment for students

who fall in these categories have been found to be personal and family chracteristics (Heal &

Rusch, 1995).

There is considerable interest among researchers in understanding how individuals

prepare themselves to make career choices and to help them do so (Phillips & Bluestein,

1994). According to Phillips and Bluestein (1994) the concept of career maturity is considered to include attitudinal factors such as planning and exploring cognitive factors such as decision-making and information knowledge. Helms and Piper (1994) noted that cultural orientations and beliefs of the individual's reference group regarding opportunities in the job market and the existence of societal barriers such as racism and sexism may affect vocational behavior.

According to Naidoo, Bowman, and Gerstein (1998), increasing attention has been given to the career maturity of minority racial and ethnic groups (Bowman, 1988). Super (1990) also noted the applicability of the construct of career maturity to African American and other minority groups warranted investigation. Thus, the present study is designed to examine the academic experiences of minorities preparing for the professoriate with emphasis on the career development model proposed by the work of Super et al., (1988). This study focuses on Super's theory that proposes that an individual's career develops through life stages. Given the present population of minorities in the professoriate, examining how minority students are coping with career choices encountered as a professor will serve as platform for further study in this area.

Career Developmental Stages

Presented in predictable stages, the components of Super's theory are defined as followed: Crystallizing, Specifying, and Implementing at the Exploration Stage; Stabilizing, Consolidating, and Advancing at the Establishment stage; Holding One's Own, Updating, and Innovating at the Maintenance stage; and Decelerating, Retirement Planning, and Retirement Living at the Decline, or Disengagement stage.

Throughout the exploration stage, individuals attempt to build skills and develop competencies to make an occupational choice (Montross & Shinkman, 1992). It is generally a period of great uncertainty about one's performance potential. Questions about professional competence, whether to commit oneself to a particular organization and/or occupation, and what kind of family relationships to develop are primary concerns (Super, 1990). Personal goal setting becomes salient as individuals try to advance in an occupation.

It is expected, therefore, that individuals in this stage would show a higher level of mobility and willingness to leave their present organization because of their tentative commitment to an occupation. The propensity to leave a chosen field of work should decrease as one moves into stabilization and maintenance stages, due to deeper commitments that result from making an occupational choice (Super, 1990).

Career issues confronting individuals in the exploration stage should focus on the crystallization of job decisions and level of work that are appropriate for the individual. Once these issues are resolved, individuals can then make a serious commitment to a specialty (Montross & Shinkman, 1992). Mentoring is a vital component for individuals in the exploration stage (Super, 1990). This role can take the format of providing the individual with visibility of the profession, involving them in decision-making task forces, assigning them challenging tasks, and providing them support for their self-esteem.

Throughout the establishment stage, individuals have chosen an occupation and have made a serious attempt to reach some personal goal (Super, 1990). Super (1990) contended that there is a tendency, if the work situation and occupational choice are at all satisfactory and individuals identify with the company and the field, inevitably, makes it more difficult to leave. Individuals in this stage need less guidance from their immediate supervisor and

display knowledge with how to secure advancement and exposure within the company (Montross & Shinkman, 1992).

Individuals in the establishment stage of their career are concerned with getting themselves established in a career that supports a life-style that the individuals aspires to, one that uses their abilities and talents (Super, 1990). Gaining satisfaction from areas other than work becomes salient, especially if the individual has dropped out of the "tournament mobility game" (Montross & Shinkman, 1992).

It is expected that even the most challenging careers will eventually become routinized, as individuals become more proficient in performing them. Individuals in the advancement stage tend to redefine and nourish one's existence in a new working environment that requires building continued interpersonal relationships with members in the organization (Super, 1990). Individuals in this stage have acquired a sizable knowledge about the organization, established contacts within it, and developed a professional relationship. As a result, these individuals are more concerned with mastering tasks than building new social relationships that would be required in the exploration stage.

Individuals in the maintenance stage are well settled in their lifestyle and career pattern (Super, 1990). Oftentimes, there is a tendency for individuals in this stage to keep doing the kinds of things that helped them get established in their career. There is little need to break new ground either because the ground they have already broken has given them an adequate standard of living. As individuals maintain their position in the organization by doing the same job very well, they may realize that the job is less challenging. While there is some concern for doing something new, these individuals are reluctant to move between organizations for family and professional reasons.

As an individual moves through the maintenance to the decline stage, the satisfactions they get from their occupation are from co-workers or the work itself, and not from pay or promotions. They have seen colleagues play the "tournament mobility game" (Super, 1990) and realize that other factors, such as loyalty and a willingness to move, are linked more closely to pay and promotion decisions than "objective" performance indicators.

Prior Research

Super's model has received considerable attention in the literature and it is clear that his theory has stimulated a great deal of research and writing about the process of making career choices over the life span. For example, Gould and Hawkins (1978) studied the relationship between performance and job satisfaction among 132 employees in a public agency and concluded that the relationship was strongest during establishment stage of a individual's career. Consistent with Gould's study were results reported by Rabinowitz and Hall (1981).

In their study of Canadian transport ministry employees, job involvement was found to differ depending on career stage. Job characteristics (variety, task identity, etc.) were related more strongly and consistently to job involvement in a person's early career stage, as opposed to mid-career or late career stages. While these authors use different terminology than that proposed by Super, their data support Super's model.

Stumpf and Rabinowitz (1981) studied the moderating effect of career stage on the relationship between performance and facets of job satisfaction and role perceptions with full-time faculty members. A significant negative relationship between work satisfaction with performance of individuals in the establishment stage of their career was found. They

state that a possible reason for this was that high and low performers differed in the career issues that could be satisfied through good performance.

Borgen (1991) called Super one of the most important figures in vocational psychology, and noted that "the power of Super's overarching thinking is apparent in how readily new ideas and trends are immediately compatible with his work decades earlier" (p. 278).

Summary

As discussed throughout this literature review, the federal government as well as higher education has an enormous stake in advancing minority graduate education and faculty diversity based on issues related to equal opportunity re-presentation to include all groups, especially those who have been victimized by past discrimination. Although federal initiatives including affirmative action have supported this agenda, the data depict another story.

According to the U.S. Department of Education (1998), during 1997, there were 45,394 terminal degrees awarded in higher education. Only 2,607 (5.7%) were awarded to Asian Americans, 1,847 (4.1%) were awarded to African Americans, and 1,098 (2.4%) were awarded to Hispanics.

Moreover, higher education is predicted to experience a significant decline in the number of professors in the next 15 years within the academy (Schuster, 1990). Given the number of terminal degrees awarded to minorities, it is imperative that higher education seeks every available means not only to increase the number of minorities going into the professoriate but also utilized existing professors to serve as mentors.

Gaff and Lambert (1996) contended that doctoral students should begin to develop professional competence in the major responsibilities that faculty members experience: teaching, research, and professional service. Prospective faculty also should have learning experiences in the different settings in which the profession is practiced (e.g., colleges and universities with different missions, student bodies, and faculty responsibilities); and learn about the complexities of teaching and service in course work, workshops, and seminars.

Throughout this literature review, the researcher provided an examination of scholarly evidence related to faculty diversity in higher education, faculty development, mentoring, values of hiring at colleges and universities, affirmative action, gender equity, diversity on college campuses, career development models, and program evaluation. PFF provides opportunities for doctoral students to become acquainted with the professional lives of faculty members at institutions markedly different from the research universities where they are earning their degree. These include liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and community colleges. Faculty members at these institutions serve as mentors, giving participants an opportunity to observe and experience the challenges in organizing undergraduate classes and in teaching a heterogeneous mix of students.

The purpose of this study was to examine the academic experiences of the minority participants in the PFF program with emphasis on the expansion of minority faculty in underrepresented academic disciplines at several public and independent colleges and universities in the Midwest. The researcher utilized Super's career development model as a theoretical framework to explore series of stages experienced by minority doctoral students preparing for an academic career. This information is intended to contribute to the

development of strategies to support minorities into the professoriate. The next chapter will

discuss the methodology utilized for this study.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Qualitative research in education has roots in many academic disciplines. They

include not only the social sciences (e.g., anthropology and sociology), but also the

humanities (e.g., art, literature, and philosophy) and interdisciplinary studies. Qualitative

researchers have been influenced by the postmodern approach to inquiry. Postmodernism

rejects the "business-as-usual" orientation to scientific endeavor that reflects the entrenched

power structure of the professional research establishment (Jacob, 1987).

The word "qualitative" implies an emphasis on processes and meanings that are not

examined rigorously, or measured (if measured at all), in terms of quantity, amount,

intensity, or frequency (Denkin, 1991). Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed

nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the

situational constraints that shape inquiry (Lecompte & Preissle, 1994). Both qualitative and

quantitative researchers are concerned about the individual's point of view. However,

qualitative investigators think they can get closer to the actor's perspective through detailed

interviewing and observation (Denzin, 1991).

Qualitative researchers are more likely than quantitative researchers to confront the

constraints of the everyday social world (Bruner, 1993). They see the world in action and

embed their findings in it. Qualitative researchers believe that rich descriptions of the social

world are valuable, whereas quantitative researchers, with their etic, nomothetic

commitments, are less concerned with such detail (Lecompte & Preissle, 1994).

Qualitative researchers use ethnographic prose, historical narratives, first-person

accounts, still photographs, life histories, fictionalized facts, and biographical and

autobiographical materials, among others. As indicated earlier, the purpose of this study is to

examine the academic experiences of the minority participants in the PFF program. More

importantly, this study focused on the opinions of PFF participants as they relate to how well

they felt prepared for the professoriate. The career development model served as the

theoretical framework. The researcher utilized this model as a basis to explore series of

stages experienced by minority doctoral students preparing for an academic career. The data

collection for this study included interviews, document reviews, and observations.

Background on PFF

In the summer of 1994, 17 clusters of institutions received support from the Pew

Charitable Trusts for the purposes of creating PFF model programs (see Appendix D). A

total of 85 different institutions were involved. Five research universities received grants of

$170,000 each to establish PFF programs. Those institutions included Northwestern

University, Arizona State University, Howard University, the University of Minnesota, and

the University of Washington. The remaining twelve institutions received small grants (e.g.,

$10,000) for specific initiatives to start alternative PFF programs. Those institutions

included Duke University, Florida State University, Indiana University, Marquette

University, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Syracuse University, the University of

Cincinnati, the University of Colorado-Boulder, the University of Michigan, the University

of Kentucky, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and the University of New Hampshire.

In the second phase launched in 1997, all 17 clusters of institutions were invited to

indicate whether they were interested in continuing with the PFF initiative. Fourteen

institutions submitted applications and 10 were selected. The 10 included the original

clusters that received large grants and five new institutions, including: Duke University,

Florida State University, Marquette University (with the University of Wisconsin-

Milwaukee), the University of Cincinnati, and the University of Kentucky (see Appendix D).

Site Selection

The sites for conducting this study included Northwestern University and the

University of Minnesota, two of the original institutions selected for the purposes of creating

PFF model programs. Each cluster within the PFF structure consists of a research university

working with other institutions, such as liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and

comprehensive universities. For example, Northwestern University has a partnership with

Chicago State University, Northeastern Illinois University, Lake Forest College, and Oakton

Community College. The University of Minnesota has a partnership with Augsburg College,

Hamline University, Macalester College, Metropolitan State University, Minneapolis

Community and Technical College, the University of Minnesota-Morris, St. Olaf College,

the University of Wisonsin-River Falls, the University of St. Thomas, and College of St.

Catherine.

The cluster institutions for investigation in this study included Lake Forest College,

Oakton Community College, Macalester College, and St. Cloud State University. In essence,

these sites were selected due to geographic reasons (e.g., proximity to Iowa) as well as

having variations in institutional types (e.g., public and private), student enrollment, and

faculty responsibilities.

Identifying appropriate sites and working with "gatekeepers" to obtain necessary

permission are critical steps in a qualitative study. Ely and her colleagues (1991) indicated

that there are several steps involved in gaining entry into a site, including:

(1) identifying people within the field setting with whom to make the initial contact; (2)

selecting the best method of communication (e.g., telephone, letter, or personal visit) to

deliver the request; (3) deciding how to phrase the request (e.g., focusing on the site's

opportunity to contribute to research or on personal benefits to site participants); and (4)

being prepared to answer questions or concerns that might arise both before and after

permission is granted.

Initially, the researcher contacted Dr. Jerry Gaff, Director of Preparing Future

Faculty (Association of American Colleges and Universities), as well as Dr. Anne Pruitt-

Logan, Co-Director (Council of Graduate Schools). Both individuals were extremely

supportive with regards to information as well as connecting the researcher with the directors

at the site selections utilized for this study. The researcher then contacted Dr. Paul Breslin,

PFF Coordinator at Northwestern and Dr. Jan Smith, PFF coordinator at the University of

Minnesota, to set up the research site visit as well as identified students who met the criteria

as potential participants for this study. A letter was sent to each participant describing the

study with the consent form that was approved by the Office of Human Subjects. Each

participant who volunteered to be a part of this study returned the signed consent form to the

researcher. The next section will focus on the role of the researcher.

Role of the Researcher

The personal characteristic, however, most affecting conduct of qualitative research is

the investigator's identity as the essential research instrument (LeCompte & Preissle, 1994).

In essence, "the identity of data collector mediates all other identities held and roles played by the investigator" (p. 91). For this study, the researcher served as the instrument. In terms of credibility, the roles the researcher assumes within the culture and the researcher's identity and experience are critical to the scientific merit of the study.

As LeCompte and Preissle (1994) indicated, qualitative research is distinguished partly by recognizing subjective perceptions and biases of both participants and researcher with regards to the research frame. The subjectivity of participants is usually a major part of what the investigators seeks to capture in their records. More importantly, the researcher's subjectivity is also essential to establishing and building the intimate relationships with participants that permit trust and confidence (LeCompte & Preissle, 1994). Comfortable interactions allow the researcher to address ethical issues more directly, negotiate data collecting and recording, and seek feedback on what is seen and how it is interpreted.

LeCompte and Preissle (1994) suggested that doing fieldwork raises many questions with regard to the researcher's biases. Like all human science research, "qualitative inquires involve complex moral and ethical dimensions, most of which are public issues concerning any informed citizen" (p. 90). "Fieldworkers, in contrast, live out their ethical and moral choices in personal, day-to-day interactions with their participants" (p. 91). With this in mind, the next section will highlight characteristics and biases of the researcher.

The Researcher

As an African American Ph.D. candidate attending a predominantly White institution, it is quite apparent that the number of minority faculty members are disproportionate to that of non-minority faculty members. According to the U.S. Department of Education (1997), African Americans represented less than 6% of the enrollment in higher education. In the

midst of so much apparent progress for African Americans in their push for full participation in American institutions, especially higher education, it is important to take a careful measure of that progress and to point the way to improvements in policies, programs, and attitudes.

Inevitably, African Americans have made significant gains in U.S. higher education with the help of supportive legislation, court decisions, affirmative action programs, and increased financial aid. As we approach this transition into the twentieth-first century, higher education must continue to evaluate the status of African-Americans in academe, the economic returns of education for African Americans, the continuing barriers to equal opportunity, and the impact of anti-affirmative action and its relationship to the future of the academy.

The critical need to understand the socialization experiences of prospective as well as new faculty is apparent today. If higher education can understand more about the experiences of new faculty members, perhaps the academy will be able to develop continued supportive strategies that enhance minority development into the academic profession. Given the importance of the early years of the faculty appointment, combined with the document frustrations of new faculty during these years, questions arise regarding the effectiveness of the socialization of scholars into successful role performance, and, in particular, the role of faculty.

With this as a framework, my professional goal is to become a faculty member at a research institution with emphasis on faculty development, organization and administration of student affairs, and diversity in higher education. Prospective faculty should have continuous opportunities to begin a lifelong practice of learning excellence in research, teaching, and service. Prospective faculties today need increasingly independent and varied

teaching responsibilities, opportunities to grow and develop as a researcher, and opportunities to serve departments within the campus climate.

As higher education embraces the new millennium, it is critical to re-examine initiatives designed to support/encourage the diversity of faculty in post-secondary institution. More importantly, further understanding of what will affect future policies designed to improve representation of people of color as administrators, faculty, and staff within institutions of higher learning.

Sampling

Qualitative research is more flexible with respect to sampling techniques than quantitative research (Jacob, 1987). This flexibility reflects the emergent design of qualitative research; that is, the freedom it affords researchers to develop and adapt methodologies in order to gain new insights into the phenomena being studied (Denzin, 1991).

This study utilized criterion-sampling techniques. Criterion sampling involved the selection of cases that satisfy an important criterion. This strategy is particularly useful in studying components within educational programs (Jacob, 1987). The criteria for selecting participants in this study included minority doctoral students involved in the PFF initiative. The researcher conducted interviews with participants until the point of data saturation or redundancy. Thirteen students (eight at the University of Minnesota and five at Northwestern University) met the criteria. Eleven of these students agreed to be a part of the study.

<u>Demographics</u>

There were eleven PFF participants involved in this study. In terms of gender, three were males and eight were females. From an ethnicity perspective, six were African American, two Native American, two Asian American, and one Hispanic. The academic disciplines represented included: Biochemistry; Education; Astronomy; Political Science; Religion; Performance Studies; Linguistics and Forestry. Nine were Ph.D. Candidates and two were assistant professors. In addition, two of the participants were first-generation college students.

<u>Data Collection</u>

The data collection utilized in this study included semi-structured interviews, document reviews, and observations. The semi-structured interview involved asking a series of structured questions and then probing more deeply using open-form questions to obtain additional information (Patton, 1990). Several methods of opening the interview were utilized to determine the one that established the best rapport and cooperation. Gordon (1980) contended that the interviewer must determine the type of personal image to present to respondents, gain trust, be sensitive to nonverbal information, as well as understand the respondents' language and culture.

For this study, the interview was structured to expose all respondents to a nearly identical experience. Interview questions were adapted and modified from Dr. Jim L. Turner and Dr. Robert Boice at California State University, Long Beach, who have studied the concerns and needs of new faculty. The protocol for the interview process involved a letter explaining the purpose of the study, a signed consent form involving gaining permission to tape the interview to use the information obtained in the study, interview questions, and a

closing remark ensuring that the data obtained from respondents would be kept confidential (see Appendix A, B, C). The researcher conducted a preliminary interview with Mr. Brian Williams, a graduate student at Emory University and Dr. Orlando Taylor, Dean of the Graduate College at Howard University, to pilot interview questions.

Observation, in contrast, allows researchers to formulate their own version of what is occurring, independent of the participants. The inclusion of selected observations in a qualitative study provides a more complete description of phenomena than would be possible by just referring to interview statements or documents (Adler & Adler, 1994). Within this study, observational field notes were kept on participants, interactions, routines, and interpretations of the participants. Finally, observations within the campus environment provided an alternative source of data for verifying the information obtained pertaining to strategies and practices concerning minority faculty development. Document reviews (e.g., course syllabi, literature reviews) were examined to determine what works and what does not work in terms of minority faculty development.

The information derived from minority doctoral students participating in the PFF program, was used both as descriptive and interpretive information for answering the research questions. As indicated earlier, the Super's career development model served as the theoretical framework in guiding the exploration of series of stages experienced by minority doctoral students preparing for an academic career. The researcher was the instrument for gathering data. All participants involved in this study signed a release of information document. As with any study involving human subjects, the Human Subjects Review Committee reviewed and approved the research agenda before the researcher begin to collect data for the study.

Interviews were recorded and analysis occurred simultaneously with data collection.
The data was organized based on the institution, as well as the individual participant (i.e.,
doctoral student). Also, the researcher utilized various methods of data management,
including observational notes, theoretical notes, and analytic memos. In addition, the
observation derived from each institution also was used to support interpretations of
participants' interviews.

Data Analysis Strategies

Strauss and Corbin (1990) contended that Glaser and Strauss coined the term
"constant comparison" to refer to the continual process of comparing segments within and
across categories. The term highlights the fact that the process of comparison and revision of
categories is repeated until satisfactory closure is achieved. Using constant comparison, the
researcher clarifies the meaning of each category, creates sharp distinctions between
categories, and decides which categories are most important to the study (Strauss & Corbin,
1990).

Although the method of constant comparison refers specifically to the development of
categories that are linked together by a theory, it is applicable to the development of purely
descriptive categories as well. Through applying the method of constant comparison, the
researcher arrived at a set of well-defined patterns, themes, trends. These findings were
applied to the participants who were categorized in the following ways: ethnicity, gender,
academic discipline, highest degree obtained by parents, and their institution.

Trustworthiness

Although methods and procedures do not guarantee validity, they are nonetheless
essential to the process of establishing trustworthiness and increasing the credibility of

conclusions (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). For this reason, Guba and Lincoln (1989) have

developed a checklist of some of the important strategies that can be used to establish

validity in qualitative studies.

Triangulation. This study utilized triangulation of data, a process of using multiple

data-collection methods, data sources, analysts, or theories to check the validity of study

findings. The triangulation of data for this study incorporated interviews, document reviews,

and observations. Triangulation helped to eliminate biases that might result from relying

exclusively on any one data collection method, source, analyst, or theory (Patton, 1990).

Member Checking. The validity of a researcher's reconstruction of individuals' emic

perspective (the research participants' perceptions and understanding of their social reality)

can be corroborated through member checking, which is the process of having these

individuals review statements made in the researcher's report for accuracy and completeness

(Adler & Adler, 1994). In this study, the researcher conducted this investigation at different

institutions in the field. The interpretations were based on observations of participants,

information derived from interviews (participants' language), and document analysis. As

indicated earlier, to assure that interpretations were correct, the researcher conducted member

checks with participants at the end of the spring semester. The researcher sent summaries of

analysis of the study to participants via e-mail. This procedure was a way of ruling out the

possibility of misinterpretation of the meaning of what they said as well as engaging their

perspective of what was going on.

Prolonged Engagement. Prolonged engagement is a lengthy and intensive contact

with the phenomena (or respondents) in the field to assess possible sources of distortion as

well as to identify saliencies in the situation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985a). The researcher was

engaged with participants throughout the study for the purposes of providing a full and revealing picture of the experiences of PFF participants. The researcher communicated with respondents throughout the fall and spring semester via e-mail after the interviews were conducted. This process was to make sure that the researcher had established rich data and had captured concrete examples of what was observed.

Peer Debriefing. Peer debriefing is exposing oneself to a professional peer for the purposes of assisting in developing working hypotheses, testing the emerging design, and obtaining emotional catharsis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985a). Throughout the dissertation process, Dr. Jerlando F. L. Jackson served as a peer debriefer for this study because of his experience as a person of color who is a faculty member at the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Audit Trail. According to Yin (1994), the validity of a study is strengthened if the researcher presents a strong chain of evidence, that is, meaningful links between research questions, raw data, and findings. The researcher should make the chain of evidence explicit in the study report by providing an audit trail. An audit trail is documentation of the research process followed in the study. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994), six types of documentation should be considered for inclusion in an audit trail: (1) source and method of recording raw data, (2) data reduction and analysis products, (3) data reconstruction and synthesis products, (4) process notes, (5) materials relating to intentions and dispositions, and (6) instrument development information.

Within this study, the audit trail consisted of the researcher's daily activities, interview notes, transcripts, audio tapes, and field notes describing problems/challenges that arose during the study. This process was utilized to determine whether or how the researcher's thinking and procedures changed as the study progressed.

Negative Case Analysis. A crucial issue in addressing validity is demonstrating that

the researcher has incorporated explanations of discrepant data. Negative case analysis is the

active search for negative instances relating to developing insights and adjusting the latter

continuously until no further negative instances are discovered (Lincoln & Guba, 1985a). In

this study, the researcher incorporated negative case analysis for the purposes of enriching

the data and establishing validity, as well as maintaining ethical standards. The next chapter

will discuss the results and findings for this study,

CHAPTER FOUR: PFF PARTICIPANTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the academic experiences of the minority

participants in the PFF program with emphasis on the expansion of minority faculty in

underrepresented academic disciplines at several public and independent colleges and

universities in the Midwest. The researcher utilized Super's career development model as the

theoretical framework to explore the series of stages experienced by minority doctoral

students preparing for an academic career.

These interviews sought the perspectives of minority PFF participants with the

ultimate purpose of helping educators and policy makers understand factors in the academic

experience that influence minority faculty representation – both positively and negatively.

Much of what these respondents suggested was consistent with the literature, although, few

studies reported in the literature focus solely on faculty of color in mid-western institutions or

examine the academic experiences of minorities preparing for the professoriate.

As discussed in the previous chapter, career development is an on-going process,

from birth to death, but traditionally individuals are not accustomed to thinking of declining

and dying as development. Maturity is a state usually thought of as the peak of development,

but a career may have a peak, one peak, or several peaks (Ohler, Levinson, & Hays, 1996).

Developmental career assessment ascertains the individual knowledge of the stages of

occupational careers, of the structure and functioning of the world of work (e.g.,

opportunities and requirements) and of the principles, processes, and data of career decision-

making (Super, 1990). These constitute vital aspects of career maturity.

Developmental career assessment identifies the focus of a person's career concerns and the developmental tasks that he or she confronts. It ascertains the values placed on and sought in the occupational, study, family, and other roles that constitute a career (e.g., the essentials for self-fulfillment). It also assesses the levels of vocational maturity in a second way, examining attitudes toward planning and toward inquiry into educational, occupational, familial, and other career roles. In essence, it estimates the possibility of stability and change in the individual over time.

There is considerable interest among researchers in understanding how individuals prepare themselves to make career choices and to help them do so (Phillips & Bluestein, 1994). According to Phillips and Bluestein (1994), the concept of career maturity is considered to include attitudinal factors such as planning and exploring cognitive factors such as decision-making and information knowledge. According to Super (1990), career maturity consists of five dimensions: exploration, establishment, advancement, maintenance, and decline.

Naidoo, Bowman, and Gerstein (1998) contended that increasing attention has been given to the career maturity of minority racial and ethnic groups. Super (1990) also noted that the applicability of the construct of career maturity to African American and other minority groups warranted investigation. Thus, the present study was designed to examine the academic experiences of minorities preparing for the professoriate with emphasis on the career development model (e.g., exploration and establishment) stages proposed by the work of Super (1990).

The sites for conducting this study included Northwestern University and the University of Minnesota, two of the original institutions selected for the purposes of creating

PFF model programs, as well as Lake Forest College, Oakton Community College, St. Olaf College, and St. Cloud State University. In addition, information also was derived via e-mail from an assistant professor (former PFF participant) from Penn State University.

In this chapter, the researcher has utilized the career development model along with quotes from respondents for the purposes of giving some sense of the universality of the experience. Interviews solicited participant views on their reasons for participating in the PFF program, their perception of the benefits of the program, their factors in choosing a faculty position, their general experiences in the academic workplace, their professional development experiences, and their perceptions to the barriers and challenges of minorities pursuing a faculty career.

Emergent Themes

Participation. Throughout the interview process, participants expressed that their rationale for participating in the PFF program derived from wanting to find a mentor (particularly a minority faculty member) for the purposes of assisting the navigation process toward the professoriate. Many participants expressed that they needed assistance in learning how to produce a curriculum vita, how to prepare for the interview process, and how to design a teaching portfolio. Other themes included preparation in becoming an exemplary teacher with emphasis on pedagogy. For example, Kate, a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science, stated that she "heard that the program would be helpful to prepare me to be a better teacher instructor."

Kari, a Ph.D. candidate in the College of Education, stated that:

at the time, I wanted to find an African-American mentor, a woman or man, but preferably a woman who had gone to a predominantly white institution but yet had interest in studying African-American children and so forth and I wanted to meet

someone who negotiated getting through the process, but still kept their integrity. Furthermore, we don't have any African-Americans in my department any more. We did, and then they left actually prior to or right after I got here.

Nicole, a Ph.D. candidate in molecular biology suggested that her rationale for being in the program came from hearing about the benefits of PFF from an older student her program. "Personally, I decided to consider teaching because of some of the great teachers I had when I was attending a private college for my undergraduate degree. I heard that the program would provide opportunities for me to get some practical experiences in the classroom."

Fred, a Ph.D. candidate in religion, indicated that:

> actually at first, I was kind of leery about it. Because it seemed like it was bent towards teaching institutions. And at the time, just a couple of months ago, I was so much brain washed from two years of being in my sociology department and with thinking Research I, that I didn't really see a need in visiting Lake Forest and all these other different schools. I thought that might be a waste of time. I met a colleague at a minority function and she was telling me about the program that it would help me as far as learning how to produce a CV as well as preparation for the interviewing processing. So then I thought, well that can help. So the first meeting I went to, I was thinking, I am not coming back. I really saw the schools they were visiting and I was like this isn't going to help me. And she convinced me to stay. After the Lake Forest site visit and panel discussion, I am so glad I stayed in the program.

Furthermore, Jeff, a Ph.D. candidate in linguistics, provided a different spin. He stated that:

> I had been working here, on campus in administration at the University of Minnesota for a number of years. And I knew I wanted to continue in administration, but I felt that in order for me to be an effective administrator, I should have some faculty experience, under my belt. And so, my plan is to teach for five to ten years and then go back in to administration.

Teri, a Ph.D. candidate in education, suggested that she has experienced several benefits from the program. For example, she stated that:

The techniques in teaching ideas as well as the actual experience in the classroom have been beneficial for me. Other benefits were actually having the opportunity to interact with faculty that were in this department. And it was kind of like an eye opening experience to me to actually see first hand some of the commitments, some of the, you know, what was involved. It was actually kind of scary. I mean, it was, it really made me think twice about, you know, the commitment. But, also learning about the different institutions, research, comprehension, you know, their are various levels and considering the culture and the environment and your goals, the institutions goals, you know, politics of departmental values of the institution. Considering all of those things, when you are considering an institution were factors that I was not aware of.

Dan, an assistant professor at St. Cloud State University in Astronomy, implied that he got into teaching in grad school and really discovered that he enjoyed it a lot more than he expected. "I wanted to improve my teaching and a student who had gone before me had taken the program and said that, you know, it was really helping her to teach and really helping her to appreciate pedagogy. Furthermore, she stated that the program was helping her realize areas where she was lacking as well as were providing pathways for her to improve. And so she really got me interested in the program and I signed up for it. So my goal when I signed up for it was to improve my teaching ability."

The literature suggests that career maturity has been defined as the individual's ability to make appropriate career choices, including awareness of what is required to make a career decision and the degree to which one's choices are both realistic and consistent over time (King, 1989; Ohler, Levinson, & Hays, 1996). Career maturity also can be defined as the extent to which an individual has acquired the necessary knowledge and skills to make intelligent, realistic career choices. It is the readiness of an individual to make an informed, age-appropriate career decision and cope with appropriate career development tasks (Luzzo, 1993).

The participants involved in this study indicated that their involvement in the PFF program was primarily for the purposes of supporting career developmental tasks pertaining to the professoriate. They valued the aspect of having a mentor to assist in the navigation process as well as expounded on how these individuals assisted them in developing CVs and teaching portfolios. These general themes were common among participants pertaining to their rationale for participation. The next section will focus on specific benefits of the program.

Benefits of the Program. Throughout the exploration stage, individuals attempt to build skills and develop competencies to make an occupational choice (Montross & Shinkman, 1992). It is generally a period of great uncertainty about one's performance potential. Questions about professional competence, whether to commit oneself to a particular organization and/or occupation, and what kind of family relationships to develop are primary concerns (Super, 1990). Personal goal setting becomes salient as individuals try to advance in an occupation.

Several themes emerged pertaining to being a minority PFF participant. Many students expressed that the program provided them with an awareness of faculty roles and workloads at other types of institutions as well as various institutions' cultures. Several students expressed that they were gaining techniques for the interview process and practical teaching experience that would make them competitive in the job market. Many suggested that the development of the teaching portfolio and awareness of the politics of a department have been beneficial in their socialization of higher education.

Kari stated that "just to learn how political and sometimes when you think how democratic that process is was very helpful. PFF encouraged me to continue wanting to be a

professor by reminding me that all institutions are not the same. Something I know that

happens with students is that they start identifying with their own professors and that, you

know, determines whether they want to be one or not. But PFF reminded me that there are

various types of institutions (e.g., liberal arts colleges) that I can work at." Kate concluded,

"I would have never had a teaching portfolio had I not participated in PFF."

Fred suggested that:

> I think as far as being competitive in the job market, I think this experience has
> helped me in the interviewing process. Understanding the positions and the culture of
> different types of schools has been beneficial even though each school has its own
> culture. Also, each institution that we visit and the fact that we speak to faculty that
> represent a type that is probably consistent with the different types I might interview
> with. So that will give me an advantage. Also it is going to help me out more
> personally in making a decision. I think that is the biggest impact PFF is going to
> have on me. Letting me listen to all these, like, especially with ten different faculty
> members talking about how they negotiate their time, how they live basically as
> scholars in these types of institutions. More importantly, being socialized into that
> environment will be easier, because I have learned from their mistakes and I have
> picked up several things from them. So definitely, my participation in the program is
> going to make the transition process easier for me as a faculty member because.

Karen, a Ph.D. candidate in performance studies, indicated that her reasons for

participating and what she hopes to gain were very targeted and specific:

> I had a very excellent content education at Northwestern, but it wasn't until I really
> began to work in PFF that I really began to understand what the difference was
> between Research I and a comprehensive university. No one takes the time to tell
> you those things. No one takes the time to walk you through what it is to create a
> teaching portfolio, what it is to go through an interviewing process, how to prepare a
> job talk, what kinds of things you can say, where you can bargain, and what you
> should negotiate for. All of those things, I didn't know any of that before I started
> doing the preparing teacher faculty program. In addition to that, I really decided that
> teaching was really what I wanted to do. And because of my funding situation and
> because of the smallness of my department, I had not had an opportunity to actually
> gain that experience.

> When I began participating in PFF was at the same time that I had an opportunity to
> teach some courses at another institution. Actually I ended up teaching for two years

at Loyola University Lakeshore Campus, and so my PFF experience was going on in conjunction with my teaching experience at Loyola and it worked out wonderfully together. There were things that were talked about in a PFF meeting and, you know, the next day I was facing them in the classroom. So the timing worked out really wonderfully for me so that I could have a place to have questions answered then talk about ideas and then go into the classroom the next day, if I wanted too, implement some of those ideas. Also at the same time it was giving me an incredible amount of savvy about the kinds of choices that I was entitled to make as an incoming member of the professoriate.

Northwestern has a lot of really strong points and one of those is that it is an excellent academic institution. But here at Northwestern, this is odd to state that sitting here in the Deans office, they have a real snob factor about them, you know. It is like every student that they train here they are training to go to Harvard and Stanford and Yale and Princeton and, you know, other schools in their caliber, if you will.

Jeff concluded that it was providing him with an "insiders" track to the profession. I

think it has giving me a chance to learn about the culture and become a part of the culture

and experience the culture before actually entering in the culture. It is as if I am going on a

fact finding data discovery. This is as if I went to a different country, when I planned on

coming to the states, I first planned on one-year travel. After one-year, I went back and then

came back to the university here. And in a sense it is the same thing, I am sort of stuffing in,

taking a look, making some connections, and studying that culture really before entering it."

Nicole suggested that the program has provided her tremendous confidence as it

relates to becoming a professor.

There are things in PFF that I wouldn't have thought out myself like, in the first quarter, there were several classes that I got the teach. That was kind of a nice break through and then in the second quarter you continue on, you know, you teach at a local college, university or something like that. And that is something that has been a tremendous benefit, because prior to those opportunities, the idea of teaching was quite frightening for me personally. PFF has enabled me an opportunity to interact in a real classroom as well as got to see how that works, including preparing for lectures and how much time that takes to be effective within the classroom. For me the benefit was the real experience and now that I know I have done it, I am looking forward to doing it again.

Furthermore, Nicole stated her interests are in teaching. "I remember at the end of last quarter, we had mock interviews and that was kind of an interesting experience for me because I kept thinking about my teaching and I did not have to say too much about my research. But I remember in the mock interviews, the older students in the PFF program really made it clear that even if you want to teach you have to have a research background. You need to be kind of well rounded." In addition, she asserted that:

> I never ever realized you could spend ten hours just writing a lecture. I didn't have any idea of that before my experience with PFF. And I suppose, another thing I learned in the program is the prep time based on the number of classes you have, as well as the number of preps that are different for each section one teaches.

Heather stated that "I think they did a really good job with providing information on what faculty roles are, particularly at various types of institutions that you may be applying too. In addition, the program has provided me with information on how I can make the choice around whether I want to be in a research institute versus teaching emphasis institute. More importantly, having an opportunity to teach has been beneficial as far as just building my confidence around standing in front of class and being prepared."

Dan viewed the benefits that he derived from the program in a different way. He concluded that:

> The biggest benefit was not quite related to any of those, it was the aspect of understanding students. Knowing how people learn and that it varies from person to person. When you know that, you can deal with how do you approach teaching. In the classroom environment, you can't focus on every person all the time, but you can at least create an environment where every person can have a chance. But in terms of the job market, I think it definitely helped. It got me focused. They had us as part of the course to write statements of teaching philosophy, we had to fill out CV's, we had to do everything and it really, basically assisted in putting together what they call a teaching portfolio. Looking back in retrospect, that became invaluable a year and a half later when I was applying for jobs.

Developmental career assessment ascertains the individual knowledge of the stages of occupational careers, of the structure and functioning of the world of work (e.g., opportunities and requirements) and of the principles, processes, and data of career decision-making (Super, 1990). These constitute vital aspects of career maturity. Developmental career assessment identifies the focus of a person's career concerns and the developmental tasks the he or she confronts. It ascertains the values placed on and sought in the occupational, study, family, and other roles that constitute a career (e.g., the essentials for self-fulfillment).

Referring to guiding question number two, to what extent does participation in the PFF program facilitate the development of people of color as faculty members, participants expressed various different perspectives. Several students expressed that they were gaining techniques for the interview process (i.e., job talk). As suggested in the rationale section, participants indicated that the development of the teaching portfolio and awareness to the politics of a department have been beneficial pertaining to the socialization of academe. Furthermore, many students expressed that their participation has provided them with awareness of faculty roles and workloads at various types of institutions. These types of experiences of participants in the program are viewed favorably as they approach the completion of their degrees. The next section will discuss factors in choosing a faculty position from the participants involved in the study.

Factors in choosing a faculty position. Throughout the interview process, the researcher wanted to gain more insight as it relates to factors in choosing a faculty position. Many students expressed that because of their participation in the PFF initiative, they would

prefer working within a department where they would have an ability to impact the curriculum. Students identified other important factors, including the flexibility within the department, the quality of the department, the demands of tenure, and the types of classes that they would be able to teach. The participants that have children expressed geographic locations as a primary criterion. Individuals in the establishment stage of their career are concerned with positioning themselves in a career that uses their abilities and talents (Super, 1980). Karen asserted that:

> I think, I guess at the top of the list personally, I would say would be the ability to impact the curriculum through my teaching. I mean, my dissertation topic is a cultural studies topic. And I have had the opportunity to teach in, you know, a couple of different departments, you know, and some people can't and my dissertation director still can't believe I got hired in a history department, you know. My goodness we put people everywhere, you know. But yes, I was hired in a history department to teach the American Social History of Race and Ethnicity, which I can do from a cultural studies point of view. I also have been hired in an English department to teach African-American literature and the performance of literature, which I am also qualified to do.

> For me, the one of the key factors will be of how flexible that department is, how they handle curricula intervention in terms of race, class, and gender and current theories on those things. What kinds of latitude they will allow in order to let me service the students of color that may be present in those institutions. More importantly, their general acceptance of difference, not only in the classroom, but in the committee meetings, and in the decision making arenas and so forth, because I am going very clearly with an intent to be an advocate for other students of color. And for building collegial links that acknowledge difference, acknowledge cultural diversity and, commitment to ways that incorporate those things.

When this question was posed to Fred, he placed more emphasis on the issue of the demands for tenure, economics, and the ability to impact the curriculum, as well as flexibility to teach in other departments.

> The demands for tenure seems to be ranked pretty high. Because that is why I am considering, there is a school in North Carolina, UNCG, University of North Carolina at Greensboro. My committee is like, no, no, no, no. But I am considering it because I think I can easily get tenure there. And the money that they are talking sounds

pretty good. So I guess demands for tenure, at this point as well as money is a little bit important. I mean, I wouldn't put it as high as demands for tenure.

But the most important thing I would even put ahead of that is the ability, and you mentioned this earlier, the ability for impact. Where am I going to be the most useful. But even something I would even put further is the type of classes I am allowed to teach. That would probably be my number one. When I go through this interviewing process, I am going to ask them when it is time when they ask if I have any questions, I am going to ask them do they give me flexibility to teach in other departments. And if they are really open to that, it is going to be something that is going to sell me. I am intrigued about the perspective about the creativity that faculty members at private liberal arts colleges have with regards to impacting the curriculum, in terms of, I heard various faculty members talk about, they've taught numerous types of courses, many of which that they just created from their own interests. With this in mind, I am finding that it seems like liberal arts schools or teaching institutions give you more flexibility.

Kate provided a different perspective as it related to factors in choosing a faculty

position. She placed more emphasis on geographical locations due to changes within her

family structure.

Well now that we have a child, my ranking is totally different. Because before we had Max, my ranking would be the feel that I got from the department and the students and then opportunities for quality teaching and scholarship. But now that I have a child, I need to be concerned with geographical location because now we have to think about well what kind of school district is our son going to be living in, will my husband be able to obtain quality employment at the same level in which he is currently employed in a major metropolitan area. And so now we are limited. But you know I can't go to some of these small liberal arts schools that may be in the middle of a corn field. So I am a lot more limited now than I was before I joined PFF.

With that central theme focusing on the importance of family, Kari stated that her

preference would be geographic location first, quality of the department second, and then

quality of the university itself. She assets:

I want to be at a university that I really enjoy as well as close to family living in a community that is diverse racially. I don't want it to be predominantly African-American, but a mixture of other people, so yeah, it is more quality of life and being at a place that is really decent and I can feel like it is a pretty good place to be.

Nicole also indicated the her preference would be geographical location "partly because I know there are so many private colleges in the area. And on the other hand, I kind of like living on the East-coast with lots of private institutions so I am not sure."

Jeff concluded that for him, "primarily I think it would be my colleagues. I think it would be my immediate supervisors along with the culture of the department is what would keep me in one place."

Dan concluded that his goal was to find a small college (e.g., liberal arts) because very few small public colleges are available. "I was looking for an institution with an emphasis on undergraduate teaching, but I also wanted to have research component. In the sciences, I am a very firm believer that a student needs to do research in order to understand the reality of what their (sic) career goal is going to be like. There are plenty of other fields that I think benefit from research and totally excluding that component can really let someone get stagnant. But, yeah, a small institution, big research schools that really just don't care about teaching, they just want you to produce produce produce papers, I have no interest." He also stated that:

> Improving on my teaching is very important. I am one of these professors who has constant feedback from students. I am always trying something new just this semester to see if it works. Instead of lecturing I am letting students discuss things and I am not actually lecturing. I am trying things like that and we'll see if it blows up in my face or not. But I think that there are, if you sit there and accept how you teach, you are going to get stagnant at it. You are just going to get worse. It is just going to happen. If you are making an effort, then it will improve. For my research, I would say the same thing. I want to keep a bit of my research always on-going. More importantly, I want to engaged my students in my research. I think that helps the learning process. One of the best things that my father ever told me and he is a doctor down at the Mayo Clinic but he also teaches down there. He told me that the best way to learn something is to have to teach it. And I think that for me doing research, it is one of these ways, once you start showing kids how to do research, your own research is just going to improve. And so I think that is best important to

me. I don't like the idea of becoming stagnant. So improvement, just general improvement of everything is going to be a big deal to me.

There is considerable interest among researchers in understanding how individuals prepare themselves to make career choices (Phillips & Bluestein, 1994). According to Phillips and Bluestein (1994), the concept of career maturity is considered to include attitudinal factors such as planning and exploring such cognitive factors as decision-making and information knowledge. Helms and Piper (1994) noted that cultural orientations and beliefs of the individual's reference group regarding opportunities in the job market and the existence of societal barriers such as racism and sexism may affect vocational behavior.

Within this study, guiding question number three focused on examining the experiences of the PFF participants of color in trying to secure a faculty position. Recognizing that career maturity includes attitudinal factors, the researcher examined various factors that participants would employ in choosing a faculty position. As stated in the narratives, several students expressed that they would prefer working within a department where they would have an ability to impact the curriculum. Other themes included the flexibility within a department, the quality of a department, the demands of tenure, and the types of classes that they would be able to teach. These factors suggest that individuals in the establishment stage of their career are concerned with getting themselves established in a department that supports a life-style that they have aspired to, one that enhances their abilities, talents, and gifts.

Definition of "Expert". Boyer (1990) sought to transcend the dichotomy of teaching versus research by suggesting that the scholarly work of the faculty revolves around four core elements: advancing knowledge, integrating knowledge, transforming knowledge, and

applying knowledge. The traditional view holds that teaching is connected with research and scholarship, and that part of the role of the faculty was service to the greater community. The status of teaching and the definition of scholarship are issues of continuing debate and those who work within a college or university are expected to be comfortable with the debate.

With this as framework, the researcher explored how participants in the PFF program defined "expert." This information was used to interpret how PFF participants viewed the concept of scholarship (e.g. exemplary teaching, publishing, etc.). The participants involved in this study concluded that an "expert" is an individual who is well published in his or her field of study. Others suggested that it is an individual who recognizes that learning is a continuous process. Furthermore, participants concluded that an "expert" is an individual with the ability to assert his or her perspective in various professional circles and is not content with the level of knowledge that he/she possesses. Several participants defined "expert" as someone who is looked to by a community of people as an authority in their respective field as well as someone who devotes time and rigor to reading and writing, and who develops his or her own ideas and perspectives from what others have discovered.

Beth, a Ph.D. candidate in Biochemistry, stated that "being an expert is never being content with the level of knowledge that is possessed." Furthermore, she stated that:

> I think being an expert comes from years of studying, years of research in a particular discipline. Expert is also one that keeps them open to different perspectives; I guess perception of a subject type of thing so that they don't become, like just focused on their particular theory, their particular ideology as being correct. And they can take the chance to kind of step back and accept different points of view.
>
> So in that respect, establishing myself is very important because, as an expert, you can never know enough, you know, and I think when you are at that point and you know there is always more for me to know, then you actually do know more. You actually do want to know more and I think that in itself keeps the learning process continuous.

Kate asserted that "being well published by major university practice (sic) as well as being called upon for policy forums and that sort of thing." For her, being an expert in her field of study is "paramount." Nicole also shared that for her, "an expert is viewed by the number of publications you have and the types of journals that you publish them." Karen stated that being an expert in her field is about "getting into circles where we have not been traditionally and inserting myself into the dialogue, into the debate, and holding a place for others to follow." Fred expressed the idea of being an expert as follows:

> I think an expert is somebody who is looked to by a community of people as an authority in that field. So when they speak or write, people, a lot of people take notice. And, becoming an expert is important to me because I have seen the rewards that come with that. And it is not just the rewards, but the ability to influence that comes with that and the credibility and things like that. And so, I want to be an expert in a black church. I want to be the leading expert on black church's so when I write a book on different movements that are taking place, people will want to buy it.

Kari looked at the idea of "expert" from a personal perspective. She stated:

> I think an expert is someone who is really devoted a lot of time and rigor to reading, writing and coming up with their own ideas and their own perspectives on what other people have already said. I do think they ought to respect the fact that we are in a field that has a tradition and has a cannon and so forth, but if they want, I like people who push the envelope a little bit who maybe a little bit more radical who know that cannon extremely well. But also they know how to just articulate new ways of thinking and doing things. I think sometimes that students can be a little naive and we come in and we want to change everything or we think, you know, everything that has already been done is wrong and then we don't really learn what people have already said. And I think it is very intelligent to understand that and to know your departure from it. That is an expert to me, a scholar I would say.

Jeff examined the issue of "expert" from a group perspective. He concluded that:

> An expert is not an individual. I think an expert is a team, a group whether they act the same and as a faculty member, I think that group dynamics for me impact change. For me personally, I need to stay dynamic enough so that I can adapt to that culture or every time I step into a classroom or step into a gathering of other colleagues, as well

as a piece of literature, or whatever it is, that group dynamic becomes the expert and I am a part. I think we are moving more towards a place where we can say, I don't know the answer. And for it to be ok not to know the answer. And part of being an expert is knowing what you don't know, you can then be able to get that information from others. I think it is a little harder for older individuals the academy to admit to that. But I think that we are moving in that direction.

Dan stated that defining an expert is actually kind of tricky. From his perspective:

An expert is going to be someone who is knowledgeable about their field. It doesn't necessarily mean they are always right, it just means they are knowledgeable and can attack a problem. I emphasis reasoning ability of a factual knowledge, so to me that is very important if someone can reason well. And most of the people that I view as experts are individuals that I consider very intelligent, people who can reason, not people that memorize stuff, if that makes sense."

For me personally, I would like to become an expert in my field. It doesn't mean I am going to be a top person in my field or anything like that, I just would like to be a person who has enough of a knowledge base where I can reason things out very well. I don't want to say a humbling experience, but I had an experience this last week where I was presenting this idea I had at a meeting. And this individual points out how almost impossible the idea I had was. And what I appreciated was the fact that he could reason me through it instead of just saying your wrong. He is probably correct. And, I am glad that he talked to me, it lets me figure out a little bit more about it. And like I said, that is the kind of stuff I want. I don't want someone just walking up to me and saying, you are wrong because of this fact. He actually walked me through the process and it took about five minutes of his time and he was nice enough to say, ok, here is why I think that this can't be correct. Here is a way to check it, and you know, mentally we were reasoning through the process. So that is what makes an expert to me. And he was by no means someone top in his field, either, he was just, he knew enough about his stuff to explain to me why he thought what I was suggesting was incorrect.

Throughout the exploration stage, individuals attempt to build skills and develop competencies to make an occupational choice (Montross & Shinkman, 1992). It is generally a period of great uncertainty about one's performance potential. Questions about professional competence, whether to commit oneself to a particular organization and/or occupation, and what kind of family relationships to develop are primary concerns (Super, 1990).

Staying within the framework of examining variables focusing on preparation of the professoriate, this section provided an alternative interpretation of defining "expert" and its relationship to PFF program objectives. The previous sections have highlighted that participants view the program as a vehicle to gain practical experience in teaching, to develop a teaching portfolio, and to provide awareness of various institutional types and cultures. These types of attributes are more applicable at institutions including comprehensive universities, private colleges, community colleges etc., where the emphasis is on teaching and service rather than research.

However, from a research perspective, many participants viewed "expert" as an individual who is well published in their field of study, recognizes that learning is a continuous process, and possesses the ability to assert themselves in various professional circles. Many participants also viewed this concept as an individual who is regarded as an authority in his or her respective field of study and develops ideas and perspectives from what others have discovered. These variables are emphasized more at institutions that primarily focus scholarship through research. These students in many instances have been socialized to research through their programs of study, but also are being socialized to the concept of teaching and learning through PFF. This duality in training with emphasis on the placement of these graduates will be an area of further investigation by the researcher. The next section will discuss the aspect of mentoring in the PFF program.

Mentoring. Mentoring is a vital component for individuals in the exploration stage (Super, 1990). This role can take the format of providing the individual with visibility of the profession, involving them in decision-making task forces, assigning them challenging tasks, and providing them support for their self-esteem.

The participants involved in this study indicated that a mentor takes a genuine interest in their development (personally and professionally), assists in sharpening their intellectual identity, and assists in the development of the research agenda. Other aspects of mentoring included assisting in developing one's ability to combine pedagogy and research and providing a structure for developing one's potential of becoming an exemplary teacher/scholar. For example, Kari suggested that a mentor is:

> Anyone who really takes a genuine interest in your personal development and professional development. And a person who doesn't try to make you separate those out or who doesn't look at those two things as being distinct. They ask you questions about, you know, what do you really enjoy, what is your passion, you know, what are your values, and that kind of thing and relate to the work you want to do. That is a true mentor to me. In addition, there are no boundaries as to whether you are actually here in my university or somewhere away. With technology, I am also utilizing mentors via e-mail who are willing to just read things for me and offer comments.

With this as a framework, the researcher wanted to gain more insights to the role that mentors play concerning the development of a potential faculty member. Kate captured her experience in this way:

> Well I think they can play as little or as much of a role as the participant wants them to play. So the more you are willing to work, so if I were to be willing to say teach a class, then I would have more opportunity to receive feedback from that faculty member. I guess it depends on the faculty member. I was lucky to be with a really great faculty mentor who cared about my development. For example, he introduced me to other faculty members in the department, he encouraged me to attend faculty development seminars, he basically gave me the schedule. He was there for me every week, you know.
>
> I had a mentor who had many years of experience and being a mentor either with PFF or with other junior faculties, he was just that kind of person who wanted to sort of help the next generation of scholars and teachers. My faculty member was tenured. Some of the faculty members who are not tenured, don't have the time and so there is some friction, I think between the students demand and the ability and the willingness of the faculty mentor to spend that time. And they just can't do it.

I mean my mentor has provided me with everything from how to frame a good letter of introduction to how to a letter of application, to how either downplay or play up your teaching experience based upon what the department looks like that you are applying too, to how you should act on a job talk, what to say, what not to say, how to time manage your job talk, I mean everything, I mean, even things that aren't directly related to teaching. A lot of what I experienced in PFF is how to get a job, how to keep your job, how to stay in a tenure track position by being a more effective faculty member in general.

Fred concluded that his mentor encourages him to pursue the best institution possible.

"Also, he has been excellent at making me challenge and critique my own work for the

purposes of positioning myself as a top African-American scholar."

Jeff suggested that his mentor is teaching him about the culture of academe.

More than any thing I think that probably captured in that, yeah, an insiders view of what happens in the profession. I walk around with my mentor, who happens to be my research advisor and I am constantly saying, oh didn't know that. Yeah, I didn't know that, oh that is interesting. And that's part of it. And also, I think that eventually what that does for me is that it will allow me the confidence to step into any faculty culture and not feel as an outsider.

Through our interactions, I became aware of various types of things that faculty members do. For instance, my mentor provided me with an opportunity to become an associate editor for a journal on-line. Before my relationship with my faculty mentor, this was something that I hadn't thought about before. I was constantly sort of looking at what he is doing, looking at what I am doing and decided that this might be an excellent opportunity.

Heather speaks definitively about the role mentors play, particularly for students of color.

I feel that mentors are the key for students of color. I was very fortunate from the time I went back to school for a second degree and during that second degree I met a remarkable person that has been my mentor and continues to be my mentor. And it was her that really continually sat on me literally to continue to develop my teaching/research skills. Since I have been at the University of Minnesota, I have always been blessed with one or two additional mentors. One in the research area and then another just for personal development. I really feel mentors are very important, even for undergraduates.

My mentor provides direction as far as, you know, whether I should do presentations or provides information about financial opportunities, as well as provides an

opportunities where I could collaborate with them or if they are working on a research project to help with a certain aspect so that I could learn.

Several students spoke about the importance of having internal as well as external mentors. For example, <u>Beth</u> stated that, "I think internal and external mentors are essential. Prior to my involvement in PFF, I did not have many internal mentors, maybe one or two outside my department. But my support system is external which is really what keeps me going because it is definitely a challenge here day to day."

<u>Karen</u> alluded to the difference between people who have acted as advisors and people who have acted as mentors.

> I would have to make a distinction between people who have acted as advisors and people who have acted as mentors. My dissertation director is an excellent advisor. He has got a wonderful ear and he is encouraging and savvy about what it takes to get through the institution. Having said that, I have to say that I don't have any mentors, per se, at Northwestern. My mentors have come from other institutions. And I think that there are a couple of reasons for that.

> One certainly is the fact that, you know, while I certainly looked for mentors here at Northwestern, I wasn't able to find anyone who was willing to take on that role. And it wasn't necessarily because people had rejected it or anything like that. I think that there are so few minority faculty members here that they just don't have the time. They are stretched literally from pillar to post. And so they don't have the time to give to the students, because of the published paper deadline, or the, you know, book manuscript deadline, or the selection committee deadline, or the government committee deadline, or whatever else it is that they happen to be up against.

<u>Dan</u> suggested that his mentor placed a lot of emphasis on active learning. Currently in his position as an assistant professor, he has realized that there is a lot more to teaching than just acquisition of knowledge. For example, he stated that:

> I am very engaging. I keep them (students) on their toes. In lab, I don't just let them run the lab, I walk around and I am constantly probing them with questions. I probably annoy the hell out of them initially, but I mean, if I had not seen that, I certainly would not be the kind of professor, I wouldn't had no interest in that aspect

of teaching. I would just done it like a job and it would seem like that you could actually do something and do it well, that made a difference in the lives of students.

Guiding question number four focused on the role mentors play in the development of PFF participants as potential faculty members. As stated in the narratives, participants reflected on what they had gained by working with external mentors at different colleges, especially when mentor relationships were helpful and free of some of the pressures of judgment felt back at their home departments.

These students were able to gain a sense of the complexities, problems, and gratifications of the academic profession through their exposure to a number of different settings in higher education. Students indicated that their participation in PFF strengthened their interest in an academic career, enhanced their ability to compete in the job market, and assisted them in understanding the job search process. These findings are consistent with the literature that concludes that many graduate students need more technical support for their teaching, as well as a relationship with a faculty member for the purposes of discussing issues and solutions to problems that may arise within academe (Stewart, 1994). The next section will highlight participants' perceptions to the concept of teaching vs. research.

Teaching vs. Research. Recognizing that the PFF program places considerable emphasis on exposing students to teaching, the researcher wanted to know how important research was personally or professionally. Kari suggested that:

> Personally, I feel like there won't be as much research, quality research done on African-American children and African-American adults in education. If people who are not from those backgrounds don't do it, the research may be somewhat skewed, so I definitely, it is a strong personal interest in doing it and professionally. Sure, I mean, I would like to get published and have my work be quality work and be out there and be something that people who have been hungering to quote somebody who has decent work in these areas, sure that is my interest.

From a teaching perspective, she concluded that "feeling like I wanted to have more African-American professors throughout my academic experience. If more of us don't become them, then who is going to do it? So I do feel that kind of obligation."

Karen examined this idea from a different perspective. For her, the research agenda enables her the ability to strengthen her pedagogy. For example, she concluded that:

> It is all about the research around here. And while that is all well and good, you know, my inclination is to spend more time on pedagogy, more time developing students' capacity in and outside of the classroom, time attending to and, you know, running interference on behalf of minority students particularly at majority institutions. I mean, yesterday, before I went to the PFF function, I went to the cafeteria and had lunch with the black students at Lake Forest. I felt very entitled to do that being an alum and I asked them, what are the things that you would want most to have somebody say on your behalf? And they were very articulate about it, you know, and very conceited, you know. Slam bam boom. I don't have any problems with that, you know, being the messenger, being the advocate, being the mouth piece in certain circles if the students are not going to get too (sic).

Beth suggested that teaching actually satisfy her both personally and professionally. She asserted that:

> I think teaching actually satisfies me both personally and professionally. I taught for two years already and in that experience, even though I was labeled as the teacher, knowledge was being transferred from my opinion in both ways and I think the more you engage yourself in the learning environment, the more you continue to grow. So it has always been my focus and my goal to always learn, never be content with the level of knowledge that I already posses.

Teri concluded that there needs to be an optimum balance between teaching and research. From her perspective, she stated that:

> I think that there is no optimum medium balance. And it was kind of a happy face and a u-curve up and down, basically, and I think that you are either going to emphasis one or the other, but there is no sort of medium where you do these equally. And my personal balance would emphasize teaching and I think that is very important for who I am as a professional and for the institution that I would choose.

Dan expounded on this idea of teaching and research from his new experiences as a

newly minted assistant professor.

> One of the dynamics that I see particularly with programs of this nature, are the fact
> that they are on institutions that the primary emphasis is from the research university
> perspective, where we should be producing scholars to enter into an environment very
> similar to the scope in which we acquire our degrees in, and the dynamic switch is
> that a PFF initiative provide opportunities for one to begin to have awareness of very
> different institutional type where the emphasis primarily is teaching and learning.

> I do believe that research universities are something that can improve their teaching.
> I am amazed at the number of people who are fairly bad in teaching in the world and I
> can't understand why they do it. Why do something you are bad at? Maybe they
> don't know. In any case, I think that there was a bit of, I don't want to say pressure to,
> but like I said, since astronomy was such a tight job market, it was funny, when I
> came in, they warned us it is an incredibly tight job market are you sure you want to
> do this. They don't really tell you how tight, but they tell you it is a tight job market.
> And then they started, you know, investigating all sorts of, thinking out of the box,
> well if we can place them in industry, we can place astronomers, you know, at small
> schools, they don't have to do what we are doing. And this was happening right up
> until the last two years, the market suddenly opened up and astronomy and all of a
> sudden they are back to the old, well they need to be researchers to be real success.
> So, um, I don't know, I think, they were thinking out of the box so to speak for a
> while, and I don't think my advisor doesn't think of me as a failure. But I think she
> would have preferred that I ended up, in fact when I was applying for schools, I
> applied for Iowa State. She is like go to Iowa State...big research institution.

Recognizing the dynamics of being a woman in the sciences, Nicole provided a rich

description of her experiences.

> Well, in our program, they hammered pretty hard, that unless you are going to go
> teach at a Big Ten research university, you've wasted your degree. And so we get
> that all the time. We never admit that we are going to teach at a small school if that is
> what you want to do. You certainly don't admit if you are going to do anything in
> industry. It is very much geared towards, we are training you to become faculty
> researchers.

> We have already been given the impression that the highest you can obtain
> particularly being a female in the sciences is to get a Ph.D. for the purposes of
> becoming a faculty member at a research institution. So, we don't know why, maybe
> that was the most difficult thing to do and maybe at that time, if you couldn't do that,
> that is why you taught at a small institution. I have been told flat out that something

to the effect of, you know, you need to work hard otherwise you will wind up at a dead end teaching job at a small school.

Heather provided an entirely different reaction to the idea of research and teaching. She began by stating that opportunities for scholarly progress were crucial as they pertained to her career. Furthermore, she concluded that the reputation of the professors working in a particular department and their scholarly contributions to the field would be factors she would consider when applying for faculty positions. She asserted that:

> My primary emphasis is toward research. I do enjoy teaching however, so the position that I have, I would like to be able to incorporate student participation with my research projects. Research is something that I have always been interested in, but I think PFF has provided some of the information that will be relevant as far as how I can be exemplary in multiple areas (e.g., research and teaching). Also, I think that the two should not be separate. I mean, especially if you work in a research institute it would make sense to give students that opportunity to learn the process.

Finally, Jeff stated that actually, "I hadn't given it a thought about that prior to the PFF program. I had always sort of considered research to be one of my strengths. And I had always been told that I was a good teacher. My parents were teachers, but I had never thought about how to develop, or even the fact that there is a place of developing attributes for becoming an effective teacher. And last year I was going to be teaching two courses here at the University. More importantly, I was immediately thrown into a position where I didn't even know where to start and without the first semester of PFF, I would not have been able to do that." As far as the research and teaching issues, Jeff concluded that:

> Well it will depend on whether I end up at a research university or a smaller college. I think that in both ways it is going to be great, in that I now understand that if I were to be at a small college, I would direct my research more closely to teaching and pedagogy. Whereas at a research university, pedagogy doesn't really matter, but I would still place emphasis towards the actual teaching, but for content. And in that sense it would work because then I could turn around and teach those things in seminars. So, yeah, I think that research and teaching are issues of great concerns as it relates to my definition of scholarship.

Students involved in this program described the concept of "duality" in the

socialization process as it pertains to the professoriate. Many students of color view

balancing the aspect of teaching and research as characteristics of being a change agent.

Several students asserted that finding an optimum balance between teaching and research

was vital to their career development. Having experiences in both teaching and research will

contribute to the marketability of these candidates regardless of institutional choice. These

students are savvy enough to recognize that if they are applying for a faculty position at a

research institution, emphasis will be placed on scholarship through research skills and

publications rather than teaching experience. However, having teaching experience, will in

fact, support their candidacy for the position. The next section will examine barriers and

challenges in the working relationships with White professors.

Barriers and Challenges. Recognizing that environment plays a critical role in one's

socialization process, the researcher wanted to gain understanding about any challenges or

barriers in working with white professors. These perceived challenges or barriers frequently

were not viewed from negatively by participants. For example, Kari suggested that:

> I have found many challenges and they weren't overtly negative like, you know, it
> always on the surface, people have been very supportive of my work and what I am
> doing and articulate that they feel that they like me. And I feel that they really mean
> that. But it is just this cultural dissonance. Just the way in which they talk, the things
> that they value, the things that they push related back to, you know, you should go to
> a research institution. I find it interesting that, I don't have a professor that has really
> asked, you know, who I am and where I really want to be and why I chose to be a part
> of this culture. I have had some black professors from other places and that is the
> first, we talk on that level before we even talk about where you are suppose to be. So
> that is a challenge, I see. And it is culturally embedded, you know, that is just the
> way that they are. That is the way they think and operate, but it causes, you know,
> some internal problems, cause sometimes, I really want to express what I really want
> to do and not be locked into these expectations.

Kate examined this question and elaborated on issues regarding departmental funding as well as stereotypes of being an Asian woman. She concluded that:

> My department is, or was when I started, um, very competitive in terms of funding. My cohort group had 24 people and we only had guarantees for nine of us. They stretched it out to 12 and so basically twice as many people were competing for half as much funding to cover us and it was just dog eat dog. From my perspective, one of the things that affected my ranking, was the fact that one of the faculty members who I have done some grading for, sort of took pity on me and said, well the reason you were not ranked higher is because you are too aggressive and you are too competitive and, you know, you don't fit the image of an Asian American woman. And if you want to stay in the program and get funding, you should be more subdued and more submissive and not talk so much, quote unquote. Furthermore, you shouldn't talk so much in class.

She also reported that her department is primarily white and all males. From her perspective, this creates an environment that seems like there is limited support for students of color as well as women.

Along those same lines, Nicole reported on being a minority woman in the sciences. She stated that:

> I can speak to the faculty. There are very few minority faculty members in our program. There are some female faculty members, but actually there are a lot of white male faculty. From a student perspective, they are a little bit more diverse. For example, there is only about 16 of us. I would say eight white males, and of the other eight, there is (sic) a couple of foreign students. Because of the sciences, I think we attract foreign students that is part of it. I am probably the only minority who grew up in America in the program. As far as like actual experiences in the program that so much depends on your mentor because after your first year you are under your mentor. My experience, she is a female, but she is harder on the females than on the males in the lab. And I think it is because she really wants us to continue breaking barriers within the academy.

Fred alluded to the fact that he felt that African Americans were treated as second - class scholars within his department. But for him, once he was accepted into the department, he had no expectations. "Once they accepted me, I figured ok, I am set. I have my own

agenda so I don't really see them as important to me so, I shouldn't say important to me, but as important to what I need to do. So, however, they think of me is almost irrelevant. But I haven't had any problems either because of this mode of thinking. But students of color who are not very autonomous and need structure, guidance, and continued affirmation from faculty members here, are probably going to have a rough time."

Teri also asserted that she, too, does not have high expectations from her environment. She stated that "I have one good friend in the program, one supportive colleague and we actually have written together a couple of times. And, so I am satisfied with the social realm. But the thing is I don't, I don't have high expectations and I am a very independent student. So I haven't initiated, you know, high maintenance nurturing with faculty or try to initiate those kinds of relationships. I mean, I just kind of pretty much take care of it myself and, you know, in general the atmosphere is supportive."

Recognizing that Teri was one of two of the students who were first-generation within the sample, the researcher wanted to gain further understanding about how this dynamic influenced her socialization process. She concluded that:

> I have always dealt with the, you know, two worlds, even as a high school student. My parents are blue color, and it wasn't such a big deal, except for, you know, you get this kind of feeling like you don't exactly fit in, you know, it is like the acting like syndrome which annoyed me at times. But you know the nature of my program does not realize what my environment is like. And these aren't really challenges except they are just little things, like when I graduated from the masters program, my parents sent me a card for congratulations and they gave me a card for earning my MBA degree. But they are supportive and they do their best and, you know, but it's not like, you know, having parents who have friends who are actually working in higher education. Second generation students have family members that understand the graduate climate, which to me is a very different tract. As oppose to trying to figure out how to be successful in graduate school, these students are setting up life after graduate studies.

Heather's comments were quite similar to those made by Fred regarding feeling like a second-class scholar. She asserted that:

> The automatic assumption that you are not going to do well. There are one or two professors within the department that were not too happy about me coming in because they figured I wouldn't succeed. Because, although my academic work was good and my GPA was high, I scored very low on the GRE. I just don't do well on those exams. And so the assumption was, well, yes I know she has A's and B's on her transcript, but, you know, according to the Miller's she really isn't going to succeed. And to this day, when I pass them in the hall, you can tell that they are surprised that I am still here.

This lack of support was also evident through the viewpoint of Beth. She began by describing her experiences in high school. "My first encounter was when I was 16 at a summer research appointment. This experience was just like getting me out there and seeing what goes on in industry if you are an engineer. And just even in that setting being the only minority woman, I realized that my white male counterparts felt as if I were there because they had to fill some quota of black students in the program. And so I was looked upon as such, as oppose to my scholarship." Furthermore, her motivation stems from her perception that:

> they think I ain't going to make it is what convinces myself you are going to make it. And definitely everyday that I come here or everyday when I went wherever I was in the past, it was challenge. Intimidation on the inside so that it is not shown to everybody else on the outside, but it has been a struggle. And that goes back to my point of having that support system that is not so quite apparent for me here in my department. I think there is only one other minority in this department.

Jeff on the other hand, viewed this concept from a different perspective. He concluded that:

> I have been so optimistic in, you know, I just viewed that everything was hunky dory in my department. And it is hard for me to get away from that utopia. And once in a while it hits me and what was interesting was actually in those preparing future

faculty classes, we would start discussing things. Throughout these discussions, I realized the extent to which some of those issues are internalized and people do not recognize what it is like to be a minority student. But I do think that when people make decisions, their decisions are oftentimes not focusing on how it benefits students of color. Personally, I have been fortunate enough for the most part, to work with these people who have in a whole different perspective and culture. And in fact, in the classes in the Preparing Future Faculty, I thought that some of the, to be blunt, I was thinking of a particular, like European-American male, and I thought, you know this class is wonderful for him. For him to be here and see the rest of us and to hear what we have to say. And I was really happy to see him so open to the extent that he could be and I think it is just the beginning for this particular man.

Karen also alluded to the fact that her relationship with her professors has been absolutely wonderful. She concludes that her challenges lie with her colleagues.

My professors understand where I am coming from. I don't make any bones about it. And they respect that. My peers, you know, are particularly contenteous in the culture studies discipline. From my perspective, so much is riding on questions of authority and who speaks, who has the power to determine where the discourse is going. Furthermore, when you sit in a lecture hall or in a conference meeting and you have a white male student challenge you about the meaning of blackness without having any direct experiences with being black, is quite difficult for me to handle.

Throughout the research process, the researcher wanted to understand what is it like to be a PFF participant of color, particularly one attending a predominantly white institution. Participants expressed a wide array perspective as it pertained to that question. For example, Karen stated that her mentor played a tremendous role by providing opportunities for exposure as well displaying behavior that suggested she believed in her as a scholar.

Well, I have to say that much of the credit is due to Carol Simpson Stern. She took a whole bunch of us out to Colorado College Trinity Annual Conference. They have a conference every year at Colorado College. At that conference I actually met some PFF participants of color from Arizona State University, people of color, and I was really impressed by the level of organization, by the level of support that they were getting from their institution, faculty, and staff.

My mentor and I sat down after that conference and had a series of very long conversations about increasing the profile and the number of minority student

participation in Northwestern PFF. And last year was the first year that we made a really concerted effort to increase those numbers and make sure to guarantee participation of minority in PFF. We sent letters to minority students encouraging them to find out about PFF to apply to the program and last year almost half of our participants were people of color. Which was a tremendous, tremendous change. And because there were so many, it really changed the complexion literally of the program. We actually ended up putting together a minority interest group and with me as the student coordinator initiated a calendar of events for the year.

This idea of being in an environment with other minority students who were having

similar types of experiences was reinforced by <u>Beth.</u>

> I think PFF has been a different experience with my being a minority because there are other minority participants. So that has been good. One of the directors is a minority and that is great that too. So it is as though, I am represented in that respect too. And I think that they are also showing how important teaching and learning is and how that can also be incorporated into the research aspect of learning. So, from my perspective, PFF has created an micro-environment within this predominantly white institution for me to interact with other scholars of color.

When this question was posed to <u>Fred</u>, he concluded that because of his socialization process

at predominately white institutions, being a PFF participant of color is something that is so

natural that it really does not affect him.

> <u>Kate's</u> response to this question was similar to <u>Fred's</u>. She suggested that:

> You know actually, I haven't really thought of myself as a person of color in the PFF. Although, I think, and this is the case for me as an Asian American woman in any minority forum, I often don't feel welcome by other subgroup minorities. I feel like when, people use the word minority it is like a code word for being black. You know, if you aren't black you're not really a minority enough or something. So my experience as an Asian American has been so much easier relative to the experience of my African American female counterparts, but I still experience departmental isolation as well being a woman and Asian.

<u>Kari</u> also suggested that she doesn't think of herself as a PFF participant of color.

> I don't really think of myself particularly in those terms. We had a pretty diverse group, African-American, Asian-American, a few Latinos. And certainly the majority of the participants are white, but the balance of ethnicity was pretty good. When we met as a group, I am trying to think of how much we really talk about race and the role of gender in the whole academic process. That wasn't so directly

addressed. There was one session where we went to a university where a professor was supposed to talk about this issue, but focused his lecture on black speech patterns, and behavior. I recall my colleagues feeling quite awkward and uncomfortable, which reinforced my belief that for some people, communicating about issues such as race and gender is still a phenomena pertaining to equity in academe.

Nicole reinforced the socialization concept by stating that she has been a minority

attending predominantly white institutions all of her life. As a result, this experience in PFF

is "pretty typical."

Heather also suggested the concept that individuals within the program are

uncomfortable with discussing issues related to inclusiveness.

> My experience as a PFF participant of color has been quite beneficial as it pertains to understanding more about the viewpoints of those who I will be working with as a professional. The faculty members who are a part of PFF are very sensitive to the experiences of students of color. However, I still sense that they are oftentimes uncomfortable with understanding issues related to diversity and inclusiveness as a topic. And that you still get from the students that are in the classes, particularly in the sciences, that they don't see it as being important to have competency because bottom line, there are few minorities in there area. So I think really to enhance the program it may be the PFF staff may consider having scholars of color come in and present on some of those topics. I just feel that there wasn't enough done as far as that aspect.

Jeff had an entirely different analysis of being a PFF participant of color. He

concluded that the program may not be conducive to or is not organized for people like

himself. For example, he stated that:

> From my perspective, the program is designed by somebody else for somebody else. I happen to end up in there, you know, it is not that I am not welcomed in there, you can't be here, that type of thing. But it is that I am not welcomed in that, it is not for me specifically. And maybe that is, you know selfish, but we are looking at trying to design initiatives to increase minorities into the professoriate. Not to single out that it is not beneficial for majority white European male female, etc. But maybe we need a track like this that is specifically design for minorities in higher education. And not that it would be from an inclusive perspective, but when the general makeup in terms of director, staff, etc. is of minority, when those factors are designed to support the

initiative or minority faculty mentors person. I mean, maybe to some other degree this could have a more beneficial impact for increasing the number of minority participants.

These narratives focused primarily on issues related to guiding question number four, examining the working relationship between PFF participants and White professors. As displayed through the voices of these participants, the working relationship with White professors had a great deal to do with one's prior socialization experiences. For those who were second-generation college students with prior experiences similar to PFF, their perceptions were favorable to the adjustment process to the majority culture. However, students who were of color as well as female, suggested that gender and racial equality issues emerged occasionally on issues regarding academic expectations, communications with faculty and departmental funding. Participants also expressed that due to their ethnicity, they often feel as if they are second-class citizens. From these students' perspective, there is an automatic assumption from professors within the department that they are not going to do well or succeed due to low test scores on the GRE.

Furthermore, for those who are first-generation college students, their difficulty was in building a support network, particularly in a department that is not supportive. In essence, several students indicated that cultural dissonance, inclusiveness, and an appreciation of a diverse faculty are still issues of concern for them. From their perspective, persons of color face many obstacles not experienced by their white counterparts such as collegiality within a department as well as isolation within a department without having sufficient faculty members of color to relate to. Regardless of the discipline, the same theme emerged. It is also clear that women of color suffer a double burden of race and gender bias.

Securing A Faculty Position. This study, in part, examined the academic experiences of minorities preparing for the professoriate. With that as a framework, the researcher wanted to explore how the PFF program has supported the process of securing a faculty position after graduation as well as facilitated the development as a potential faculty member.

Fred suggested that the program provided him with an understanding of the various roles and responsibilities of faculty members at various types of institutions. He also suggested that the program assisted him in writing strong professional goals and teaching statements, developing a teaching portfolio and curriculum vita, and receiving techniques for the interview process. Furthermore, he went on to say that these variables helped him build confidence in handling the transitioning to the next level as a faculty member. Fred stated that:

> Listening to some of the personal experiences of these different faculty members to me the biggest thing I am going to get out of this, is showing me what the expectations of me as a faculty member will be. Also, these opportunities are showing me the type of atmosphere I am going to be working in and I am fortunate to be exposed to this at this stage of my development. Cause one of the problems I had being a student here, I used to complain that there was no process that actually socialized us as being a professional scholar. But now, all of this information is being offered to me without me even having to ask all of these questions. And I can ask questions. So, um, to me that is the biggest thing I am gaining from the program.

Kate also reported that the program provided her with tremendous awareness to faculty responsibilities as well as exposure to what it is really like once one obtains the first faculty position.

> For me personally, the program has helped me understand the process of how to obtain a faculty position. What you need to do to obtain the job that you want, how to make your application more attractive. How to play up your teaching experience. See I had been teaching for five years before I joined PFF. So I actually had a lot of teaching experience already whereas a lot of the PFF people go to PFF because they don't have any teaching experience and it is a way to sort of get pseudo-teaching

experience. I looked at PFF as a way to argument my teaching experience. You know, make it better, polish it, you know.

When this question was posed to Karen, she had similar thoughts but her perspectives were geared more toward completing her degree. She stated that the program has given her some real insight on the negotiation process of getting hired, but currently, she is focusing on completing the degree.

> I am not thinking about the job market at the moment. And I think one of the reasons that I am not thinking about the job market so hard is cause I am feeling much more comfortable with it, the idea of it and that is due to PFF. I am thinking about finishing, you know, and if I have to marshall my energies and my strength to do one of those things, look for a job or complete the dissertation, I would rather finish the dissertation. I am in a field where I enjoy a little bit of latitude. My course work and my research has put me in such a position that I can apply for women studies, theater studies, film studies, or African-American studies. Furthermore, I am in a position that I can apply for a number of different types of academic positions. So to be honest, I am not really that worried about the job or the job market. PFF has given me some real insight on the job talk and the process of getting hired and so I am feeling much more comfortable with that. And those things have allowed me to take that and put it on the back burner and bring all my energy to the process of finishing, you know. I think about the position after I get the degree in sweaty little palms.

Nicole also described the aspects of how the program enabled her opportunities to develop a teaching portfolio. She stated that the program assisted her in the process for preparing for interviews as well as provided her with a better understanding to the concept of active learning, particularly in the area of science.

> I had no idea that people even had teaching portfolios or even how do you put one together. Right after I got out of PFF, I actually had to submit my portfolio for a fellowship, and ironically, I got the fellowship. The mock interviews in the program were so helpful because even though the program is diverse in terms of major fields, during the mock interview process, they put us together by our field. So the older students knew so much more than I did, so that was a huge help. They also did a thing where they had professors come in and talk about their experiences as professors. And even things like negotiating a starting salary were helpful. So I think probably, the second quarter was the most helpful in practical terms. The first quarter was good in that got actual teaching experience in front of a room.

And the final thing would be when we talked about facilitation of development and honing in of your pedagogy. I was exactly one of those types...this doesn't work in science. Throughout the first quarter, we had to do group things where we got into groups with people in our field and they made us think about how to do active learning. So that is something I learned that totally shifted my philosophy and I will probably actually try it. I mean I think in science with all those things, we are never take seriously, but actually I think that is probably the way our field of study will change in the future. I try to incorporate the idea of active learning in the classes that I will teach.

Dan's perspective was somewhat different from the others due to the fact that he is currently an assistant professor. When this question was posed to him, he observed that:

Well like I said, the biggest thing that helped me was realizing that people think and learn differently. That by itself has made a huge world of difference. It is like when you have these epitianies, you know, one moment where you suddenly realize how things work, and that one epitany helped me in just. It is not, I don't want to say I am this super amazing teacher, my students like me a lot, and I received an award last year for being teacher of the year for our college, one of four of them. But I think that what helps a lot and what the students like in fact that I make the effort. And the class showed me a lot of it was, I didn't buy into all the philosophies that were being exchanged.

My students showed me is that there were different ways of thinking and that you have to be engaged. And just the realization that the only solid teaching is not standing in the front of the room lecturing, made a huge difference in how I approach things here. Unfortunately it makes me a lot more busier but, as my wife also says I am much more happy now than I have been, you know, through the whole time she has known me. And I think a lot of it has to do with, I am working harder now, but I am doing something I like. So that makes a big difference.

The emphasis for guiding question number five focused on how has the PFF program assisted participants in securing a faculty position. Recognizing that nine out of the eleven participants were Ph.D. candidates, the researcher placed emphasis on the facilitation of their development as a potential faculty member.

Participants expressed that understanding the various roles and responsibilities of faculty members at various types of institutions will be beneficial as they began to decide issues related to institutional fit. Several students elaborated on how the program assisted

them in developing professional goals, teaching philosophy, and curriculum vita. One other finding focused on providing more information/details about the negotiation process of being hired.

These findings highlight, among other things, a profound dilemma. On the one hand, it is important to diversify the professoriate. There are too few faculty of color in all disciplines, and too few women in many fields. The data suggest that the pursuit of the professoriate for minorities can present multiple challenges including collegiality within a department, the job market and the conditions of faculty work, the problematic nature of the tenure process, and one's prior socialization to the political culture of academe. However, the students involved in this PFF initiative are motivated in their career aspirations by a love of teaching, enjoyment of research, and interest in doing service-the three traditional components of faculty work. They find college campuses appealing places to work and appreciate the lifestyle of faculty. In short, they are enthused by an increasingly realistic vision of the life of faculty.

In the past 10 years, a number of national and campus-level projects have focused on the aspects of teaching in doctoral preparation. These initiatives have ranged from a brief orientation for teaching assistants to programs aimed at developing future faculty. Most teaching development activities have focused on improving the skills for TAs for the purposes of improving the quality of undergraduate education.

However, specific faculty development initiatives such as PFF has focused primarily with providing experiences with multiple types of institutions, provide opportunities for working with diverse populations, construct courses, employ a varied of pedagogical repertoire, and assess student learning. These findings would suggest that there is a need to

encourage more minorities and students that represent underrepresented disciplines to consider faculty careers by providing similar types of experiences and the support mechanisms employed through the PFF initiative.

The responses of the students who have participated in the study suggest that although their experiences have been somewhat challenging, ultimately they are utilizing this experience to navigate their way toward the professoriate. The following chapter will highlight a general summary and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the academic experiences of minorities preparing for the professoriate in the PFF program. This chapter will provide a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for minority students and institutions.

Participation. Participants indicated that they wanted to participate in the PFF program so that they could to find a mentor who could help them enter the professoriate. Participants also suggested that career developmental tasks such as how to produce a curriculum vita, how to prepare for the interview process, and how to produce a teaching portfolio were reasons for their participation. This finding in consistent with the literature that suggests that mentoring is a vital component for individuals in the exploration stage by providing the individual with visibility of the profession, assigning them challenging tasks, and providing them support. (Super, 1990).

Benefits. Many students expressed that they have benefited from developing an awareness of faculty roles and workloads at other types of institutions as well as various institutional cultures. Furthermore, participants suggested that the development of a teaching portfolio and becoming aware of the politics of a department have been beneficial in their socialization to higher education. These types of experiences are viewed favorably as they approach the completion of their degrees. Dunn, Rouse, & Seff (1994) defined socialization as the process by which individuals acquire the knowledge, attitudes, values, and skills needed to participate effectively in a profession.

Factors in choosing a position. Regarding factors that would influence their choosing a faculty position, several participants expressed that they would prefer working within a department where they would be able to impact the curriculum. Other important factors included flexibility within the department, the quality of the department, the demands of tenure, and the types of classes that they would be able to teach. From a theoretical perspective, these themes are consistent with the literature asserting that individuals in the establishment stage of their career are concerned with positioning themselves in a career that uses their abilities and talents. (Super, 1990).

Expert. The participants involved in this study concluded that an "expert" is an individual who is well published in his or her field of study. Others suggested that an expert is an individual who recognizes that learning is a continuous process as well as someone who is looked to by a community of people as an authority in his or her respective field. Participants also expressed that an "expert" is an individual who devotes time and rigor to reading and writing, as well as develops his/her own ideas and perspective from what others have discovered.

Mentoring. As discussed in chapter two, mentoring is a vital component for individuals in the exploration stage. The participants involved in this study indicated that a mentor takes a genuine interest in their development, assists in sharpening their intellectual identity, and assists in the development of the research agenda. Other aspects of mentoring included assisting in developing one's ability to combine pedagogy and research and providing a structure for developing one's potential of becoming an exemplary teacher/scholar. These findings are consistent with the literature that concludes that many graduate students need more technical support for their teaching, as well as a relationship

with a faculty member for the purposes of discussing issues and solutions to problems that may arise within higher education (Stewart, 1994).

Teaching and Research. The status of teaching and the definition of scholarship are issues of continuous debate. Those who work within colleges and universities are expected to be conversant with the debate. Students involved in this program described the concept of "duality" in the socialization process as it pertains to the professoriate. Many students of color view balancing the aspect of teaching and research as characteristics of being a change agent. Several students asserted that finding an optimum balance between teaching and research was vital to their career development. Furthermore, having experiences in both teaching and research will contribute to the marketability of these students regardless of institutional choice.

Barriers and Challenges. As displayed through the voices of the participants involved in the study, barriers and challenges to adjusting to the climate of higher education had a great deal to do with one's prior socialization experiences. For those who were second generation college students with prior experiences similar to PFF, their perceptions were viewed favorably pertaining to adjusting to the majority culture. However, students who were of color as well as female suggested that gender and racial equality issues emerged occasionally on issues regarding academic expectations, communications with faculty and departmental funding. Participants also expressed that due to their ethnicity, they often felt as if they were second class citizens. From several students' perspective, there was an automatic assumption from professors within the department that they were not going to do well or succeed due to low-test scores on the GRE.

In essence, several students indicated that cultural dissonance, inclusiveness, and an appreciation of a diverse faculty are still issues of concern for them. From their perspective, persons of color face many obstacles not experienced by their white counterparts such as collegiality within a department as well as isolation within a department without having sufficient faculty members of color to relate to. Regardless of the discipline, the same theme emerged. It is also clear that women of color suffer a double burden of race and gender bias. These findings are consistent with Naidoo, Bowman, & Gerstein, (1998) that suggested that there needs to be further studies focusing on the career maturity of minority racial and ethnic groups.

Securing a position. Participants expressed that understanding the various roles and responsibilities of faculty members at various types of institutions will be beneficial as they began to decide issues of institutional fit. Several students elaborated on how the program assisted them in developing professional goals, teaching philosophy, and curriculum vita. One other finding focused on providing more information/details about the negotiation process related to being hired.

These findings highlight, among other things, a profound dilemma. On the one hand, it is important to diversify the professoriate. There are too few faculty of color in virtually all disciplines, and too few women in many fields. The data suggest that the pursuit of the professoriate for minorities can present multiple challenges including collegiality within a department, the job market and the conditions of faculty work, the problematic nature of the tenure process, and one's prior socialization to the political culture of academe.

Pursuing a career in academia is not easy. As the respondents suggested in this study, there are rigorous requirements, both explicit and implicit, for preparing for the professoriate.

The respondents involved in the study expressed the sense of being expected to work harder and achieve more weighs heavily on them, often leading to despair and diminished self confidence. Several participants also suggested that their feeling of isolation is reinforced by a scarcity of other minorities at an institution.

However, the students involved in this PFF initiative are motivated in their career aspirations by a love of teaching, enjoyment of research, and interest in doing service, the three traditional components of faculty work. They find college campuses appealing places to work and appreciate the lifestyle of faculty. In short, they are enthused by an increasingly realistic vision of the life of faculty.

Conclusions

This study, in part, examined the academic experiences of minorities preparing for the professoriate. Based on the summary of findings derived from participants involved in this study, this researcher has concluded several themes to support continued strategies for increasing minority faculty in higher education.

From a socialization perspective, the PFF initiative is designed to enhance the development of minority faculty and concentrates primarily on either teaching, mentoring, or some form of fellowship program for graduate students. As a consequence of participating in the PFF program, the minority PFF participants reported that they:

1. Were ready for a faculty position.

2. Felt that mentoring was effective.

3. Indicated that awareness of faculty roles and responsibilities were crucial in their development.

4. Identified cultural dissonance, inclusiveness, and an appreciation of a diverse faculty as issues of concern.

5. Described the concept of "duality" in the socialization process as it pertains to the professoriate (e.g., teaching and research).

Based on the data generated by this study, networking, mentoring, and research support stand out as major strategies for addressing the problems faced by prospective minority faculty.

Networking is a particular effective way to deal with problems of isolation for minorities, and there are a number of approaches to making this strategy successful. Participants concluded that networking along ethnic lines allowed members to relate in the areas of shared culture, language, and academics.

Mentoring has been a powerful force in the lives of some of the respondents involved in this study. As articulated in chapter four, many of the respondents attributed much of their success to past and present mentoring relationships. Initiating an effective and meaningful mentoring component particularly for prospective faculty of color helped reduce some of the issues related to isolation. The effectiveness of this relationship depended on making good matches between the mentee and mentor because each must be able to deal with the other on many levels.

Research support along with emphasis on exemplary teaching was described as concepts of "duality" in the socialization process as it pertains to the professoriate. For those whose academic success will depend on research and publication as criteria for professional advancement, participants concluded that programs such as PFF provided them with increased support and visibility for conducting research.

In conclusion, for too many graduate students, preparation for a faculty career still means essentially learning a discipline, developing expertise in a specialization, and conducting a research project presented in a dissertation (Gaff & Pruitt-Logan, 1998). In addition, developing the capacity for teaching and learning about fundamental professional concepts and principles remain accidental occurrences (Tillson, 1998). Marincovich et al. (1998) contended that it does little good to give special preparation to graduate students if they enter institutions that do not value their broad perspective. From these perspectives, enhanced graduate preparation initiatives should redefine faculty work and ultimately, improve the quality of education for all students. The next section will provide recommendations for minority students.

Recommendations for Students

This study was an attempt to present critical perspectives emerging from minorities involved in the PFF program. These perspectives were derived from the voices of prospective faculty of color.

It is apparent that recent strategies for faculty development programs focus on students needs, linkages with universities, with emphasis on the improvement of teaching and learning. Faculty development programs such as PFF, also focus on specific curricula needs, scholarship, and professionalism as aids to enhance professional growth (see Appendix E). Based on the findings of this study, the researcher has developed several suggestions that should be implemented for the purposes of positioning minority faculty in higher education, with emphasis on networking, mentoring, and research.

- Minority graduate students who are interested in pursuing a career as a professor should participate in some form of a faculty development preparation program. If such a

program does not exist within their department or institution, graduate students should advocate for an experience of this nature.

- Minority graduate students in collaboration with the graduate faculty should take leadership for identifying, mentoring, and preparing minority doctoral students for the professoriate with emphasis on exposing them to the types of role, responsibilities, and expectations of a faculty career. Emphasis should focus from providing answers to helping define questions.

- Minority graduate students should determine if a faculty development preparation program is integrated as an actual component of graduate education (e.g., faculty track). In essence, they need to find out if it is possible to incorporate courses such as teaching in higher education or practicum courses for future faculty that can be incorporated as a part of their programs of study.

- Minority graduate students should seek faculty development efforts that focus primarily on developing prospective faculty for a career in higher education that includes increasingly and varied teaching responsibilities as well as opportunities to grow and develop as a researcher.

- Minority graduate students should seek faculty development programs that provide intellectual substance, planned adequately, and well organized for success.

Recommendations for Institutions

As outlined in this study, the objective of faculty development initiatives should be focused on developing a more inclusive model of professional preparation for the professoriate. The data from this study suggest that faculty development initiatives should provide more emphasis on teaching, render service to departments and develop continued

respect for the academic profession (e.g., teaching, research, and service). Based on the information gleaned from this study, the researcher recommends that:

- The doctoral experience should include increasing and varied teaching responsibilities.

- The doctoral experience should provide opportunities to grow and develop as a researcher.

- The doctoral experience should provide opportunities to serve the department and the campus associated with recruitment and retention efforts of minorities.

- The doctoral experience should encompass developing specific goals for student learning, using a variety of methods to cultivate learning, and techniques for assessing learning.

- The doctoral experience should incorporate apprenticeship teaching, research, grant-writing, and service and recognize that experiences should be planned so that they are appropriate to the student's stage of personal development.

- The doctoral experience should provide opportunities for prospective faculties to effectively relate to and teach students from many cultures, with a wide range of learning styles and interests.

- The doctoral experience should incorporate themes that foster collaboration. Doctoral students should be encouraged to learn about the academic profession through exposure to a wide range of professional responsibilities in the variety of institutions that may become their professional homes.

- The doctoral experience should include a formalized system for mentoring various aspects of professional development. Programs such as PFF need to develop a nation-wide database that consists of pertinent information for all minorities involved in this program. Ideally, this strategy will encourage scholars to connect and interact with other

individuals who are in similar institutional settings for the purposes of sharing professional commonalties (e.g., research, teaching, service, etc.).

- The doctoral experience should include creating greater access to publication opportunities, developing incentives for collaboration between senior faculty and junior faculty for undertaking research projects, and supporting travel for professional development and research networking activities.

- The doctoral experience should include bringing students together (e.g., colloquium, conferences, etc.) for the purposes of sharing research findings and discussing common issues and concerns.

Institutional Impact

As outlined in the narratives of this study, prospective faculty of color often find themselves outside the informal networks of the department. A sense of isolation is among the most commonly reported problems for minorities involved in this study as well as the literature. However, those students who had prior experiences similar to the PFF environment, had very little difficulty feeling as if they belonged or were impacted in their adjustment process.

The respondents acknowledged that new forms of mentoring for teaching and service can be a fruitful complement to mentoring for research. In addition, the students involved in this study were eager to be treated like prospective faculty members and their PFF experience has provided tremendous awareness of the roles and responsibilities of the professoriate.

The respondents in the study suggested themes common to those of the literature, emphasizing an improvement in professional development opportunities for prospective minority faculty. Establishing awareness of the professional culture, understanding roles and

responsibilities, and defining a relationship with senior faculty are efforts to improve

recruitment, retention, and advancement for prospective faculty of color. Many of these

suggestions that are discussed in the literature are components of the PFF initiative.

Recommendation for Further Study

The departmental role is critical in promoting diversity among its faculty.

Departmental performance in nurturing, hiring, retaining, and providing a supportive

workplace environment for faculty of color needs to be re-examined. Mickelson and Oliver

(1991) challenged hiring departments to broaden their faculty hiring criteria. If these were

accomplished, there could well be many more qualified applicants making the short list and

being hired for faculty positions.

As Olivas (1988) noted, in academia "consumers are also producers" (p. 7). When a

department says that the problem is that there are no qualified minority candidates for faculty

positions, the institution should determine the extent to which the department is preparing

and credentialing minority scholars in appropriate numbers. If not, the department can and

should become a part of the solution. What is of major importance is the extent to which

higher education is willing to address aggressively the problem of underrepresentation of

minority faculty. To address this issue, the researcher recommends that there needs to be

further studies that examine institutional environments that have been successful with

recruiting and retaining faculty of color.

To achieve faculty diversity is recognition that institutional efforts cannot be viewed

in isolation. Scholars within academe must broaden their scope to re-examine their definition

of "scholarship." For racial and ethnic groups to maintain their integrity of identity while

participating as equals in the large community of academe requires change. No matter how

difficult such change may be, it is important that institutions of higher education find more creative ways to successfully develop strategies to improve the access for minorities toward the professoriate. If prospective faculty members have the opportunity to participate in programs such as PFF and after graduation, have the ability to connect with senior faculty, institutional change can occur in a collaborative environment. Current faculty working together to restructure the daily interactions of academic life has the potential to improve the chances that the next generation of scholars will too enjoy a richer, more positive, and more stimulating academic climate.

From a theoretical perspective, the majority of the participants were in the exploration stage of their development as they attempt to build skills and develop competencies toward transitioning into the professoriate. Also, the researcher can conclude that participants are moving into the establishment stage of their career from the perspective of getting themselves in a career that uses their abilities and talents. The researcher recommends that further research be conducted using Super's career development model to examine how it relates to these participants as they move through various stages of their career development (e.g., advancement, maintenance, and decline).

Based on the data gleaned from this study, assertions and generalizations about the academic experiences of minorities involved in the PFF program can be based only on the institutions involved in this study. With this in mind, the researcher suggests that further research at other sites besides those examined in this study and other approaches to faculty development should be examined.

Furthermore, a longitudinal analysis emphasizing the institution in which the participants acquired their degrees compared to the institutional placement after graduation

could be conducted. Future research should focus on examining the differences in the adjustment process of faculty life between those individuals who were exposed and socialized to programs such as PFF and those who were not. Another avenue for future research would also include a study of the PFF students after they graduate. It would be interesting to determine how these students will incorporate some of their PFF experiences in institutions in which they will be working. This information will add to body of knowledge to strategies for enhancing minority participation in the professoriate.

Donald Kennedy (1997) argued that significant change in academic preparation is needed and that new faculty members will need different types of experiences throughout their graduate studies. The changing of the guard is an excellent opportunity to alter traditional ways of doing things, but unless the new faculties are prepared differently than their professors were, an opportunity will be lost. Therefore, this study is timely from the perspective of examining the academic experiences of minorities in their quest for the professoriate.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PFF PARTICIPANTS

Demographic Background

1) What is the highest degree that you have earned?

2) What is the highest level of education obtained by your mother?

3) What is the highest level of education obtained by your father?

Career Path

1) Provide a rationale as to why you decided to participate in the PFF program.

2) What benefits have you derived from participating in the PFF program (e.g., understanding of faculty roles, increase awareness of diverse institutions, ability to compete in the job market, etc.)?

3) With circumstances being the same and knowing what you know now, would you make the same choice of being a participant in the PFF program again?

4) Ideally, what type of institution do you prefer working in (e.g., small college with primary emphasis on undergraduate teaching, state college/university with equal emphasis on teaching and research, major university with primary emphasis on research and graduate level teaching, or other)? Has your experience in the PFF program influenced this decision? Explain

5) What will be the major factors you will consider in choosing a faculty position (e.g., quality of department, location, opportunities for scholarship, salary, other, etc.)?

Faculty Interest

1) Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or in research? How has your participation in PFF impacted this decision?

2) How important for you (as a personal or professional goal) is engaging in research? How important is teaching?

3) How many hours per week do you spend on research, scholarly writing, and preparing for lectures?

4) How important to you personally is it to become an "expert" in your field?

5) How many days during the past academic year were you away from campus for professional activities (e.g., professional meetings, conferences, conducting research, etc.)?

Relationship with Faculty Mentors

1) What role, if any, do mentors play concerning your development as a potential faculty member?

2) What sort of advice, if any, have you received from your faculty mentor?

3) What is your impression of your faculty mentor's attitude toward the PFF program?

4) Have you experienced any challenges/barriers in working with White professors? If so, explain.

5) Do you anticipate collaborating in research and/or co-teaching courses with any of your peers or faculty mentor?

General Impressions of PFF

1) What has it been like to be a PFF participant of color at a PWI?

2) How have your experiences as a PFF participant supported securing a faculty position after graduation?

3) Would you recommend PFF to other doctoral students? Explain

4) How has your experiences as a PFF participant facilitated your development as a potential faculty member?

APPENDIX B: REVIEW OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

Dear PFF Coordinator:

Your institution's PFF program is invited to participate in the study, "Examining the Experiences of Minorities Preparing for the Professoriate." The purpose of the research is evaluating the experiences of the minority participants in the PFF program. The study will focus on five fundamental questions: What has it been like for PFF participants of color to be students at PWIs? What is the extent to which participation in the PFF program facilitates the development of people of color as faculty members? What are the experiences of the PFF participants of color in trying to secure a faculty position? What role do mentors play concerning the development of PFF participants as potential faculty members? What are the experiences like in the working relationship between PFF participants and White professors?

For the purposes of data collection, we would like for you to provide a list of the PFF students of color, faculty mentors, and participant's major professors for the purposes of arranging volunteers as well as scheduling a convenient time to conduct the interviews for this study. Each interview will last no longer than an hour and will be audio-taped. Participants will be asked to allow the researcher to facilitate the interview and document those interactions. Follow-up may be necessary to review transcripts and audio-tapes to ensure accuracy in the interpretations.

Each participant involved in the study will be assigned a unique number, and a pseudonym will be assigned to interview participants. This number will identify the transcripts. Names of participants will be coded and will not appear on any of the documents gathered for research. All items pertaining to the study will be stored and locked in a secure location in the principal investigator's residence. By the indicated date, May 1, 2001, all identifiers will have been removed from the interview transcripts and will be erased.

The research activity will take place at your institution at a location agreed upon by participants and the researcher. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you have questions or need additional information, please contact me at (515) 294-6635, or by e-mail (wheggins@iastate.edu).

Thank you.

Willie J. Heggins, III, Ph.D. Candidate   John H. Schuh
Principal Investigator   Professor
Iowa State University   Iowa State University

APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Dear Participant:

You have been invited to participate in the study, "Examining the Experiences of Minorities Preparing for the Professoriate." The purpose of the research is evaluating the experiences of the minority participants in the PFF program. The study will focus on five fundamental questions: What has it been like for PFF participants of color to be students at PWIs? What is the extent to which participation in the PFF program facilitates the development of people of color as faculty members? What are the experiences of the PFF participants of color in trying to secure a faculty position? What role do mentors play concerning the development of PFF participants as potential faculty members? What are the experiences like in the working relationship between PFF participants and White professors?

For the purposes of data collection, you will be asked to participate in an interview scheduled at your convenience. Each interview will last no longer than an hour and will be audio-taped. Participants will be asked to allow the researcher to facilitate the interview and document those interactions. Follow-up may be necessary to review transcripts and audio-tapes to ensure accuracy in the interpretations.

Your participation is confidential, and confidentiality will be maintained through: storage of data and field notes in a secure location accessible only to the researcher; use of personal and organizational pseudonyms in written reports and oral presentations of this research; and purging of personally-identifiable information from interviews and research reports.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to participants involved in this study. While you will be encouraged to answer interview questions honestly, you may refrain from an interview question (s) if you are uncomfortable. You may choose to withdraw during the interview process at any time.

If you have questions or need additional information about this research or your participation, you may contact me at: Willie J. Heggins, III, 222 Student Services Building Rm. 1072, Ames, IA 50011, (515) 294-6635, and/or by e-mail at wheggins@iastate.edu

---

I consent to participate in the research study named and described above.

Participant Name: (printed) _____

Signature: _____   Date _____

Researcher Signature: _____   Date _____

APPENDIX D: UNIVERSITIES INVOLVED WITH PFF

PFF Phase One: Recipients of Major Grants

Arizona State University, with Arizona State University-West, Grand Canyon University, and Maricopa Community College

Howard University, with Bowie State University, the Catholic University of America, Howard Community College, and Marymount University

Northwestern University, with Chicago State University, Lake Forest College, Northeastern Illinois University, and Oakton Community College

University of Minnesota, with the University of Minnesota-Morris, Macalester College, Metropolitan State University, Minneapolis Community College, and St Olaf College

University of Washington, with North Seattle Community College, Seattle Central Community College, Seattle Pacific University, Seattle University, the University of Puget Sound, Western Washington University, and the University of Washington-Bothell

PFF Phase One: Recipients of Small Grants

City University of New York Graduate School and University Center, with the Borough of Manhattan Community College, Bronx Community College, Brooklyn College, The City College, Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College, and Queens College

Cornell University, with Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Ithaca College, and Wells College

Duke University, with Guilford College, Meredith College, and North Carolina Central University

Emory University, with Agnes Scott College, Morehouse College, Oglethorpe University, and Spelman College

Florida State University, with Florida A & M University, Tallahasse Community College, and St. Thomas College

Loyola University of Chicago, with Barat College, College of Lake County, Benedictine University, and Roosevelt University

Marquette University, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, with Alverno College, Carthage College, and the University of Wisconsin-Parkside

Northeastern University, with Bunker Hill Community College, Emerson College, Roxbury Community College, and Wenthworth Institute of Technology

The Ohio State University, with Capital University, Central State University, Columbus State University, Denison University, and the College of Wooster

University of Cincinnati, with Cicinnati Technical and Community College, College of Mount Saint Joseph, Northern Kentucky University, and Xavier University

University of Kentucky, with Eastern Kentucky University, Kentucky State University, Centre College, and Lexington Community College

University of Texas-Austin, with Austin Community College, Houston-Tillotson College, Saint Edward's University, and Southwest Texas State University

PPF Phase Two

Arizona State University, with Arizona State University-West, Grand Canyon University, and Mesa Community College

Duke University, with Durham Technical Community College, Guilford College, Meredith College, and North Carolina Central University

Florida State University, with Bainbridge College, Florida A & M University, Rollins College, Tallahassee Community College, St. Thomas College, and Valdosta State University

Howard University, with Bowie State University, Howard Community College, Marymount University, The Catholic University of America, and Virginia Tech-Northern Virginia Center

Indiana University-Bloomington, with Anderson College, Butler University, DePauw University, Franklin College, Indiana University-East (Richmond), Indiana University-Indianapolis, Indiana University-Kokomo, Indiana University-Northwest (Gary), Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, Indiana University-South Bend, Indiana University-Southeast (Albany), Miami University (OH), Taylor University, the University of Notre Dame, and the University of Kentucky

Marquette University/University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, with Alverno College, Cardinal Stritch University, Carthage College, Carroll College, Milwaukee Institute of Art and Design, the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, the University of Parkside, the University of Wisconsin College at Rock County, the University of Wisconsin College at Washington County, and the University of Wisconsin College at Waukesha County

Northwestern University, with Chicago State University, Lake Forest College, Northeastern Illinois University, and Oakton Community College

Syracuse University, with Colgate University, Hamilton College, LeMoyne College, Onondaga Community College, and the State University of New York-College at Oswego

University of Cincinnati, with College of Mount Saint Joseph, Northern Kentucky University, the University of Cincinnati-Clermount College, the University of Cincinnati-College of Applied Sciences, the University of Cincinnati-Raymond Walters College, the University of Cincinnati-University College, and Xavier University

University of Colorado-Boulder, with Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State University, Community College of Denver, Regis University, The Colorado College, the United States Air Force Academy, the University of Colorado-Colorado Springs, and the University of Colorado-Denver

University of Kentucky, with Asbury College, Centre College, Eastern Kentucky University, Kentucky State University, Lexington Community College, and Transylvania University

University of Minnesota, with Augsburg College, Bethel College, College of Saint Catherine, Concordia College, Gustavus Adolphus College, Hamline University, Macalester College, Metropolitan State University, Minneapolis Community and Technical College, St. Olaf College, the University of Minnesota-Duluth, the University of Minnesota-Morris, the University of Saint Thomas, and the University of Wisconsin-River Falls

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, with Chadron State College, Creighton University, Doane College, Grambling State University, Metropolitan College, Nebraska Wesleyan University, and the University of Nebraska-Omaha

University of New Hampshire, with Howard University, Keene State University, and Saint Anselm College

University of Washington, with North Seattle Community College, Seattle Central Community College, Seattle Pacific University, Seattle University, the University of Puget Sound, the University of Washington-Bothell, and Western Washington University

PFF Phase Three

American Chemical Society

Duquesne University, with Chatham College, Community College of Allegheny County, La Roche College, Seton Hill College, St. Vincent's College, and Thiel College

CUNY-Queens College, with Queensborough Community College, Baruch College, and Manhattan College

University of California-Los Angeles, with California State University-Fullerton. Mount St. Mary's College, and Mount San Antonio College

University of Massachusetts-Amherst, with Amherst College, Hampshire College, Greenfield Community College, Holyoke Community College, and Smith College

University of Michigan, with Calvin College, Eastern Michigan University, and Grand Valley State University

American Association of Physics Teachers

Howard University, with The Catholic University of America, Bowie State University, Marymount University, Howard Community College, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University/Northern Virginia Campus

University of Arkansas, with the Northwest Arkansas Community College, Crowder College, and the University of Kansas

University of California-San Diego, with San Diego State University, Grossmont Community College, University of San Diego, and San Diego City College

University of Colorado-Boulder, with University of Northern Colorado, Adams State College, and Laramie County Community College

Special Interest Groups on Computer Science Education – Association of Computing Machinery

University of Iowa, with Central College, Grinnell College, Cornell College, and St. Ambrose University

University of Cincinnati, with Xavier University, Northern Kentucky University, and College of Mount Saint Joseph

Mathematical Association of America/American Mathematical Society

Arizona State University, with Arizona State University-West Grand Canyon University, Northern Arizona University, and Scottsdale Community College

SUNY-Binghamton, with Broome Community College, Ithaca College, King's College, and SUNY-Oneonta

University of Washington, with Seattle University and the Seattle Central Community College

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, with Virginia State University, Washington and Lee University, and Bridgewater College

Biological and Life Science Departments (coordinated by the PFF National Staff)

Duke University, with Durham Technical Community College, Elon College, Guilford College, and Meredith College

University of Cincinnati, with College of Mount Saint Joseph, Northern Kentucky University, Raymond Walter College, and Xavier University

University of South Carolina, with Benedict College, Midlands Technical College, and University of South Carolina at Salkehatchie

University of Nebraska, with Alcorn State University, Creighton University, Dana College, Metropolitan Community College, Grambling State University, University of Nebraska Medical Center, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Nebraska Wesleyan University, and New Mexico Highlands University

APPENDIX E. PFF COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Preparing Future Faculty
University of Minnesota
GRAD 8102: Practicum for Future Faculty (3 cr.)
Fall 2000
Monday, 2:30-5:30 p.m.
Donhowe 215, 210, 317, 421-422[1]

Instructors:	Shelley Smith	Deb Wingert
Phone:	(o) 612/625-3492;	(o) 612/625-3405
	(h) 651/698-8499	(h) 612/474-0988
E-mail:	smith103@tc.umn.edu	winge007@tc.umn.edu

Offices: Center for Teaching and Learning Services, 120 Fraser Hall

PFF Program Associate: Sharon Haller, 612-625-3811; pff@tc.umn.edu

Office hours: We are available by appointment and invite you to give us a call; we look forward to meeting with you.

Course Description
Welcome. This course is designed to give participants opportunities to apply the theories and methods they learned in *GRAD 8100/8101: Teaching in Higher Education* (or in their PFF-approved departmental pedagogy course) and to further enhance their understanding of the faculty role in higher education. To accomplish these goals, participants will work closely with faculty mentors, guest speakers, and the PFF staff. The predominant teaching method will be guest panels, small and large group discussions and a variety of interactive learning strategies.

Course Objectives
Upon completion of this course, participants will have:
- increased their understanding of the institutional culture and their future responsibilities as faculty members at community colleges, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and research universities.
- increased their understanding of what it means to be an academic professional and a colleague in a variety of educational contexts.
- established a mentoring relationship with a faculty member at one of the above types of institutions.
- applied the knowledge gained through course and mentoring experiences to teach three class sessions.
- experienced a faculty role played by their mentor at their institution that is in addition to their work as a classroom teacher.
- in consultation with their mentor, performed a service for the host institution.
- assessed the effectiveness of their own teaching through self-reflection, and mentor and consultant observations.
- developed a realistic perspective of the academic job-search process.
- continued to develop a self-reflective Teaching Portfolio that will be used to construct a working Job-Search Portfolio for an advertised position in their field, with documentation of their experience as PFF participants.

Room Schedule

Donhowe 215:	Sept. Oct.	11th and 25th

[1] See Room Schedule

	Nov.	(R.'2nd, 9th, 16th, and 30th
	Dec.	6th, 20th and 27th
		11th
Donhowe 210	Sept.	18th
Donhowe 317	Oct.	23rd &
	Nov.	13th
Donhowe 421-422	Dec.	4th

Course Activities(see 8102 Assignments for more detail.):

To achieve these objectives, participants will:

- Participate in a mentored *teaching, faculty role,* and *service* experience during which they will:
    - meet with their faculty mentor for one initial planning meeting, two pre-observation and two post-observation meetings; be observed by the mentor during two teaching opportunities which will each be at least 50 minutes in length;
    - following the initial planning meeting, write up and submit an interaction plan that will help guide your interactions during the rest of the quarter. You and your mentor will also be required to attend a mentoring workshop session sponsored by PFF. At these sessions you will continue your conversations with your mentor about your mutual obligations to each other, learn what can be expected of one another, what you can do to foster a more meaningful and productive mentoring experience, and how you might structure your faculty role activity;
    - meet with a PFF teaching consultant for one pre-observation and one post-observation meeting, and be observed by the consultant during one teaching opportunity which will be at least 50 minutes in length. The consultant will also videotape the class session they observe;
    - design and implement a classroom assessment tool to students during one teaching opportunity or during a course that you are teaching. You should develop an evaluation form based on what you learned about classroom assessment and evaluation in GRAD 8100/8101 or in your discipline-based pedagogy course;
    - create a piece for your Job-Search Portfolio which reflects on your teaching experience in light of the student evaluations from your teaching opportunity. You will also share your impressions of this evaluation process with your peers at the last class session;
    - explore one additional aspect of the faculty role through a structured activity with your mentor;
    - design and implement, in consultation with your mentor, a service project for your host institution. This activity can involve a wide range of activities and will be decided with the help of your mentor.
    - present information and facilitate discussions on the professional issues that face academics in a variety of educational contexts;
    - conduct a student interview at your host institution regarding his/her views of the purpose of education, life goals, teaching, students, and the learning process at their college or university
- prepare a Teaching Forum based on the course readings designed to initiate discussion. In groups of two or three, you will work with the course's co-instructor to develop substantive learning/discussion opportunities on class topics;
- prepare and submit a Job-Search Portfolio;
- document the value of your experience as a PFF participant. Preparation of this portfolio will give you the opportunity to reflect on what you have learned during GRAD 8100/8101 (or your PFF-approved departmental pedagogy course) and GRAD 8102, and to think about your role as a member of the higher education community.
- read all required readings. Please bring the day's required readings with you to class.

Grading/Expectations

This is a three-credit, Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory (S/N), graduate-level course. To obtain a grade of "S," a student must complete all activities and satisfy all the criteria previously listed. Failure to do so will

result in the issuance of an "N" grade. Final determination as to whether the criteria have been satisfied will be made by the instructors. Please consult us if you are unclear about these expectations. All criteria must be met by December 31, 2000 unless other arrangements have been made with the instructors.

Grades of "I"—Incomplete, or "W"—Withdraw will be given only under special circumstances and following a discussion between the instructors and the participant.

Disability Statement:

Any student with a documented permanent or temporary disability (e.g., physical, learning, psychiatric, vision, hearing, etc.) who needs to arrange reasonable accommodations must contact the instructor *and* Disability Services at the beginning of the semester. All discussions will remain confidential.

Required Texts

Matthews, A. (1997). *Bright College Years: Inside the American Campus Today.* New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Rojstaczer, S. (1999). *Gone for Good.* New York: Oxford University Press

Palmer, P. (1998). *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

National Teaching and Learning Forum (NTLF), selected articles, located at: http://www.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/news.html

Recommended:

Heiberger, M. M, & Vick, J. M. (1992). *The Academic Job Search Handbook.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (for those actively on the job market)

Pescolido, B. A. & Aminzade, R. (2000). *The Social Worlds of Higher Education: Handbook for Teaching in a New Century.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

The required texts are available for purchase at Williamson Hall Book Store and the St. Paul Book Store. All course materials are available at the PFF office in the Center for Teaching and Learning Services, 120 Fraser Hall and may be signed out for short (very short) periods of time.

COURSE OVERVIEW

Class #1 September 11 Course Overview & Introduction

Course Overview

Teaching Forum: Deb Wingert

Required Reading:
- Rojstaczer, *Gone for Good*, Ch. 1, 1-10
- Matthews, *Bright College Years*, 17-19

Class #2 September 18 Institutional Fit

Expert Panel: Institutional Fit

Required Reading:
- Matthews, *Bright College Years*, 20-44
- Palmer, *Courage To Teach*, Ch I, 1-34

4

- Choose an article from the "Disciplinary Perspective," section, NTLF Online Library

Class #3 September 25 The Scholarship of Teaching

The Scholarship of Teaching: Jan Smith, Co-Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning Services

Videotape Practice Presentation: Prepare and deliver a 10 minute teaching presentation.

Required Reading:
- Rojstaczer, *Gone for Good*, Ch 2, 13-26; Ch. 4, 37-46
- Palmer, *Courage To Teach*, Ch 2, 35-60
- Choose an article from the "Assessment and Evaluation" section, the NTLF Online Library

Assignment Due:
- *Mentor Interaction Plan*

Class #4 October 2 Academic Job Search – Preparing for the Job Interview

Expert Panel: Academic Job Search

Teaching Forum #1

Required Reading
- Rojstaczer, *Gone for Good*, Ch. 9, 95-105
- Matthews, *Bright College Years*, 45-108
- Choose an article from the "Learning Environments" section, the NTLF Online Library

Websites: • http://dcslab.snu.ac.kr/~ilhwan/grad/survival/part1.9.html
"The Assistant Professor's Guide to The Galaxy"
- http://owl.english.purdue.edu/writers/by-topic.html#bw

Assignment Due: "Institutional Fit Reflection"

Class #5 October 9 The First Year

Expert Panel: The First Year

Required Reading:
- Rojstaczer,*Gone for Good*, Ch 14-15, 152-177
- Jigsaw # 1:
  - Gist, M.E. (1996)."Getting Tenure." In P.J. Frost & M.S. Taylor (eds.), *The Rhythms of Academic Life*, Sage, (185-192).
  - Bedian, A.G. (1996). Lessons learned along the way: Twelve Suggestions for Optimizing Career Success. In P.J. Frost & M.S. Taylor (eds.), *The Rhythms of Academic Life*, Sage, 1996 (3-9).
  - King, T.C. (1996). "Rounding Corners," In P.J. Frost & M.S. Taylor (eds.), *The Rhythms of Academic Life*, Sage, (193-197).
  - Gallos, J.V. (1996). "On Becoming a Scholar: One Woman's Journey." In P.J. Frost & M.S. Taylor (eds.), *The Rhythms of Academic Life*, Sage, (11-18).
- Choose an article from the "Disciplinary Perspectives" section, the NTLF Online Library

University of Minnesota
Preparing Future Faculty

GRAD 8101: TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION (3 cr)

Fall 2000

Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday
Deb Wingert	Shelley Smith & Connie Tzenis	David Rayson
2:30-5:30 p.m	3:00-6:00 p.m	6:00-9:00 pm
Smith 111, Mpls	Bio Science 70, St. P	Murphy Hall 228, Mpls

Instructors:	Deb Wingert	David Rayson
Phone:	(o) (612) 625-3405	(o) (612) 625-3829
	(h) (612) 474-0988	(h) (612) 822-8423
E-mail:	winge007@tc.umn.edu	rayso001@tc.umn.edu

Instructors:	Shelley Smith	Connie Tzenis
Phone:	(o) (612) 625-3492;	(o) (612) 625-3330
	(h) (651) 698-8499	(h) (952) 435-5675
E-mail:	smith103@tc.umn.edu	tzeni001@tc.umn.edu

Offices: Center for Teaching and Learning Services (CTLS), 120 Fraser Hall

PFF Program Associate: Sharon Haller (612) 625-3811; pff@tc.umn.edu

OFFICE HOURS: We are available in our office (usually between 9 AM & 4 PM) on most days when not in class. Because we observe students in the classroom, however, we encourage you to set up appointments to make sure we get together with you. We are happy to talk over any concerns you have with GRAD 8101, or just chat about life in academia. You can also reach us by telephone or e-mail. We welcome talks at the local coffee/tea establishments!

COURSE OBJECTIVES:
As a result of taking this course, participants will be able to:
- initiate the development of a teaching portfolio by:
  - articulating their philosophies of teaching
  - synthesizing their academic and professional experience in a curriculum vitae
  - constructing, applying, and interpreting the results of both formative and summative assessment tools that measure student learning and teaching effectiveness
  - designing a syllabus with a rationale that demonstrate the relationship between course objectives, content, and methodology
- demonstrate knowledge of active learning theory and practice by applying active learning strategies in a classroom setting
- analyze and manage classroom environments in relation to student learning and instructor teaching styles
- identify ways in which technology enhances or detracts from student learning

COURSE DESCRIPTION: We are glad you chose to take Grad 8101. This course is designed to help you become a better and more reflective college teacher. We will model a variety of active learning strategies (e.g. cooperative learning, collaborative learning, problem-posing, case study, interactive lecture, discussion, critical thinking, role playing) and will facilitate participant discussions on educational theory and practice. By combining theory and practice, participants can develop teaching skills which will promote learning within a diverse student body in a variety of settings. Throughout our exploration of new knowledge and strategies, we will discuss the ways in which our choices as teachers influence student learning.

RESOURCES:
- Davis, B. G. (1994). *Tools for Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass;

- Campbell, Wm. E. & Karl A. Smith (eds.) (1997). *New Paradigms for College Teaching*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Co.;
- National Research Council (1997). *Science Teaching Reconsidered: A Handbook*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press;
- Course Handout Packet, available in the bookstore.
- One article in *The National Teaching and Learning Forum* (NTLF) Online Library – (a sign-up sheet for this assignment will be distributed in class). To access *The National Teaching and Learning Forum*, type in the Center for Teaching and Learning Services URL: http://www.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/news.html and click on the NTLF button. You must be using a U of M account to gain access to the newsletter.

The text books and Handout Packets are available for purchase in the Williamson Bookstore and are on reserve in the Norris Hall Reserve Library, St. Paul Library, and in 120 Fraser.

GRADING: Grades will be determined on a contract basis. Review the grading criteria listed below for S/N and A/B options and inform your instructor of your grading preference. You will be graded on satisfactory completion of the criteria for your grade choice and class participation. Instructors reserve the right to require revisions or rewrites if any reflective writing piece does not fulfill the assignment criteria. In addition to the assignments, thoughtful consideration of the issues raised by the course and consistent participation in all aspects of the class are necessary to receive a grade of A, B, or S.

To receive a B or S:	*To receive an A:*

- Attendance and participation during each class session
- Four teaching practice sessions
- One co-facilitation session
- One classroom observation
- Teaching Portfolio
  - Curriculum vitae
  - *Three* reflective writing assignments
  - Syllabus with rationale
	- Attendance and participation during each class session
	- Four teaching practice sessions
	- One co-facilitation session
	- One classroom observation
	- Teaching Portfolio
	  - Curriculum vitae
	  - *Five* reflective writing assignments
	  - Syllabus with rationale and *one* sample assignment

A grade of "I" ("Incomplete") will be given only under special circumstances following discussion with the instructor.

DISABILITY STATEMENT: Any student with a documented permanent or temporary disability (e.g., physical, learning, psychiatric, vision, hearing, etc.) who needs to arrange reasonable accommodations must contact the instructor and Disability Services at the beginning of the semester. All discussions will remain confidential.

Note: Students with special needs should talk to your instructor as soon as possible so that we can better assist you in meeting the course goals and objectives.

ATTENDANCE POLICY: Due to the interactive and participatory nature of this course, attendance at each class session is required. If you miss more than one class, the instructor will require you to do additional work. If you miss more than three classes, the instructor reserves the right to require you to attend the course in a subsequent semester.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS:
- Teaching Portfolio: The Teaching Portfolio is "documentation in progress" that will extend throughout your professional academic career. The assignments you produce for this course will serve as entries in this portfolio. They will include:
  - Curriculum Vitae: The CV goes beyond the idea of a one-page resume. It is a running account of all of your professional activities – teaching, writing, research, service, and professional development. (See Assignment Packet)
  - Reflective Writings (See Assignment Packet): Reflective writing assignments are designed to prompt critical reflection about the choices course participants make as educators. These

assignments are also intended to be works in progress for your teaching portfolio. All students must complete the following:
1. A teaching philosophy statement
2. Reflective writing of your choice
3. A reflective piece on a grading challenge which has occurred to you or one that you fear might occur in the future and what you did or will do to meet that challenge

- **Syllabus and Sample Materials with Rationale** (see Assignment Packet): Over the course of the semester, you and another student from the same or a similar discipline will develop a syllabus with a rationale explaining the pedagogical choices made with regard to sequencing, assignments, assessments and activities.

In addition to all of the above requirements, those choosing the "A" grading option will write two additional reflective pieces and produce a sample assignment or assessment to accompany their syllabus.

- **Participant Discussion Questions:** Participants are expected to read all the required material prior to class. Each week, two participants will send to the class e-mail list discussion questions based on the week's readings which will serve as the basis for class discussion. A sign-up sheet will be circulated the second class session

- **Website Report:** In addition, course participants will sign-up to investigate and comment upon (via e-mail prior to class) the suggested weekly web sites listed on the course syllabus (or to comment on web sites which you have discovered which you think are relevant to the topic of the week). A sign-up sheet will be circulated the second class session.

- **Peer Teaching Practice Groups** (see Assignment Packet): In order to gain experience using the teaching strategies that this course explores, interdisciplinary groups of three or four course participants will meet after class sessions 2, 4, and 6 for approximately two hours to practice teaching skills. The time and place of the meetings will be arranged by the members of the group. Each participant will develop a twenty-minute teaching demonstration addressing a topic in his/her discipline to present to the others in the group.
  - In the introductory session, you will present the context for your teaching (who are your students, what is the class, academic context, etc.) as well as introduce yourself to the other members of the group.
  - In the first peer teaching session, you will present an interactive learning exercise for the first day of the semester.
  - For the second peer teaching session, you will present an active learning exercise that you might do in the middle of the course, when the energy level of both you and your students is low.
  - In the third and final peer teaching session, you will try a technique of your choice.

Following each demonstration, the group will have a ten-minute opportunity to provide constructive feedback and to discuss implications of what group members have experienced. At the close of the last three sessions, group members fill out a form, to be handed in during the next class, that asks the group to collaboratively evaluate and comment on the value of the session.

- **Co-Facilitation** (see Assignment Packet): Your final opportunity for teaching practice will be the co-facilitation of a 50-minute session of one of our class meetings. The co-facilitation session will provide a context for practice on a larger scale than was possible during the peer teaching practice. During the second week of class you will be asked to sign up for co-facilitations that will begin the fifth class meeting. In pairs, you will collaboratively plan, facilitate, and assess your session.

- **Observation of a Class Session** (see Assignment Packet): Observing a class session taught by someone else will provide you with another opportunity to evaluate and reflect upon teaching strategies used in a realistic setting. For this assignment, you will choose a teaching format that you wish to observe (e.g., a large lecture, a small seminar, an introductory course in your field, or perhaps a course outside your field taught by someone you have heard is a good [or not so good] teacher). After asking the instructor for permission, you will observe and then send a one page-reflection to the class e-mail list that highlights your observations and impressions of how student learning was facilitated (or not) during the class session which you observed.

- **Jigsaws** (see Assignment Packet): At three points during the course we will discuss several selected readings through a cooperative learning activity called a "jigsaw." You will select one of the articles listed for each jigsaw activity. You will be responsible for teaching that article to others in the class session in a format which will be described in class.

3

- **E-mail Listserve Participation:** By the second week of the class, an e-mail list will be up and running for participants in the course. The e-mail dialogue is intended to provide an opportunity for you to respond to class assignments, to develop ideas that emerge in class dialogue, and to receive further perspectives on and feedback about angles of teaching that you either are experiencing or imagine you might experience. Your first assignment will be to send out a brief biography about yourself as a way to introduce yourself to the other course participants. The instructors will also use the list to send out any announcements pertaining to classes.

GRAD 8101: COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

DUE BY	ASSIGNMENTS DUE
Class 2	• E-mail Autobiography to the list • Jigsaw Reading #1
Class 3	• Introductory Meeting Peer-Teaching Group
Class 4	• Jigsaw #2 Reading • Co-facilitations begin
Class 5	• Reflective Writing #1 (Teaching Philosophy) • "First Day" Peer Teaching Group (Form #1)
Class 6	• Curriculum Vitae • Form Syllabus Base Groups
Class 7	• Optional Reflection #1 (for "A" option) • "Midterm Activity" Peer-Teaching Group (Form #2)
Class 8	• Reflection #2 (your choice)
Class 9	• "Teaching Technique" Peer-Teaching Group (Form #3)
Class 10	
Class 11	• Jigsaw #3Reading • Classroom Teaching Observation (e-mail report 1-3 days prior to class; prepare overhead)
Class 12	• Reflection #3 (Grading Challenge)
Class 13	• Syllabus, Rationale, Sample Materials
Class 14	• Jigsaw #4 Reading
Class 15	• Optional Reflection #2 (for "A" option) • Teaching Portfolio

REFERENCES

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln

(Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Allmendinger, D. (1975). Papers and scholars: The transformation of student life in

nineteenth-century New England. New York: St. Martin.

American Council on Education, (1995). "Joint association letter on affirmative action."

Letter to college presidents in supporting of affirmative action. American Council on

Education: Washington, D. C.

Anderson, H., Gaff, J., & Pruitt-Logan, (1997). Frequently asked questions about preparing

future faculty. A series of occasional papers, Number 3.

Astin, A. (1993). What matters in college? Four critical years revisited. San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Baiocco, S., & DeWaters, J. (1995). Futuristic faculty development, Academe, 81, 38-39.

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multiethnic education: Theory and practice. Boston, MA: Allyn and

Bacon.

Bar, R. B. & Tag, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for graduate

education. Change. November/December, 12-15.

Benjamin, M. (1991). Science and sensibility: Gender and scientific inquiry. Oxford: Basil

Blackwell.

Blackburn, R., & Conrad F. (1986). " The new revisionist and the history of U.S. higher

education." Higher Education., 1, 211-30.

Blackbum, R., & Lawrence, J. (1995). Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins.

Blackwell, J. E. (1987). Mainstreaming outsiders: The production of black professionals. (2nd ed.) Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.

Bloom, B. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook I, cognitive domain. New York: McKay.

Bogue, E. A journey of the heart. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Bogue. E., & Aper, J. (2000). Exploring the heritage of American higher education: The evolution of philosophy and policy. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.

Bok, D. (1993). The cost of talent. New York: The Free Press.

Borgen, F. H. (1991). Megatrends and milestones in vocational behavior: A 20-year counseling psychology perspective. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39, 263-290.

Boyer, E. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: HarperCollins.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bowen, H. (1978). Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). American professors. New York: Oxford.

Bowen, W. G., & Sosa, J. A. (1989). Prospects for faculty in the arts and sciences. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Bowman, S. L. (1988). An examination of the career development of black college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.

Brest, P., & Oshige, M. (1995). Affirmative action for whom? Stanford Law Review, 47, 855-900.

Brim, O. G. (1976). Theories of the male mid-life crisis. The Counseling Psychologist, 6 2-9.

Brubacher, J. (1977). On the philosophy of higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruner, E. (1990). The scientist vs. the humanists. Anthropology Newsletter, 31, 28.

Bruner, E. M. (1993). Introduction: The ethnographic self and the personal self. In P. Bensen (Ed.), Anthropology and literature (pp. 1-26). Urbana: University of Illinois.

Burgess, R. G. (1991). Sponsors, gatekeepers, members, and friends: Access in educational settings. In W. B. Shaffir & R. A. Stebbins (Eds.), Experiencing fieldwork: An inside view of qualitative research. (pp. 43-52.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Busch, J. W. (1985). Mentoring in graduate schools of education. American Educational Research Journal, 22, 2, 257-65.

Carrell, W. (1968). American college professors: 1750-1800. History of Education Quarterly, 8, 289-305.

Carson, C. G., & Crosby, F. J. (1989). Rx: Affirmative action. Smith Alumnae Quarterly, 12-16.

Carter, D. J., & Wilson, R. (1989). Eight annual states' report, minorities in education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 1995-96, no. 42.

The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 1996-97, no. 43.

The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 2000-01, no. 1

Clark, S. M., Corcoran, M., & Lewis, D. (1984). Critical perspectives of faculty career development with implications for differentiated institutional policies. Presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference.

Clayton, S. D., & Crosby, F. J. (1992). Justice, gender, and affirmative action. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Cole, N. (1997). The ETS gender study: How females and males perform in educational settings. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Committee on Graduation Education. (1998). Report and recommendations. Washington: Association of American Universities.

Crosby, F. J. (1989). Preface. In F. A. Blanchard & F. J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perspective (pp. 3-7). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Cross, T. (1986). The Black power imperative. New York: Faulkner.

Cytrynbaum, S., Lee, S., & Wadner, D. (1982). Faculty development through the life course. Journal of Instructional Development, 5, 11-22.

Denkin, N. K., (1991). Empiricist cultural studies in America: A deconstructive reading. Current Perspectives in Social Theory, 2, 17-39

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Diamond, R. M., & Adams, B. E. (1993). Recognizing faculty work: Rewards systems for the year 2000. New Directions in Higher Education, No. 81, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

D'Souza, D. (1991). Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus. New York: Free Press.

D'Souza, D. (1995). The end of racism: Principles for a multicultural society. New York: Free Press.

Eberhardt, J. L., & Fiske, S. T. (1994) Affirmative action in theory and practice: Issues of power, ambiguity, and gender versus race. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15, 201-220.

Ely, M., Anzul, M., Friedman, T., Garner, D., & Steinmetz, A. M. (1991). Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles. New York: Falmer.

Erickson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and society, (2nd ed.) New York: Norton.

Evans, T. (1997). Preparing Future Faculty: Lessons learned and next steps. Association of American Colleges and Universities Annual Meeting.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). The American academic profession. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Finkelstein, M. L., Seal, R. K., & Schuster, J. H. (1998). The new academic generation. Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

Flansberg, S., & Hanson, K. (1993). Legislation for change: A case study of Title IX and the women's educational equity act program. Newton: Center for Equity and Cultural Diversity, Education Development Center, Inc.

Fleming, J. E., Gill, G. R. & Swinton, D. H. (1978). The case for affirmative action for Blacks in higher education. Washington, DC: Howard University.

Francis, L. P. (1993). In defense of affirmative action. In S. M. Cahn (Ed.), Affirmative action and the university: A philosophical inquiry (pp. 9-47). Philadelphia: Temple University.

Gaff, J. (1997). The changing roles of faculty and administrators. Liberal Education, 83 (3),

12-17.

Gaff, J. & Lambert, L. (1996). Socializing Future Faculty to the Values of Undergraduate

Education. Change 38-45.

Gaff, J. G. & Pruitt-Logan, A. S. (1998). Preparing college faculty. M. S. Anderson, (ed.).

The experience of being in graduate school. New Directions for Higher Education,

No. 101. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gaff, J. & Simpson, R. (1994). Faculty development in the United States, Innovative Higher

Education, 18, 167-176.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind. New York: Basic Books.

Gilligan, C. In a Different Voice: Psychological theory and women's development.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Gorden, R. L. (1980). Interviewing: Strategy, techniques, and tactics (3rd ed.). Homewood:

Dorsey.

Gould, S., & Hawkins, B. (1978). Organizational career stage as a moderator of the

satisfaction-performance relationship. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 434-

450.

Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). Scholarship assessed. San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park: Sage.

Hartigan, J. A., & Wigdor, A. A. (1989). Fairness in employment testing. Washington:

National Academy.

Harvey, W. B. (1986). Where are the black faculty members? Chronicle of Higher Education. 22, 96.

Heal, L. W., & Rusch, F. R. (1995). Predicting employment for students who leave special education high school programs. Exceptional Children, 61, 472-487.

Helms, J. E., & Piper, R. E. (1994). Implications of racial identity theory for vocational psychology. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44, 124-128.

Hook, S. (1971). Discrimination against the qualified? The New York Times, p.43.

Horowitz, H. L. (1987). Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to present. New York: Knopf.

Hubbard, G. & Atkins, S. (1995). The professor as a person: The role of faculty well-being in faculty development, Innovative Higher Education . 20, 117-128.

Huber, R. (1992). How professors play the cat guarding the cream. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.

Hynes, W. (1984). Strategies for faculty development, in Brown, D. (ed.), Leadership roles of chief academic officers: New Directions for Higher Education, no 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 31-38.

Jacob, E. (1987). Qualitative research traditions: A review. Review of Educational Research, 57, 1-50.

Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. Review of Educational Research, 61, (4), 505-532.

James, D. P. (1989). Increasing retention rates of black students. Mentoring International, 3, 34-39.

Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (1996). Appeals court bars racial preference. The Chronicle of

    Higher Education A26-30.

Kaufman, F. A. (1986). The nature, role and influence of mentors in the lives of gifted adults.

    Journal of Counseling and Development 64, 576-78.

Kennedy, D. (1997). Academic duty. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

King, S. (1989). Sex differences in a causal model of career maturity. Journal of Counseling

    & Development, 68, 208-215.

King, S. (1990). Background and family variables in a causal model of career maturity:

    Comparing hearing and hearing impaired adolescents. The Career Development

    Quarterly, 38, 240-260.

Kolb, D. (1976). Learning styles inventory technical manual. Boston: McBer.

Lawrence, J. H., & Black, R. T. (1986). Issues in sorting out faculty aging effects. Presented

    at the American Educational Research Association Conference.

LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1994). The role and experience of the researcher. In M. D.

    LeCompte & J. Preissle, Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research

    (pp. 86-115). San Diego: Academic Press.

Licata, C. M. (1998). Post-Tenure review. AAHE Bulletin. Washington: American

    Association for Higher Education, 6, 3-6.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985a). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lipset, S. (1996). American exceptionalism. New York: Norton.

Longino, H. (1990). Science as social knowledge: Value and objectivity in scientific inquiry.

    Princeton University.

Luzzo, D. A. (1993). Predicting the career maturity of undergraduates: A comparison of personal, educational, and psychological factors. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 271-275.

Magner, D. (1996). "The New Generation." Chronicle of Higher Education vol. 42, no. 21, A17-A18.

Marincovich, M., Prostko, J., & Stout, F. (1998). The professional development of graduate teaching assistants. Boston: Anker.

Marsh, H. W., & Dunkin, M. J. (1997). Students' evaluations of university teaching: A multidimensional perspective. In R. P. Perry and J. C. Smart, (eds.). Effective teaching in higher education: Research and practice. New York: Agathon.

McCaughey, R. (1974). The transformation of American academic life: Harvard university, 1821-1892. Perspectives in American history, 8, 239-334.

McMillen, L. (1987). Faculty development programs seen often marginal to important campus needs, The Chronicle of Higher Education, 15-16.

Mehrotra, C. M. N. (1984). Teaching and aging. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 19. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mickelson, R. A., & Oliver, M. L. (1991). Making the short list: Black candidates and the faculty recruitment process. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), The racial crisis in American higher education (pp. 149-166). Albany, NY: SUNY.

Millis, B. (1994). Faculty development in the 1990s: What it is and why we can't wait, Journal of Counseling and Development, 72, 454-464.

Mitchell, T. (1998). Mentorship as leadership. Change, 30, 48.

Montross, D. H., & Shinkman, C. J. (1992). Career development: Theory and practice (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL.

Munley, P. H. (1977). Erikson's theory of psychosocial development and career. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 10, 261-269.

Musil, C. M., Garcia, M., Moses, Y. T., & Smith, D. G. (1995). Diversity in higher education: A work in progress. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Naidoo, A. V., Bowman, S. L., & Gerstein, L. H. (1998). Demographics, causality, work salience, and the career maturity of African-American students: A causal model. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 53, 15-27.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2000). Digest of Educational Statistics, 2000. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

O'Brien, E. (1988). Dr. Charles Willis prescribes mentoring methodologies for minorities. Black Issues in Higher Education, 5 (5), 15.

Ohler, D. L., Levinson, E. M., & Hays, G. M. (1996). The relationship between congruence, consistency, differentation, and career maturity among individuals with and without learning disabilities. Journal of Employment Counseling, 33, 50-60.

Olivas, M. A. (1988). Latino faculty at the border: Increasing numbers key to more Hispanic access. Change, May/June 6-9.

Ouellett, M. L., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (1995). Teaching and learning in the diverse classroom: A faculty and TA partnership program. To Improve the Academy, 14, 205-217.

Palmer, P. (1987). "Community, conflict, and ways of knowing." Change. Vol. 19, no. 5, 20-25.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., Whitt, E. J., Nora, A., Edison, M., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T., (1996). "What have we learned from the first year of the national study of student learning?" Journal of College Student Development, 37 (2), 182-192.

Patterson, F. D. (1997) Research institute of the college FUND/UNCF. The African American Education Data Book, Volume 1Higher and Adult Education.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.

Post, R. (1996). Introduction: After bakke. Representations, 55, 1-12.

Phillips, S. D., & Bluestein, D. L. (1994). Readiness for career choices: planning, exploring, and deciding. Career Development Quarterly, 43, 63-73.

Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, T. (1981). Changing correlates of job involvement in three career stages. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18, 138-144.

Ravitch, D. (1983). The Troubled Crusade. New York: Basic Books.

Reed, R. J. (1983). Affirmative action in higher education: Is it necessary? Journal of Negro Education 52, 3, 332-49.

Rice, R. E. (1991). The new American scholar: Scholarship and the purposes of the university. Metropolitan Universities, 7-18.

Rice, R. E. (1996). Making a place for the new American scholar. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Riegle, R. (1987). Conceptions of faculty development, Educational Theory 37, 53-59.

Rosser, S. V. (1990). Female Friendly Science. New York: Pergamon.

Rudolph, F. (1990). The American College and University, a History. Athens, GA: University of Georgia.

Sandler, B. (1975). Affirmative action on campus: Progress, problems, and perplexity. In Affirmative action in employment in higher education: A consultation sponsored by the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, DC, September 9-10, 1975 (pp.118-140). Washington: United States Commissions on Civil Rights.

Schuster, J. (1990). The need for fresh approaches to faculty renewal, in Schuster, J., Wheeler, D. and Associates (eds.), Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 3-19.

Schuster, J., Wheeler, D., & Associates (eds.) (1990). Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scott, W. R. (1966). Professionals in bureaucracies-Areas of conflict. In H. M. Vollmer & D. L. Mills (Eds.), Professionalization (pp. 265-275). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Shandley, T. C. (1989). The use of mentors for leadership development. NASPA Journal, 27, 59-66.

Shulman, L. S., & Hutchings, P. (1998). The carnegie teaching academy: The pew scholars national fellowship program. Stanford: Carnegie Foundation for the Improvement of Teaching.

Simmons, R. (1982). Affirmative action: Conflict and change in higher education after bakke. Cambridge: Schenkman.

Slevin, J. (1992). The next generation: Preparing graduate students for the professional responsibilities of college teachers. Washington: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Sowell, T. (1989). Affirmative action: A worldwide disaster. Commentary, 88 (6), 21-41.

Stumpf, S., & Rabinowitz, S. (1981). Career stage as a moderator of performance relationships with facets of job satisfaction and role perceptions. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18, 202-218.

Sullivan, L. (1983). Faculty development: A movement on the brink, The College Board Review 127, 21 and 29-31.

Super, D. E. (1990). A life span approach to career development. In D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.), Career choice and development: Applying contemporary theories. (2nd ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. 197-261.

Super, D. E., & Hall, D. T. (1978). Career development: Exploration and planning. Annual Review of Psychology, 29, 333-372.

Super, D. E., Thompson, A. S., Lindeman, R. H., Jordaan, J. P., & Myers, R. A. (1988). Manual for the Adult Career Concerns Inventory and the Career Development Inventory. Palo Alto: CA: Consulting Psychologists.

Stake, R. E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. Teachers College Record, 68, 523-540.

Sternberg, R. (1988). The Triarchic Mind. New York: Viking.

Stewart, D. (1994). Graduate education and the preparation of faculty: Path to the future. The CGS Communicator. Washington: Council of Graduate Schools.

Stowe, N. J. (1997). Developing a professoriate track for doctoral programs. Organization of American Historians Newsletter, 25 (4).

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park: Sage.

Stromquist, N. (1993). Sex-equity legislation in education: The state as promoter of women's rights. Review of Educational Research, 63, 379-407.

Sykes, C. (1988). Profscam. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Gateway.

Tice, S. L., Gaff, J., & Pruitt-Logan, A. S. (1998). Preparing future faculty programs: Beyond TA development. The professional development of graduate teaching assistants: The practitioner's handbook. Boston: Anker.

Tillson, L. D. (1998). Developing the professoriate: Today's Tas – tommorrow's tenure track. The Journal of Graduate Assistant Development. 5 (3), 133-138.

Tobias, M. (1982). Old Dartmouth on trial. New York: New York University.

Turner, J. & Boice, R (1987). Starting at the Beginning: The Concerns and Needs of New Faculty. In To Improve the Academy. U.S. Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Urofsky, M. (1991). A conflict of Rights: The supreme court and affirmative action." New York: Scribner.

U. S. Department of Education. (1997). National Center for Educational Statistics, Education and the economy: An indicators report. NCES 97-269. Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Education. (1998). National Center for Educational Statistics, Integrated post-secondary education data systems, NCES 96-133. Washington, DC.

Veysey, L. (1965). The emergence of the American university. Chicago: University of

Chicago.

Washington, V., & Harvey, W. (1989). Affirmative rhetoric, negative action. ASHE-ERIC

Higher Education Report 2. Washington: George Washington University.

Weldman, J. & Strathe, M. (1985). Faculty development in technology: A model for higher

education, Educational Technology, 15-19.

Wilson, L. (1979). American academics: Then and now. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, R. (1995). Affirmative action: Yesterday, today, and beyond. Unpublished

manuscript.

Wilson, R., & Justiz. M. J., (1988). Minorities in higher education: Confronting a time bomb.

Educational Record, 68/69, 8-14.

Wolcott, H. F. (1975). Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research in schools. Human

Organization, 34 (2), 111-127.

Worsfold, V. F. (1997). New priorities for the professoriate: A response to Bruce Busby.

Perspectives: The Journal of the Association for General and Liberal Studies. 27(2).

Wright, B. (1990). Piety, politics, and profit: American Indian, missions in the colonial

colleges. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study techniques: Design and methods (2nd ed.). Newbury park, CA:

Sage.