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The Center for Faculty Development & Research

Program Overview

The Center for Faculty Development & Research (CFDR) at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU) is designed to emphasize ways that allow faculty members to amplify and/or focus their specializations and to acquire new ones. The central purpose of the faculty development program is to improve faculty teaching and student learning at the university. Supported by funding from the Office of Title III programs, all activities presented by the CFDR are designed to directly enhance the professional needs of both new and tenured faculty. To maximize the use of limited resources, improve student success rates, and to promote program efficiency and accountability, the CFDR strives to create a productive relationship between all existing campus initiatives that utilize faculty participation and support the University’s instructional planning efforts.

The long term goal of the CFDR is to establish a sustainable program for supporting faculty as they enter various career stages and seek to widen the range and scope of their work; to encourage faculty to acquire skills and approaches that push the limits of their own disciplines. The CFDR is designed to assist faculty through the development of two professional strands:

1) The development of research communities, which focus on data collection, data analysis, designed to enhance University teaching and learning; and

2) The development of best practices designed to enhance the teaching and learning practices at the University as delivered through campus workshops, seminars, webinars, virtual field trips, and professional conferences/meetings.
These two professional strands will support university faculty with promoting innovation and enhancing professional growth in the various academic areas.

**Dissemination Model**

The CFDR uses a training and share approach, which values the expertise of faculty who have acquired knowledge through research and/or participation in conference activities to present learning gains at university-wide seminars, workshops, or at faculty forums to maximize and/or build the collective intellectual capacity of the University.
Introduction

This Faculty Needs Survey was designed to gather information to help clearly define the professional development needs of faculty at Florida A&M University. Survey participants were not identified by name. And individual survey data is not being reported will not be made available, and the data gathered is being reported as “aggregate data.”

This survey was conducted by Center for Faculty Development & Research and supported by the Office of Title III Programs. Additionally, this survey project is aligned with the Goal 1.3 Academic Enhancement and Improvement outlined in the University’s Strategic Plan. Finally, this project supports the goal of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which, “Faculty development will be an important part of the implementation of the FAMU QEP.”

Survey Method

The Center for Faculty Development & Research (CFDR) began surveying faculty concerning programming needs and interests in the Spring Semester 2009. This faculty survey was developed by CFDR personnel, under the leadership of Dr. Kirk E. Gavin. The Faculty Development Investment Council (FDIC) was very instrumental in assessing and changing the instrument prior to its administration.

The survey instrument was constructed to collect data on (1) faculty perceived needs for professional development to improve university teaching and learning, (2) likelihood of participation in faculty development activities based upon type of delivery, (3) preferences for attending workshops, events,

---

1 Faculty Development Investment Council (FDIC) is comprised of faculty members who serve as program advisors.
professional development opportunities, etc, and (4) to collect professional development program suggestions. A copy of the survey instrument is presented in Appendix A.

The survey was administered both through FAMU Info, Survey Monkey Online Module and as a hard copy paper pencil medium. The survey was live from February 18, 2009 through March 19, 2009. A university-wide email that introduced the survey was sent via FAMU Info to all faculty. A total of 215 faculty responded to this survey.

Sample

The survey sample included full-time and part-time faculty members who may have received a communication either directly through an academic area or through an email communication on FAMU-INFO. As reported by the FAMU Office of Institutional Research, the University currently employs three hundred eight (308) tenured faculty, one hundred sixty (160) not-tenured/tenure earning faculty, and one hundred thirty (130) not-tenured/not tenure earning faculty, for a total of five hundred, ninety-eight instructional faculty by rank (598).²

Data Analysis

A total of 215 respondents or thirty-six percent (36%) of the total number of university faculty completed the survey that was considered valid and included in the data analysis. The mean was used to identify the top five items in each area. Further discussion will focus on these items of perceived relevance.

² Source: FAMU 2008 Facts, BOG Employee File, March 2009. See Appendix B.
Demographics used to focus analysis included academic rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, academic advisor, library faculty, and faculty administrator) and college/department affiliation.

Participant Profile

Participation in the survey varied greatly by school/college with the majority of respondents, thirty-seven percent (37%) coming from the College of Arts & Sciences. Thirteen percent (13%) of the respondents were from the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, eleven point one percent (11.1%) from the School of Architecture, and eleven percent (11%) from the College of Engineering Sciences Technology & Agriculture, respectively. Thirty-nine percent (39%) of the respondents were tenured faculty.

Additionally, the frequency of female faculty participating in the survey was one hundred eighteen (118) at fifty-four point nine percent (54.9%) as compared to ninety-seven (97) male faculty at forty-five point percent (45.1%).

Table 1. Faculty Respondent Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Administrator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools and Colleges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: Perceived Needs of the Faculty

Table 2 presents the top three professional development topics selected by faculty across academic ranks. Survey participants were asked to select from a broad variety of professional development topics based upon their individual interests for professional improvement, which were listed under ten broad categories. Within the ten categories, analysis indicates a high priority of interest across faculty ranks to improve "teaching and learning."

The top 3 reported topics for faculty improvement in each professional development category includes the following: (1) the Classroom Methods category reported the top three faculty responses of effective lecturing at 66%, collaborative learning at 55.3%, and experiential learning at 42.7%; (2) the category of Writing across the Curriculum reported faculty responses for designing effective writing assignments at 71.1%, integrating writing into large classes at 69.3%, and grading writing assignments at 59.5%; (3) the Syllabus and Curriculum Design category reported curriculum development at 64.2%, designing student research projects at 56.3%, with use and evaluation of portfolios at 49.3%; (4) the Assessment category reported developing rubrics for grading assignments at 32.0%, program evaluation at 26.5%, and grading group work at 24.7%; (5) the Instructional Technology category reported using the internet for instruction at
73.0%, facilitating online instruction at 67.9%, and developing a course website at 25.1%; (6) the Diversity and Inclusion category report working with international students at 37.7%, gender issues in the classroom at 34.4%, and incorporating multicultural content at 33.5%; (7) the Students category reported motivating students at 82.8%, teaching first year students at 66.5%, and teaching students how to learn at 64.7%; (8) the Teaching the Competences category reported critical thinking at 89.3%, ethics and academic integrity at 40.5%, and technology literacy at 38.1%; (9) the Classroom Management Techniques category reported encouraging academic integrity at 66.0%, dealing with difficult students at 60.0%, and civility in the classroom and beyond at 47.9%; and, (10) the Professional Issues category reported inter-disciplinary research collaborative at 62.3%, maximizing mentoring relationships with colleagues at 50.7%, and preparing for promotion and tenure at 26.5%.

Table 2. Top 3 Perceived Needs of Faculty, Total across Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories/Topics for Development</th>
<th>Of Total Respondents</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Lecturing</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Across the Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Effective Writing Assignments</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Writing Into Large Classes</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Writing Assignments</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syllabus and Curriculum Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Student Research Projects</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and Evaluation of Portfolios</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Rubrics for Grading Assignments</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Group Work</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Internet for Instruction</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Online Instruction</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Course Website</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity and Inclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with International Students</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Issues in the Classroom</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incorporating Multicultural Content

Students
- Motivating Students 33.5% 72
- Teaching First Year Students 82.8% 178
- Teaching Students How to Learn 66.5% 143

Teaching the Competences
- Critical Thinking 64.7% 139
- Ethics and Academic Integrity 40.5% 87
- Technology Literacy 38.1% 82

Classroom Management Techniques
- Encouraging Academic Integrity 89.3% 192
- Dealing with Difficult Students 66.0% 142
- Civility in the Classroom and Beyond 60.0% 129

Professional Issues
- Inter-disciplinary Research Collaborative 47.9% 103
- Maximizing Mentoring Relationships with Colleagues 50.7% 109
- Preparing for Promotion and Tenure 26.5% 57

Total Respondents = 215
Note: Responses may not equal the total for N; only the top responses are presented.

Chart 1 presents the preferred program start-times for faculty development activities. The results indicate that faculty respondents prefer development activities to begin at 12:00noon, 3:00pm, 11:00am, and 5:00pm as the best suggested start times.

Chart 1.
Chart 2 reveals that faculty respondents overwhelmingly prefer that the program length for development programs utilize a half day format (with a meal). The next recommended program length is three (3) hours, two (2) hours, and ninety (90) minutes, respectfully. The results of this data suggest that more time should be made available for development activities to attract faculty interest.

**Chart 2.**

**Preferred Program Length**

- 90 minutes
- 2 Hours
- 3 Hours
- 1/2 Day with Meal

N= 179

Chart 3 shows responses to the preferred method of contact for future professional development activities. The results reveal that faculty prefer contact via the website. Using a listserv method received the second highest faculty recommendations, third was email, and fourth was a flyer in campus mail. There were no other suggests for contacting faculty.
At the time of data collection, fifty-two (52) out of the two hundred fifteen (215) survey respondents provided qualitative comments. Listed in table 6 are faculty comments for each of the three presented survey questions. Given the many varied comments, a central theme surfaced: *teacher preparation to improve learning* in the undergraduate program.

Faculty responses:

- Questions A responses included comments that directly addressed the professional development needs of faculty; requests for assistance ranged from lesson planning issues to grant writing assistance.
- Question B comments included issues that involved teacher training to meet the needs of under-prepared students and building instructional skills.
• Question C provided the names of several educators with specific credentials that faculty believe may assist them with improving teaching and learning at the university.

There were two interesting comments reported in table 3. First, in question A, faculty and student disposition along with student dress and student behavior in class were recommended as a workshop topic. The presentation of this topic suggests that there may exist within the university’s academic culture, certain behaviors which may negatively affect the teaching and learning. Second, the suggested need of an essay grading workshop to establish norms in the departments may prompt the question, "Is there an established instructional agenda within the academic departments?"

Finally, faculty comments report a need for training in grant writing, the publication process, and to acquire funding for travel. The comments of faculty are consistent with their perceived needs selection of topics for professional development.

Table 3. Selected Faculty Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>B.</th>
<th>C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What other programs and topics would you like to see presented through the FAMU Center for Faculty Development &amp; Research?</td>
<td>Are there any discipline specific topics you would like to present in collaboration with other college or department?</td>
<td>Can you suggest a guest speaker or workshop leader on “teaching and learning” that we should consider bringing to campus?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media to enhance classroom teaching</td>
<td>Improving student performance and graduation rates in the STEM areas</td>
<td>Dr. Laurie Richardson, Claremont Graduate University, CA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing</td>
<td>Integrating Technology in the classroom</td>
<td>Jack Gant – New problem solving approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
<td>Critical thinking in general studies. Comprehensive writing text.</td>
<td>Teachers that have practiced experience in their respective areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty disposition, student disposition, student dress, and student behavior in class.</td>
<td>Meeting basic skill needs of under-prepared undergraduate and graduate students</td>
<td>Dr. Kawanza Kunjufu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help all teachers have a better syllabus</td>
<td>How to convince students to read and to attend class more often?</td>
<td>Dr. Freddie Thomas, Virginia State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Academic Conference</td>
<td>How to secure funding from outside sources, particularly, the social sciences?</td>
<td>Dr. Kathleen Yancy, FSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary and Implications

The findings from the Faculty Needs Survey indicate within the university faculty there is an alignment of priorities. Across the spectrum, the faculty selection of topics and comments indicate a requested need for professional programming dealing with the improvement of instructional competences, student behavior, instructional technology, and curriculum development. Effective teaching and conducting research are important priorities for a large cohort of faculty.

A result from this survey also builds support for the upcoming developmental activities preceding the implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which the university will engage during the fall semester 2009. The topic of the QEP is, "Enhancing Performance in Critical Thinking." As noted earlier, 89.3% of faculty respondents selected critical thinking as a topic for professional development.

The results of this Faculty Needs Survey present three realities which must be understood: (1) Faculty have a desire to improve instruction and student learning; (2) Faculty are concerned with their professional development needs; and, (3) Faculty have unmet financial needs to satisfy their professional goals.
Recommendations

Given the results from the 2009 Faculty Perceived Needs Survey, it is clear that the Center for Faculty Development & Research (CFDR) must be responsive to a faculty striving to meet the goals established by the University Strategic Plan, Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and the professional requirements to achieve tenure status outlined within each academic area. Faculty development programming initiatives in 2009-2010 must evolve to align with the unique realities at the university.

The challenge facing the Center for Faculty Development & Research (CFDR) will be to tailor a professional program to address the needs of faculty and keep within the budget provided by the Office of Title III Programs and the Division of Academic Affairs. The results of this faculty survey will serve as evidence of need to request additional funding from both entities.

Finally, as a result of the 2009 Faculty Perceived Needs Survey, a list of recommendations was developed. These recommendations will be reviewed in consultation with the Faculty Development Investment Council (FDIC) to be considered for addition to current programming activities:

- the development of a CFDR website is of the highest priority;
- a calendar of professional development workshops should be developed to include recommendations from the faculty;
- a faculty lecture series should be established to include experts to address instructional issues;
- an alignment of faculty development activities should be performed to support and build upon existing departmental programs designed to improve teaching and learning;
- the development of a faculty-to-faculty mentoring program should be explored to assist faculty with enhancing instructional capacity;
• an expansion of the 1st annual university research summit should be considered to include faculty/student undergraduate research collaborations;
• an exploration of vehicles for soliciting and attracting faculty development funding outside of current university revenue sources should be conducted; and
• additional research should be conducted to find solutions for teaching and learning issues; and
• the communication of areas of faculty expertise would encourage faculty collaboration and collegial support.

Conclusion

A review of the literature on faculty development consistently supports the conclusion that no university is greater than its faculty. The utilization of these results from the 2009 Faculty Needs Survey will serve as evidence to build a program that allows faculty to improve instructional materials, keep abreast of new technology and methods that can be used in the delivery of instruction, and network with professional colleagues. Further, the University must incorporate faculty development as part of its administrative structure (FAMU Strategic Plan Strategy 3.4.2). Faculty development should be a required component within the assessment plans of each school and college.

The work that faculty members do determines the strength or the weakness of a university in terms of its reputation for research and in teaching.
In an ideal university, faculty are (1) accomplished and dedicated teachers, (2) researchers who lead their fields and who convey the excitement and importance of research to undergraduate and graduate students, (3) professionals who value the conversation of their colleagues, and, (4) employees that feel recognized and rewarded by their university and are deeply loyal to it (Kang and Miller, 2000).

An objective reviewer might categorize Florida A&M University as having "islands of innovation" in both instructional technology and in research, where great things are happening, but in isolation. A goal of the Center for Faculty Development & Research (CFDR) will be to provide training and collaborative opportunities for faculty that support growth in a collegial atmosphere. By utilizing a train and share approach, CFDR will invest in the expertise of faculty toward building the summative capacity of the University. This train and share approach is intended to pay intellectual dividends for many years to come.

Finally, the results of the 2009 Faculty Needs Survey support the goals and objectives outlined by Center for Faculty Development & Research (CFDR), which is currently funded under the Office of Title III Programs. Faculty development is a pressing need for the University. Together with the administration and faculty, it is the opinion of this writer, that the CFDR is strategically positioned to provide effective professional services and to conduct research that yields data to enhance the University’s instructional design and planning efforts.
**References**


Appendix A
(Actual Survey Instrument)

Faculty Development Needs Survey

This survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please complete and return this survey to the Center for Faculty Development and Research, located in building #636, Gamble Street.

PART I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
College/School________________________________________
Department ________________________________
Gender: _____female _____male
Position:
_____Tenured faculty:
_____Assistant Professor _____Associate Professor _____Professor
_____Academic administrator
_____Library Faculty
_____Academic Advisor
_____Adjunct faculty
_____Other______________________________________________

PART II: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TOPICS
Please check program topics you would likely attend.
Classroom Methods
  o 1.1 Collaborative learning
  o 1.2 Working in groups/teamwork
  o 1.3 Active learning in large and small classes
  o 1.4 Problem-based learning (PBL)
  o 1.5 Using Test-Data to plan instruction
  o 1.6 Experiential learning
  o 1.7 Discovery-based learning
  o 1.8 Object/artifact-based teaching
  o 1.9 Using games and simulations
  o 1.10 Controversial issues in the classroom
  o 1.11 Challenging students' misconceptions
  o 1.12 Constructivist approaches to teaching
  o 1.13 Use of humor in the classroom
  o 1.14 Effective explanations
  o 1.15 Clarifying expectations
  o 1.16 Effective lecturing
  o 1.17 Facilitating discussions
1.18 Teaching in laboratory settings
1.19 Teaching in studio settings
1.20 Teaching in clinical settings
1.21 Teaching the seminar
1.22 Teaching large lecture classes
1.23 Enhancing academic rigor
1.24 Academic freedom and its implications for teaching
1.25 Promoting/supporting integrative learning
1.26 Promoting/supporting interdisciplinary teaching and learning
1.27 Team teaching
1.28 Integrating community service learning into your teaching
1.29 Designing and teaching the study abroad course
1.30 Supervising undergraduate research
1.31 Other____________________________

Writing across the Curriculum

2.1 Informal writing-to-learn activities for the classroom
2.2 Integrating the writing process into your teaching
2.3 Integrating writing into large classes
2.4 Designing effective writing assignments
2.5 Instructing students about plagiarism
2.6 Using peer feedback with students' drafts
2.7 Grading writing assignments
2.8 Other______________________________

Syllabus and Curriculum Design

3.1 Curriculum development process
3.2 Designing a course: aligning goals, methods, and assessments
3.3 Designing activities, assignments, and projects
3.4 Designing student research projects
3.5 New approaches to syllabus design
3.6 Other______________________________

Assessment

4.1 Effective grading
4.2 Developing rubrics for grading assignments and projects
4.3 Writing effective essay exams
4.4 Writing effective objective tests
4.5 Designing and implementing poster sessions
4.6 Program evaluation
4.7 Classroom assessment techniques (CATs)/formative assessments
4.8 Performance assessment (service learning, projects, presentations)
4.9 Use and evaluation of portfolios
- 4.10 Use and evaluation of e-portfolios
- 4.11 Grading group work
- 4.12 Other____________________________

**Instructional Technology**
- 5.1 Developing and teaching a hybrid course
- 5.2 Integrating instructional technology into your courses
- 5.3 Using the Internet for instructional purposes
- 5.4 Developing the course website
- 5.5 Online assessment
- 5.6 Facilitating online instruction (asynchronous or synchronous)
- 5.7 Other____________________________

**Diversity and Inclusion**
- 6.1 Incorporating multicultural content into your curriculum
- 6.2 Inclusive teaching practices
- 6.3 Use of inter-group dialogue
- 6.4 Teaching for social justice
- 6.5 Gender issues in the classroom
- 6.6 Integrating feminist perspectives in the classroom
- 6.7 Working with students with disabilities
- 6.8 Working with international students
- 6.9 Sexual orientation issues in the classroom
- 6.10 Other____________________________

**Students**
- 7.1 Teaching first year students
- 7.2 Teaching adult learners
- 7.3 Cognitive development
- 7.4 Emotional intelligence
- 7.5 Student learning styles and their implications for the classroom
- 7.6 How people learn: implications of brain research for teaching
- 7.7 Building productive relationships with your students
- 7.8 Motivating students
- 7.9 Teaching students how to learn
- 7.10 Teaching underprepared students
- 7.11 FAMU students, their needs, and implications for teaching
- 7.12 Students in crisis
- 7.13 Effective faculty advising
- 7.14 Other____________________________

**Teaching the Competencies**
- 8.1 Written literacy
8.2 Information literacy  
8.3 Improving analytical reading comprehension  
8.4 Oral literacy/communication skills  
8.5 Quantitative literacy  
8.6 Visual literacy  
8.7 Critical thinking  
8.8 Global competency  
8.9 Technological literacy  
8.10 Multicultural competency  
8.11 Engaged citizenship  
8.12 Ethics and academic integrity  
8.13 Ethical implications of advances in science and technology  
8.14 Other______________________________

Classroom Management Techniques  
9.1 Civility in the classroom and beyond  
9.2 Managing difficult discussions  
9.3 Dealing with difficult students  
9.4 Encouraging academic integrity  
9.5 Other______________________________

Professional Issues  
11.1 Evaluating Teaching  
11.2 Conducting peer evaluations of teaching  
11.3 Developing a teaching portfolio  
11.4 Writing reflective statements about your teaching  
11.5 Faculty guiding undergraduate student in research  
11.6 Advanced practices in the scholarship of teaching and learning  
11.7 Conducting effective faculty and committee meetings  
11.8 Identifying and maximizing your teaching style  
11.9 Maximizing mentoring relationships with colleagues  
11.10 Intellectual property (copyright, fair use, avoiding plagiarism, Internet use)  
11.11 Writing textbooks  
11.12 Preparing for promotion and tenure review  
11.13 Introduction to college teaching for new college teachers  
11.14 What research tells us about faculty career stages  
11.15 Inter-disciplinary research collaborative  
11.16 Other______________________________

What one topic would prompt you to attend a workshop/program if it were held tomorrow?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
PART III: PREFERENCES
1. Preferred formats (Preferences often depend on the topic, but indicate in general which formats you prefer):
   - Formal presentation(s) followed by discussion
   - Combination of presentation, group/interactive work, and discussion
   - Problem-based session–work session based on problems or case studies defined by participants or session leaders
   - Book discussions
   - Informal discussions on designated topics
   - Small group discussion on teaching with open topics
   - Spring/summer multi-day institutes
   - Three session seminar over a period of weeks
   - Comments:

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

2. Preferred starting time: Check three preferred starting times.
   - 8am
   - 9am
   - 10am
   - 11am
   - 12pm
   - 1pm
   - 2pm
   - 3pm
   - 4pm
   - 5pm
   - 6pm
   - 7pm

3. Preferred program length: Check all those you would likely attend.
   - 90 minutes
   - 2 hours
   - 3 hours
   - 1/2 day with meal

4. What is the best way for us to contact you about upcoming events? Check all that apply.
   - Office of Faculty and Organizational Development Website
   - Email
   - Flyer in campus mail
   - Listserv for specific interest groups
   - Other

PART IV: SUGGESTIONS
1. What other programs and topics would you like to see presented through the FAMU Center for Faculty Development & Research?
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
2. Are there any discipline-specific topics you would like us to present (in collaboration with colleges or departments)?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

3. Can you suggest guest speakers or workshop leaders on teaching and learning that we should consider bringing to campus?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

Note: If you are willing to share your expertise and/or experience with colleagues on specific topics on teaching and learning, please send us an email <kirk.gavin@famu.edu>.

Comments:
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

Thank you for participating in this survey! Please return this survey to:
Dr. Kirk E. Gavin, Director
Center for Faculty Development & Research
Building #636, Gamble Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32307
(850) 561-2312
Appendix B

Florida A&M University
Faculty and Staff Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Category</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec/Admin/Managerial</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Non-Faculty</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial/Clerical</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Professional</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Crafts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Maintenance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1,923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional Faculty by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eminent Scholar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional Faculty by Tenure Status

- **Tenured** = 308 (51.51%)
- **Non-Tenured, Tenure Earning** = 160 (26.76%)
- **Not-Tenured, Not Tenure Earning** = 130 (21.74%)
