THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

FACULTY THROUGH MENTORING

———————————

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

———————————

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

———————————

by

Steven Matthew Thomas

December 2016

APPROVAL SHEET

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

FACULTY THROUGH MENTORING

Steven Matthew Thomas

Read and Approved by:

_____

Anthony W. Foster (Chair)

_____

John David Trentham

Date _____

This thesis is dedicated to my wife and our three daughters.

God's grace is made evident to me in the gift that each of you are.

Beth, the example of Christ that you have been will always be a sweet reminder

of my coming to Christ. I love you for loving Jesus.

Emma, Elli, and Abby, I love you and am thankful for the daily reminder

you are to me of God's faithfulness and love.

Thank you family for praying me through this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APIP   Alternative Perry Interview Protocol

CSID   Center for the Study of Intellectual Development

MER   Measure of Epistemological Reflectivity

MID   Measure of Intellectual Development

SPIP   Standard Perry Interview Protocol

LIST OF TABLES

PREFACE

Acknowledging those that have assisted me in accomplishing this endeavor would require far more space than is provided in this document. However, I must mention certain individuals who have joined me on this journey. First, the knowledge of higher education and encouraging spirit of Dr. Anthony Foster served as a needed resource in times of frustration.

I would also like to thank my research pod, Jeff Horner and Kristen Ferguson. The friendship and support that they collectively provided has been a blessing that I did not deserve. I have been sharpened, challenged, and mentored by their input and influence in my life.

This study would not have been possible if it were not for some helpful colleagues within higher education. The willing help that Dr. Roberta Sands and Dr. Shelley Cunningham offered when this study originated encouraged me greatly and enabled me to find a clearer path for my research. Also, I thank my friend, Dr. Dennis Eastman, for taking the many hours to encourage, mentor, and probe my research ensuring that it would serve a greater purpose than this study alone.

I am thankful to Philip De Courcy and the Kindred Community Church. This godly elder board and congregation and faithful leadership team supported me in ways that modeled Christ's love and kindness. Doug and Carol McAllister, Don and Grace Modglin, and Stan and Mary Longenecker are among those whom I could never repay for their investment in my life and ministry.

Finally, I would like to thank some of the most important people in my life. First, my wife deserves an honorary doctorate for enduring this process and the multiple conversations where she had no interest but engaged me nonetheless. She often assumed

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statistics indicate that private colleges make up roughly 4 percent of the
student population in the United States.[1] This number represents an increase in
attendance by 16 percent since 2000.[2] The demographic represented in this increased
attendance includes, but is not limited to, private Christian postsecondary colleges and
universities. More than 4,700 degree-granting institutions of higher education exist in the
United States, nearly 3,100 represent private institutions, and just over 1,000 classify
themselves as religiously affiliated.[3] Of those, 145 have found common support in the
mission of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. In light of this increase in
student population, Christian higher educational institutions must strive to be sustainable
by increasing demand for serious improvement and innovations in the area of best
practices. What are the best practices for improvement and innovation to occur?

Research states that faculty and leadership development is the key to these
improvements and innovations.[4] McKee and Tew note, "This critical part of an
institution's makeup is important because faculty must be prepared to engage current and

---

[1]Number of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions annually (private not-for-profit,
four-year or above; private for-profit, four-year or above). National Center for Education Statistics,
"Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems," accessed January 15, 2015, https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/
trendgenerator/tganswer.aspx?sid=2&qid=2.

[2]Ibid.

[3]National Center for Education Statistics, "Higher Education General Information Survey
(HEGIS) Survey: Fall Enrollment," accessed September 6, 2015, http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/
ICPSR/series/30.

[4]Anne E. Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past,
Understanding the Present* (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2006).

future realities that manifest itself through veritable seismic shifts of the very ground on which institutions are built."[5] Additionally, Guskey argues that professional development is a recognized part of enhancing the practices of classroom teachers: "High-quality professional development is at the center of every modern proposal to enhance education."[6] A consensus as to how faculty and leadership development should be practiced has not been reached. Furthermore, consensus on what means would best foster faculty and leadership development for the Christian faculty has also not been reached.

<div align="center">

Presentation of Research Problem

</div>

When analyzing faculty and leadership development programs, a significant component is missing that relates specifically to the professional and spiritual development of faculty members within Christian higher education. This overlooked component is described twofold in the Scriptures as a bond in Christ each Christian faculty member enjoys with one another and the unique responsibility Christians have to each other.[7] Because it is assumed that Christian higher education faculty members are members of an institution whose membership is based on spiritual qualifications, this component may be the distinguishing factor that sets Christian faculty apart from secular faculty. Additionally, because of the unique relationship and responsibility Christian faculty share, the importance of spiritual development and personal discipleship speaks to the need for ongoing biblical relationships to be practiced—a concept that is closely related to mentoring.

---

[5]William C. McKee and Mark W. Tew, "Setting the Stage Teaching and Learning in American Higher Education: Making the Case for Faculty Development," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 13.

[6]Thomas R. Guskey, *Evaluating Professional Development* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 1999), 16.

[7]"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:8).

Research also explored mentoring as a means by which Christian higher education administrators elected to establish a plan to fulfill the school's mission of training among the faculty. For example, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) states,

> Professional development for faculty and staff on CCCU campuses is critical to the Council's mission of helping our institutions transform lives. In order to equip campus leaders to better reflect the integration of faith and learning, the Council offers high-quality programs to challenge, inform, encourage, and inspire in a variety of areas across disciplines and peer groups. Special leadership development programs and faculty opportunities are provided as catalysts for effective professional development in senior positions. CCCU's professional development opportunities include conferences and workshops, networking grants, assessment, research, institutional surveys, and helpful resources.[8]

The CCCU also explicitly states that, as an organization, they are committed to "advancing the cause of Christ-centered higher education and helping member institutions transform lives by faithfully relating scholarship and service to biblical truth."[9] In light of this, have Christian higher education institutions given appropriate consideration to the unique responsibilities of Christian faculty and the biblical emphasis for ongoing spiritual development?

Finally, research acknowledges not only success through mentoring but also highlights the fact that both parties benefit from the relationship.[10] Obviously, potential pitfalls exist and generally appear when the mentor, protégé, or both do not contribute to the process, or when the benefits of time, incentive, and reward are not connected to mentoring.[11] Even Boice, who is critical of mentoring programs, readily acknowledges

---

[8]Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, "Professional Development and Research," accessed September 6, 2015, http://www.cccu.org/professional_development.

[9]Council for Christin Colleges and Universities, "CCCU Mission," accessed September 6, 2015, http://www.cccu.org/about.

[10]W. Brad Johnson, *On Being A Mentor: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2007), 11.

[11]Shelly Cunningham, "Who's Mentoring the Mentors? The Discipling Dimension of Faculty Development in Christian Higher Education," *Theological Education* 34, no. 2 (Spring 1998): 33.

the benefits for new faculty who are acquainted with an active mentor. His research specifically noted that good mentoring served as a powerful predictor of "good starts" for new faculty.[12] Likewise, McCabe and McCabe contend that having a good mentor may be the most important element in one's career.[13] Wilson and Johnson's research counters Boice's criticism by showing that those who are mentored often report more rapid promotion, higher salaries, and a greater awareness of their institutional structure, but that maximal benefits come from the care and concern received by mentors who practice virtue and moral integrity. [14] Additional research indicates that mentoring practices are important factors for benefitting women and minority groups within the faculty.[15]

Academic deans, faculty, faculty developers, and administrators that desire to enhance faculty development in Christian higher education institutions may find this research helpful in achieving CCCU stated goals.

Current Status of Research Problem

A call for restructuring and reforming has been given to modern educators by researchers like Pellicer and Anderson. They note that the American education system is

---

[12]Robert Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000), 235.

[13]Linda L. McCabe and Edward R. B. McCabe, *How to Succeed in Academics* (San Diego: Academic, 1999); Christopher J. Lucas and John W. Murry, *New Faculty: A Practical Guide for Academic Beginners* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007); Carol A. Mullen, *From Student to Professor: Translating a Graduate Degree into a Career in Academia* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2012); Richard Valantasis, "Mentoring Younger Faculty," *Teaching Theology and Religion* 8, no. 1 (2005): 20. McCabe and McCabe elsewhere note that the mentor is critical because he or she can assist the mentee in understanding areas that need to be improved by sensitive evaluation and by providing insight into how those strengths can be developed. Ibid., 2.This argument directly addresses Boice's criticism that faculty mentoring lacks compassion and socialization.

[14]Peter F. Wilson and W. Brad Johnson, "Core Virtues for the Practice of Mentoring," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 29, no. 2 (2001): 122, 127.

[15]Jayne Edman, "Best Practices: Mentoring New Full-Time Faculty: Reenergizing and Improving an Existing Formal Mentoring Program" (Ed.D. diss., Rowan University, 2011), 17; Wilson and Johnson, "Core Virtues," 122.

in fact broken.[16] Where and how does this reformation begin? The Carnegie Foundation

for the Advancement of Teaching states, "The key to successful reform lies in creating a

new profession of well-educated teachers prepared to assume new powers and

responsibilities to redesign schools for the future."[17] Broader faculty development

research indicates that the quality and effectiveness of an institution is most closely

related to the work of the faculty.[18] The common theme in the literature is that the best

schools have the best-equipped teachers.[19] Does this phenomena exist in Christian higher

education institutions, and should the same criteria be used to quantify "best-equipped"?

In particular, what does best-equipped mean for the Christian faculty member? I assume

that the best-equipped Christian faculty members are those that are cared for socially,

academically, and spiritually through mentoring relationships.

      Within the field, debate exists on many levels: Is faculty development

necessary? Should faculty development be systematized within higher education? And

even what definitions describing faculty development should be used? For example,

Stabile and Ritchie state, "When faculty experience an enhancement program, rather than

training and development programs, they are more likely to develop as a faculty

---

[16]Leonard O. Pellicer and Lorin W. Anderson, *A Handbook for Teacher Leaders* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 1995), 7.

[17]The Carnegie Foundation of New York, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (New York: Carnegie Forum on Education, 1986), 2.

[18]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*, xiii.

[19]Susan Athey and Douglass K. Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative: A Framework for Faculty Development," *Marketing Education Review* 17 (Fall 2017) 1-9; Ann E. Austin and Mary Deane Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development: Where Are We Going?" *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 85-96; Pamela Harvey and Martin Dowson, "Transitional Experiences of New Teachers in Christian Schools," *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 2 (Fall 2003): 217-43; Amy M. Knight, Joseph A. Carrese, and Scott M. Wright, "Qualitative Assessment of the Long-Term Impact of a Faculty Development Program in Teaching Skills," *Journal of Medical Education* 41 (2007): 592-600; Lucas and Murry, *New Faculty*; Daisy Nwokorie-Anajemba, "Current Practices for Teacher Leadership Development within Christian Schools" (Ed.D. diss., Pepperdine University, 2010); Maryellen Weimer, *Learner Centered Teaching: Five Keys to Practice* (San Francisco: Jossey- Bass, 2013).

member;"[20] and yet still, debate surrounds specific methods of development that should be employed. Consequently, the abundance of perspectives have resulted in a polarized debate in one particular area; there are those that argue that mentoring programs are a best practice within faculty development, and others who argue that negative and damaging messages are communicated when utilizing mentoring programs.[21]

Although research and resources are available to faculty, faculty development directors, and administrators of Christian higher education institutions, a void of research exists identifying the benefits of mentoring in a Christian higher education context.

A survey of the literature reveals a gap that warrants research in this area. When scanning the literature regarding faculty development, it is easy to see the wealth of information that currently exists. In fact, there is much research in the field of faculty development and best training practices; however, this literature does not adequately address mentoring and spiritual formation among faculty in Christian higher education institutions.[22]

[20]Christopher Stabile and William F. Ritchie. "Clarifying the Differences between Training, Development, and Enrichment: The Role of Institutional Belief Constructs in Creating the Purpose of Faculty Learning Initiatives," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspective* 133 (Spring 2013): 71.

[21]Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members*; James W. Selby and Lawrence G. Calhoun, "Faculty Mentoring: Unintended Consequences?" *Teaching of Psychology* 25, no. 3 (1998): 210.

[22]Athey and Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative"; Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development"; Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*; Alan J. Child, "Talking It Through: A Way to Raise Teacher Performance," *Management in Education* 16 (2002): 11-13; Cathleen S. Colon-Emeric, Lynn Bowlby, and Laura Svetkey, "Establishing Faculty Needs and Priorities for Peer-Mentoring Groups Using a Nominal Group Technique," *Journal of Medical Teacher* 35 (2012): 631-34; Dee L. Fink, "Innovative Ways of Assessing Faculty Development," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 47-59; Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, *A Guide to Faculty Development* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010); Don Haviland, Shin Seon-Hi, and Steve Turley, "Now I'm Ready: The Impact of a Professional Development Initiative on Faculty Concerns with Program Assessment," *Innovation of Higher Education* 35 (2010): 261-75; James Honan, Andrew Westmoreland, and Mark W. Tew, "Creating a Culture of Appreciation for Faculty Development," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 33-44; McKee and Tew, "Setting the Stage"; William C. McKee, Mitzy Johnson, and Mark W. Tew, "Professional Development of the Faculty: Past and Present," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013):15-20; Adrian Opre, Monica Zaharie, and Dana Opre, "Faculty Development: Teaching Staff Needs, Knowledge, and Priorities," *Cognition, Brain,*

Three questions emerged from the literature:

1. If mentoring exists, what is the nature of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education?

2. Is faculty mentoring in a secular context able to be generalized to Christian faculty?

3. Does institutional mission impact the role of a mentoring program?[23]

When examining the literature, it is obvious that Christian higher education faculty members are unique from secular undergraduate and postgraduate faculty, and therefore, should be given specific attention when research is being conducted.[24] The literature identified three characteristics that differentiate Christian higher education faculty from secular undergraduate and postgraduate faculty. The first is the unique mission of the institution where full-time Christian faculty members instruct. A casual search of mission statements within Christian higher education institutions reflects an emphasis on personal transformation and Christ-centered growth. For Christian higher

Behavior 12 (2008): 29-43; David W. Schuman, John Peters, and Taimi Olsen, "Cocreating Value in Teaching and Learning Centers," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 21-32; Weimer, *Learner Centered Teaching*; Barbara E. Wolvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010).

[23]Athey and Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative"; Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development?"; Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*; Child, "Talking it Through"; Colon-Emeric, Bowlby, and Svetkey, "Establishing Faculty Needs and Priorities"; Fink, "Innovative Ways"; Gillespie and Robertson, *A Guide to Faculty Development*; Haviland, Seon-Hi, and Turley, "Now I'm Ready"; Honan, Westmoreland, and Tew "Creating a Culture of Appreciation"; McKee and Tew, "Setting the Stage"; McKee, Johnson, and Tew, "Professional Development"; Opre, Zaharie, and Opre, "Faculty Development"; Schuman, Peters, and Olsen, "Cocreating Value"; Weimer, *Learner Centered Teaching*; Barbara E. Wolvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education.* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010).

24Matthew P. Phelps and Scott Waalkes, "Christian Friendship as Faculty Development: A Narrative Account," *Journal of Education and Christian Belief* 13, no. 2 (2009): 125-39; Ron Penner, "Mentoring in Higher Education," Directions 30, no. 1 (Spring 2001):45-52; Samuel T. Logan, Jr., "Faculty Development: An Organic Perspective," *Theological Education* 31, no. 2 (1995): 27-36; Ralph Schroder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment for Faculty and Administrators of a Private Christian University," *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 17 (2008): 81-97; Cunningham, "Who's Mentoring the Mentors?," 31-49; James A. Swezey, "Faculty Sense of Religious Calling at a Christian University," *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 18 (2009): 316-32; Hokyung Paul Kang, "Perceptions and Experience of Transformative Learning and Faculty Authenticity among North American Professors of Christian Education (NAPCE)," *Christian Education Journal* 10 (2013): 339-59.

education institutions, transformation and Christian formation serve as a dominant theme[25] and therefore create unique responsibilities for faculty to support and advance the institution's mission. Although secular higher education institutions have mission statements, they do not include an emphasis on Christ-centered growth that is central to developing as a Christian. Mentoring as a faculty development practice may assist individual faculty members in becoming adept in this area.

A second characteristic that differentiates Christian higher education faculty from secular undergraduate and postgraduate faculty is the unique sense of calling that a Christian faculty member generally possesses. This sense of calling relates to the unique emphasis placed on faculty being Christian. Michalec writes, "I believe that teaching is inherently a spiritual endeavor characterized by the search for meaning" and further describes teaching as "the spiritual process of uncovering truth."[26] Often accompanying the religious convictions of a Christian faculty member is the belief that God has ordained a particular person for a particular responsibility.[27] Additionally, this sense of calling broadens the unique role of the faculty member to more than just scholar and teacher, but also includes good citizen, and mentor.[28] Kang similarly argues for uniqueness among Christian faculty through his extension of educational theorists' view of faculty authenticity.[29] Kang's synthesis of the components of authentic teachers apply to all faculty;[30] but have a greater application to Christian faculty because the needed

---

[25]Kang, "Perceptions and Experience," 339.

[26]P. Michalec, "A Calling to Teach: Faith and the Spiritual Dimensions of Teaching," *Encounter: Education for Meaning and Social Justice* 15, no. 4 (2002): 5.

[27]J. C. Dalton, "Career and Calling: Finding a Place for the Spirit in Work and Community," *New Directions for Student Services* 95 (2001): 20.

[28]Jane D. Douglass, "Faculty Development: A Shared Responsibility," *Theological Education* 28, no. 1 (Autumn 1991): 39.

[29]Kang, "Perceptions and Experience," 342.

[30]Ibid., 342-44. Kang synthesizes educational theorists literature and derives three components

components also mirror Scripture's instructions to those who would become teachers. Mentoring as faculty development may best support this life calling and the broader expectations on Christian faculty.

A final characteristic that differentiates Christian higher education faculty from secular undergraduate and postgraduate faculty is the unique responsibility of nurturing and discipling that Christian teachers assume. Christian faculty are biblically entrusted with a responsibility of helping to produce a Christ-likeness not only in other faculty members but also in their students. Phelps and Waalkes emphasize that a personal friendship with Jesus highlights the role in strengthening and deepening the student population's faith.[31] Penner notes that a rising trend in the mission of Christian higher education is typically understood in terms of student mentoring of various kinds; consequently, the emphasis on a student's spiritual formation is paramount, even over academics.[32] This objective cannot adequately be accomplished without appropriate and unique training and development for all Christian higher education faculty. Mentoring as faculty development may best support this unique responsibility the Christian faculty member assumes.

In summary, at least three characteristics call for additional research in the field of mentoring as faculty development in Christian higher education: the unique mission of Christian higher education institutions, the unique sense of calling that a Christian faculty member has, and the unique responsibility of a Christian faculty member to nurture and disciple.

---

of faculty authenticity: (1) bringing the whole self; (2) relationship; (3) integrity and morality.

[31]Phelps and Waalkes, "Christian Friendship," 127.

[32]Penner, "Mentoring in Higher Education," 45.

Research Questions

In light of the available literature, important questions must be addressed:

1. What is the nature of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education institutions?

2. Do Christian higher education institutions prioritize mentoring as a faculty development practice based on current understanding of the research?

3. What activities are practiced in faculty mentoring relationships?

4. What differences exist between the rank of the mentor and the rank of the protégé?

5. What conditions might impact the development of mentoring relationships among faculty?

Terminology

The following section identifies terms that are important to understanding the context and research of mentoring as faculty development.

Assessment. Assessment consists of a series of decisions that the person(s) doing the assessment must make.[33]

Best mentoring practices. Those practices that increase the overall effectiveness of the institution while nurturing the faculty members participating in the mentoring process.[34]

Christian higher education. Cunningham describes this term:

Degree granting institutions which provide formal schooling following graduation from high school. Christian higher education schools provide education from a worldview that is based on the values and teachings of orthodox Judeo-Christianity as recorded in the Protestant Bible. Christian faculty believe that Jesus is God; that He was born into a human family and took on human form without losing His

---

[33]Fink, "Innovative Ways," 48.

[34]Guskey, *Evaluating Professional Development*, 16, writes, "Those processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students. In some cases, it also involves learning how to redesign educational structures and cultures." However, for a private Christian postsecondary institution this definition must include a spiritual dynamic. Therefore, a hybrid definition using Guskey and Cunningham is used for this thesis. Cunningham identifies successful mentoring when a mentor is seen as someone who guides, teaches, and influences another within the same profession.

divinity, His God-nature; lived a sinless life on earth; died on a cross; came to life again and returned to heaven.[35]

Enhancement. Faculty development activities that engage faculty in personal reflection and improvement.

Enrichment. Faculty development practices that intend to bring about individual change from within the person.[36] Enrichment practices are described as those practices that promote self-reflection, leading the faculty member to focus on their own learning processes.[37]

Faculty development. This term describes the multiple tasks and areas of expertise of the faculty developer seeking to develop the teaching and learning skills of the teacher.

Faculty Learning Communities (FLC). FLCs exist to develop and foster growth, particularly with regard to teaching.[38] Generally, there are two types of FLCs: cohort and topic based.[39]

Faculty member. A person hired to teach in a full-time capacity at the university level.

Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (IRMS). Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale is described as one of the most psychometrically sound measure of intrinsic/extrinsic religious commitment.[40]

---

[35]Michelle M. Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships among Faculty Members in Christian Higher Education" (Ed.D. diss., Talbot School of Theology, 1996), 8

[36]Fred A. J. Korthagen, "Professional Learning from within," *Studying Teacher Education* 5, no 2. (2009): 195-99; Stabile and Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences," 79.

[37]Jennifer York-Barr et al., *Reflective Practice to Improve Schools: An Action Guide for Educators* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2005), 67-68.

[38]Courtney M. Holmes and Kelly A. Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience in a Research Learning Community," *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (May 2014): 35.

[39]Virgina Lee, "Program and Protoyped," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, ed. Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010), 28.

[40]Schroder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment," 87.

Mentoring. Cunningham describes this term:

Relational interaction between two people which one knows something, the mentor, transfers that something (advice, wisdom, information, emotional support, protection, link to resources, career guidance, status) to someone else, the mentoree, at a sensitive time so that it impacts development.[41]

The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD Network). The POD Network was formed in 1974 to support faculty development and organizational improvements initiatives.[42]

Teaching circles. Teaching circles are comprised of six to eight faculty members who gather around a topic of interest for a predetermined amount of time to engage in faculty development practices.[43]

Transformative assessment. This assessment becomes a part of the faculty member's already existing practices.[44] Transformative assessment respects the context and goals of individual programs, builds on existing work, captures data that are meaningful to the program faculty, and is sustainable.

Conclusion

This study provides a clear picture of mentoring practices and how they might be generalized to best fit all Christian higher education institutions. Because Christian higher education institutions are uniquely positioned within society to have significant impact on current and future generations, and because the literature base is lacking in the area of Christian higher education faculty development and mentoring practices, this thesis sought to discover current practices of mentoring within Christian higher education, the issues undergirding these practices, and the benefit from implementing

---

[41]Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships," 7.

[42]McKee and Tew, "Setting the Stage," 16.

[43]Lee, "Program Types and Prototypes," 27.

[44]Haviland, Seon-Hi, and Turley, "Now I'm Ready," 264; Catherine M. Wehlburg, "Assessment Practices Related to Student Learning," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, 179.

such programs. Additionally, this study sought to provide a convincing argument for the use of mentoring as a best training practice in Christian higher education.

Therefore, this research is necessary because Christian faculty membership is based on unique qualifications, a unique calling, and unique responsibility, and consequently should be supported by specifically asking, what practices best sustain and prepare Christian faculty for the challenges of a Christian higher education academic career? What are the challenges that a Christian faculty member might encounter, and are these challenges unique to a Christian context?

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

There is no shortage of research within the field of faculty development in higher education. A casual search on the general topic yields extensive results that reveal a multiplicity of perspectives. In light of the various perspectives, multiple debates exist within the literature, including whether faculty development is necessary, and if it is, to what extent should it be systematized within higher education. Further debate surrounds the topic of best practices for faculty development. Are certain structures considered better practices than others and how does one measure this? Even definitions of faculty development are often debated in the literature. The literature often defines faculty development as academic development, academic staff development, or even educational development.[1] The educational community is still building a consensus on what words actually work best to describe what is entailed in developing faculty. Further, Stabile and Ritchie state, "When faculty experience an enhancement program, rather than training and development programs, they are more likely to develop as a faculty member."[2] Yet varying perspectives still exist regarding what methods of development should be employed and what practices are most helpful or what methods might communicate negative messages.[3]

---

[1]Connie Schroeder and Associates, *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change* (Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011), ix.

[2]Christopher Stabile and William F. Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences between Training, Development, and Enrichment: The Role of Institutional Belief Constructs in Creating the Purpose of Faculty Learning Initiatives," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 71.

[3]Robert Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000); James W. Selby and Lawrence G. Calhoun, "Faculty Mentoring: Unintended Consequences?" *Teaching of*

Faculty development is a global concern within education,[4] and represents an important tool in addressing the ever-changing educational landscape. In light of this, widespread acceptance by faculty, inclusion in institutional initiatives and priorities,[5] and diminishing budgets have characterized the profile of faculty development programs in higher education. However, a shift in cultural influence and impact within the literature is emerging resulting from new faculty development practices and critical assessment taking place in the field. The following literature review considers the field of faculty development as it stands today. What are the current practices and philosophy that have shaped faculty development? How is faculty development addressing the changing nature of education? What is the current structure of faculty development today? These questions were all examined within this survey. Within the literature, best practices emerged reflecting the impact that faculty development is currently having. The literature collectively established a framework for ongoing faculty development and the impact this tool can have in shaping institutional impact, especially in Christian higher education.

Faculty Development as It Stands Today

What is faculty development? What is the purpose it is meant to accomplish? What is the appropriate terminology to use to describe the responsibilities of a faculty developer? These common questions emerge as critical points of dialogue within the literature. For consistency purposes, the term *faculty development* will be used to adequately describe the multiple tasks and areas of expertise of the faculty developer.[6] Additionally, in this review a definition that has endured 30 years will be used to describe

---

Psychology 25, no. 3 (1998): 210.

[4]Anne E. Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present* (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2006), 160.

[5]Schroeder and Associates, *Coming in from the Margins*, x.

[6]Ibid.

faculty development: "The total development of the faculty member – as a person, as a professional, and as a member of the faculty community."[7] Similarly, Matthew Ouelett synthesizes that although faculty development is an expansive term and definition, it generally encompasses three key areas of effort: personal development, instructional development, and organizational development.[8] Research reveals that faculty development is key to individual faculty and institutional success as a whole.[9] Specifically, Guskey argues that faculty development is a recognized part of enhancing the practices of classroom teachers: "High-quality professional development is at the center of every modern proposal to enhance education."[10] McKee and Tew further argue, "Because the faculty is crucial to the dynamic and growing educational enterprise, faculty development should be viewed as a necessity, not a nicety."[11] Additionally, McKee and Tew add, "This critical part of an institution's makeup is important because faculty must be prepared to engage current and future realities that manifest itself through veritable seismic shifts of the very ground on which institutions are built."[12] In other words, change is not only inevitable in higher education; it can be monumental and far-reaching. Therefore, this paper argues that ongoing faculty development is a best practice for embracing and engaging such dramatic change.

---

[7]Mary Lynn Crow et al., "Faculty Development Centers in Southern Universities," *Undergraduate Education Reform Project* (1976): 3.

[8]Mathew L. Ouellett, "Overview of Faculty Development: History and Choices," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, ed. Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010), 7.

[9]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*, xix.

[10]Thomas R. Guskey, *Evaluating Professional Development* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 1999), 16.

[11]William C. McKee and Mark W. Tew, "Setting the Stage for Teaching and Learning in American Higher Education: Making the Case for Faculty Development," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioner's Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 3.

[12]Ibid., 13.

Although extensive research supports faculty development,[13] consensus has not been reached as to how faculty development should be leveraged. A survey of the literature reveals an abundance of models and methods pertaining to the subject of faculty development.[14] Looking at the literature over the last fifty years, higher education faculty development programs and approaches have changed considerably.[15] Because of these significant changes, new research is being done that seeks to go beyond exploring programs and services offered to faculty and delves deeper into the issues that undergird the reasons for services being offered. The result will be to measure the effectiveness of current faculty development services.[16] Currently, there is a lack of literature specifically for faculty development in Christian higher education and its unique context, even though there is an abundance of research regarding secular faculty development.

As it stands today, faculty development works itself out in various ways depending on the values and goals held by the institution[17] and therefore must consider

---

[13]McKee and Tew, "Setting the Stage," 3-14, synthesize three studies (Exxon Study in 1976, POD Network study in 2001, and Faculty Development Practices in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 2009-10). William C. McKee, Mitzy Johnson, and Mark W. Tew, "Professional Development of the Faculty: Past and Present," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 15-20, note the collective wisdom as evidence supporting the need for faculty development in the academy in direct relation to the ever changing landscape encountered by faculty. Ironically, research indicated that faculty development was necessary. When asked to identify the extent to which participants used time and resources to take advantage of faculty development opportunities, only 20 percent of the faculty used the available resources to enhance academic credentials.

[14]Ann E. Austin and Mary Deane Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development: Where Are We Going?" *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 85-96; Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*; James Honan, Andrew Westmoreland, and Mark W. Tew, "Creating a Culture of Appreciation for Faculty Development," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 33-44; Matthew P. Phelps and Scott Waalkes, "Christian Friendship as Faculty Development: A Narrative Account," *Journal of Education and Christian Belief* 13 (2009): 129-39.

[15]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development,* 69.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Ibid.*,* 8.

17

the specific faculty needs according to their context and institutional mission. Since faculty development programs have been conceived, the shared common goal was to create a better education for students by working to improve the faculty's craft.[18] The desire to improve faculty skill has been marked by a movement that supports all types of faculty development, ranging from small networks to global faculty development professions. For the purpose of this study, it is important to note that there is a lack of literature specifically for faculty development in Christian higher education and its unique context.

The Evolution of Faculty Development

Current faculty development has benefitted from more than seventy-five years of research and practice in higher education. Contributing equally to the current state of faculty development were the increased rights of the student population and faculty members advocating for promotion and awards.[19] Sorcinelli best synthesized the literature in describing the faculty development evolution through four past ages progressing into one new age. The first age, the Age of the Scholar, was characterized by formal activities designed to improve the competence of the faculty member as a scholar. This stage of faculty development held that teaching skills would naturally improve with one's increased scholarship. Faculty measured personal success by publication of research.[20] The second age developed into the Age of the Teacher. This stage of faculty development is noted by the increase of activities devoted to developing the faculty member as a teacher. A need for faculty development professionals became necessary to facilitate the training and development process.[21] The third age, the Age of the Developer, saw faculty

---

[18]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development,* 19.

[19]Ouellett, "Overview of Faculty Development," 4.

[20]Ibid., 5.

[21]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development,* 159.

development units emerging on university campuses creating innovative approaches to faculty development practices. The fourth age's focus shifted to the Age of the Learner. The typical "sage on the stage" approach of teacher instruction was replaced with an increased interest in a "guide on the side" learning strategy. It is during this stage that the greatest amount of developmental advances in the areas of instruction, philosophy, initiatives, and support programs was achieved.[22]

Today there is a new age of faculty development resulting from previous decades of research combined with changes being experienced in current educational settings. The Age of the Network represents both the past and present of faculty development by expanding on each previous age collectively and shifting paradigmatically through faculty developers evoking faculty of the need for professional and personal development, supporting institutional mission, and responding to the ever-changing educational landscape of the twenty-first century.[23] This evolution is cause for increased research in the area of future practices and development of faculty members.

The Changing Nature of Education

Dynamic and rapid change is being experienced in all areas of society. Higher education is not exempt from this reality. Three distinct areas represent the dynamic change in higher education: the complex roles of the faculty member, diversity within the student body, and the increase use of technology.

Research conducted in 2006 by the Professional and Organizational Development Network (POD Network) surveyed 494 faculty members representing 300 institutions points out that higher education institutions are in fact concerned with adequately addressing teaching and learning issues. However, institutional concern is not

---

[22]Ouellett, "Overview of Faculty Development," 6.

[23]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development,* 28.

enough. For decades, the professoriate consisted of responsibilities like teaching and research and could be addressed with common faculty development programs. But in today's educational context, research reveals the complexity of issues encountered and responsibilities assumed by faculty members have significantly increased.[24] This, coupled with research that shows faculty need development at every step of their career, represents a change that institutions and faculty development programs must anticipate and address to keep pace with the changing educational landscape.[25] McKee and Tew specify that the shift in responsibilities for faculty can be seen in learning new pedagogical techniques and utilizing new online curricula, transitioning to unique learning styles and new ways of connecting to the student, assuming the role of parent to new students as they transition to college life, and adapting to new institutional landscapes reflecting corporate America more than traditional brick and mortar institutions.[26]

A second area of significant change is the diversity within the student body. No longer do socioeconomic and generational differences represent the environment of diversity in higher education, but rather multiculturalism, diverse values, divergent political beliefs, and various religious faiths and worldviews reflect a more accurate picture of the changing educational landscape today. In light of this, the literature[27] calls for new research to be conducted providing necessary means for faculty to cultivate learning environments inclusive for all students. This learner-centered approach is a changing of the balance of power in the classroom and represents a drastic conceptual

---

[24]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development,* 69-70.

[25]Ann E. Austin, "Supporting Faculty Members across Their Careers," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, 363.

[26]McKee and Tew, "Setting the Stage," 4-11.

[27]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*; Ouellett, "Overview of Faculty Development"; Austin, "Supporting Faculty Members"; McKee and Tew, "Setting the Stage."

shift that faculty members commonly experience today.[28]

A third area representing dynamic change is the issue of integrating technology into teaching environments and faculty development practices. Ranging from document preparation to teaching online courses, twenty-first century faculty are expected to possess the skills to interact with students. As difficult as it may be to assist faculty in this area, Kuhlenschmidt identifies three additional challenges relevant to faculty development: understanding the attitude of the faculty toward technology, selecting appropriate technology for faculty, and helping faculty integrate technology into the classroom.[29] Austin's research discovered that faculty members want support that "supports the appropriate, effective, and innovative use of evolving, mainstream instructional technologies that support students wherever they are—be it in a classroom, on campus, in transit, at home, or at work."[30] Faculty members are faced with the difficult task of navigating technological progress while maintaining pace with younger, sometimes more technologically adept students, integrating current course content with new learning processes. Faculty development can assist the faculty member in accomplishing the primary task of teaching and using technology to fulfill learning objectives.

The evolution of faculty development can be partly attributed to the multiple shifts in the educational arena. As a result, the literature revealed a progression within faculty development based on self-focused preservation, to organizational growth, to personal skill development, and finally to a context-wide refocus on learning by all involved parties.[31] Because of these significant changes, new research is being done that

---

[28]Maryellen Weimer, *Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2013), 10.

[29]Sally Kuhlenschmidt, "Issues in Technology and Faculty Development," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, 259-60.

[30]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*, 77

[31]Susan Loucks-Horsley, "Professional Development and the Learner Centered School,"

seeks to go beyond exploring programs and services offered to faculty and delves deeper into the issues that undergird the reasons for services being offered. The key will be to measure the effectiveness of current faculty development services.[32]

Structures of Faculty Development

Although faculty development has been in existence for more than 50 years, professionals who are responsible to develop structures and programs are a recent addition.[33] With the creation of the POD Network, a significant increase of professional faculty developers has assisted in organizing and increasing the effectiveness of faculty development. The literature typically narrowed these structures to either a centralized or decentralized function. Research by Austin et al., serves as the leading authority on structural identification within faculty development programs in higher education.[34] In their study, they identify five structures that comprise faculty development programs: a centralized unit with dedicated staff (54 percent), an individual faculty member or administrator (19 percent), a committee that supports faculty development (12 percent), a clearinghouse for progress and offerings (4 percent), and other system-wide offices or combinations (1 percent).[35] This research reveals a significant increase from Erickson's 1986 study showing only 14 percent of faculty development existing as a centralized unit.[36]

Theory Into Practice 34, no. 4 (Autumn 1995): 265.

[32]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development,* 69.

[33]Virgina Lee, "Program and Protoyped," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, 21.

[34]Ibid., 22.

[35]Ibid., 23-26.

[36]G. Erickson, "A Survey of Faculty Development Practices," *Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development* 1 (Winter 1986): 82-196.

Within these structures, various models exist depending on the resources and mission of the individual institution. The following is a synthesis of the existing programs of faculty development:

Faculty Learning Communities (FLC). FLCs exist to specifically develop and foster growth, particularly with regard to teaching.[37] Generally, there are two types of FLCs: cohort and topic based.[38] The cohort model is created to address specific needs of the cohort, while the topic model addresses a broader, campus or departmental-wide issue. Within the literature, multiple benefits support faculty development.[39] Among the positive outcomes are support for new faculty within a new university setting, increased rate of achieving tenure, and increased knowledge and skill. Although benefits accompany this model of faculty development, research is limited and does not shed enough light on faculty member's experience that is beyond the distinction of new faculty member.

Mentoring programs. On multiple occasions, the literature links the history of mentoring to Mentor, the trusted counselor of Odysseus.[40] The primary responsibility that Mentor assumed was to remain in Ithaca where he began to serve as an official role model to the son of Odysseus. The etymology of this word is significant as it denotes the responsibility of the mentor to establish positive influence and relationship by serving as

---

[37]Courtney M. Holmes and Kelly A. Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience in a Research Learning Community," *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (May 2014): 35.

[38]Lee, "Program Types and Prototypes," 28.

[39]Milton D. Cox, "Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities," *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 5-23; Susan H. Marston and Gerald J. Brunetti, "Job Satisfaction of Experienced Professors at a Liberal Arts College," *Education* 130, no. 2 (2009): 323-47; Jane MacKenzie et al., "From Anxiety to Empowerment: A Learning Community of University Teachers," *Teaching in Higher Education* 15, no. 3 (June 2010): 273-84.

[40]Jeffrey L. Butler, *The Essential College Professor: A Practical Guide to an Academic Career* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010); Carol A. Mullen, *From Student to Professor: Translating a Graduate Degree into a Career in Academia* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2012); Ron Penner, "Mentoring in Higher Education," *Directions* 30, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 45-52.

a role model rather than simply using verbal instructions. Mullen joins Butler by defining a mentor as a person who becomes a trusted counselor or guide to a protégé.[41] Mullen's definition is applied through a mentoring dyad that serves both an educational and relational purpose between the mentor and protégé. Lucas and Murry extend the definition of a mentor further by including an element of advocacy on behalf of the protégé.[42] Valantasis illustrates a similar definition through the image of a mentor standing at a door and fighting the good fight on behalf of the protégé.[43] Cunningham defines a mentor as someone who guides, teaches, and influences another within the same profession. This too is a critical definition for two reasons. First, this definition reveals an imbedded negativity toward faculty mentoring. A peer guiding, teaching, or influencing another peer can be interpreted as a deficiency that is incongruent with being a member of higher education. Second, it introduces the positive concept of influence within the mentor protégé relationship. Ambrosetti identifies mentoring as development that provides the underpinning for the growth of the mentee's skills. Lewis-Hall and Maltby's research supports Ambrosetti by stating that at the core of successful mentoring is a developmental relationship.[44] They note that mentoring relationships made available to faculty can offer unique developmental opportunities in two specific areas: career skills and psychosocial support.[45]

---

[41]Mullen, *From Student to Professor*, 14.

[42]Christopher J. Lucas and John W. Murry, Jr., *New Faculty: A Practical Guide for Academic Beginners* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 21.

[43]Richard Valantasis, "Mentoring Younger Faculty," *Teaching Theology and Religion* 8, no. 1 (2005): 57.

[44]M. Elizabeth Lewis-Hall and Lauren E. Maltby, "Mentoring: The View from Both Sides," *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 32, no. 1 (2013): 71.

[45]Ibid., 72.

Teaching circles. Teaching circles are typically comprised of six to eight faculty members who gather around a topic of interest for a predetermined amount of time.[46] These topics are selected by the faculty development center and serve to facilitate a circle of colleagues engaging in mutual development through strategic activities.

Traditional methods. Traditional methods include workshops, conferences, classroom observation, and individual discussion with a faculty member. Such practices have proven helpful and will continue to be a critical part of faculty development in the future. Because these traditional methods typically emphasize the development of the professor's skill, they will remain a mainstay in faculty development programs.

Faculty development programs are critical to the overall success of the institution because they impact the entire academic community.[47] The literature identified that when a faculty development program incorporates multiple programs rather than a single program, significant impact can be made on the individual institutions they serve.

Faculty development in Christian higher education. This study is concerned with the status of faculty development in Christian higher education. Although higher education has its beginnings in Christian colleges, current literature underrepresents the demographic of Christian universities and colleges of higher education today.[48] The literature identified many unique factors that separate Christian higher education institutions from secular institutions; they included mission, expectations of faculty, and sense of calling. This literature also revealed a need for specific and strategic faculty development unique to the context of Christian higher education institutions.

---

[46]Lee, "Program Types and Prototypes," 27.

[47]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development,* 53.

[48]John Charles Thomas, "Administrative, Staff, and Faculty Perceptions of Organizational Climate and Commitment in Christian Higher Education," *Christian Higher Education* 7 (2008): 226. James A. Swezey, "Faculty Sense of Religious Calling at a Christian University," *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 18 (2009): 316.

Mission within Christian higher education institutions is generally based on biblical commands or principles. For example, a Christian institution may set forth as its mission a desire to make and mature disciples of Jesus Christ. Ideally then, faculty development would be shaped in such a way that all faculty members would be in process of being conformed to the image of Christ. This is a unique quality to Christian faculty. Further research conducted by Thomas surprisingly revealed a negative correlation between organization climate and commitment to an institution in Christian higher education. Among the reasons he attributes the negative correlation of faculty commitment to a Christian institution is not unrelated to this unique aspect of mission within Christian higher education. Thomas offers this explanation, "Perhaps a negative correlation does exist given the unique nature of Christian higher education employees. It is possible that such employees maintain employment for reasons other than those assessed."[49] Thomas makes the point that some indicators of commitment could not be taken into account due to the uniqueness of Christian faculty and institutions. He continues,

> The types of commitment measured by the Organizational Commitment (OCQ) instrument may not have tapped into why Christian higher education employees remain with their organizations. Perhaps a specialized commitment instrument is needed that would more sensitively assess the reasons Christian personnel remain with their employers.[50]

Also, expectations of Christian faculty differ from general expectations of faculty members in secular higher education.[51] Because Christian universities aim at eternally impacting the student who is attending the school, faculty members assume a position of influence that is intended to fulfill that mission. While secular faculty members may utilize moral and even biblical principles in their leadership, Christian

---

[49]Thomas, "Administrative, Staff, and Faculty Perceptions," 240.

[50]Ibid., 244.

[51]Ralph Schroder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment for Faculty and Administrators of a Private Christian University," *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 17 (2008): 81-97.

leadership distinctively possesses a quality beyond leadership principles, to emphasize the impact of the life of the leader. Don Howell is helpful in explaining the uniqueness of Christian leadership: "Biblical leadership is taking the initiative to influence people to grow in holiness and to passionately promote the extension of God's kingdom in the world."[52] This leadership quality too is a unique quality to Christian faculty.

Finally, a sense of calling sets Christian higher education apart from secular higher education. Like Christian faculty, secular faculty members may have a special purpose for teaching or possess a motive linked to a deep passion that may represent a commitment to a greater cause inspired by a sense of calling.[53] However, Swezey's research presented a unique paradigm among Christian faculty members based on how Christians view "sense of calling" in light of Scripture and the belief that God is intricately involved with the affairs of people of faith and the examination of religious beliefs impacting the context or setting in which a phenomena occurs.[54] Swezey maintains that because Christian faculty possess a calling of God, and exist within a Christian context, they make up a unique demographic. Schroder used the Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale to survey administrators and faculty of Christian colleges and universities and found among administrators: "The highest amount of variance for organizational commitment was explained in a five-predictor model for university administrators. The strongest predictor in this model was growth followed by religious commitment."[55] Schroder joins Swezey in his recommendations that because Christian universities have a

---

[52]Don N. Howell, Jr., *Servants of the Servant: A Biblical Theology of Leadership* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 3.

[53]J. C. Davidson and D. P. Caddell, "Religion and the Meaning of Work," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33, no. 2 (1994): 135-47; L. W. Fry, "Toward a Theory of Spiritual Leadership," *Leadership Quarterly* 14, no. 6 (2003): 693-727; Schroder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment."

[54]Swezey, "Faculty Sense of Religious Calling," 320-28.

[55]Schroder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment," 81-97.

deep religious commitment among administration and staff, unique attention should be given to hiring practices and the ongoing development of personnel.

While not explicitly addressing Christian higher education, the literature addressed issues that small colleges face and the best faculty development practices for their unique context. This unique context is somewhat adaptable to Christian colleges and universities because of the size of the student body; many Christian colleges have fewer than 250 faculty members, and a large percentage of faculty involved in both teaching and research.[56] Additional characteristics that may be similar to Christian higher education include faculty-run and student-focused cultures and the administrative position of faculty developer, which plays a central role in determining faculty development culture and practice.[57] The literature highlighted three common misconceptions about faculty development in small colleges emphasizing teaching as central: (1) "faculty development is remedial, (2) faculty development only promotes one "right way" way to teach, (3) and that faculty development forces faculty to choose between teaching and scholarship."[58]

In light of these factors, the literature does not adequately inform the uniqueness of faculty serving in Christian higher education.

Training Best Practices in Faculty Development

A theme of faculty development being equally critical to shaping academic culture and helping faculty learn how to stay current while incorporating innovations in their field emerged in the literature.[59] However, discourse surrounds the application of

---

[56]Michael Reder, "Effective Practices in the Context of Small Colleges," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, 293-94.

[57]Ibid., 294.

[58]Ibid., 295.

[59]Lucas and Murry, *New Faculty*; Pamela D. Sherer et al., "Online Communities of Practice: A

faculty development and the terminology that should be used. For instance, Schroeder's research discovered that various terms like academic development or educational development were often used interchangeably with faculty development, but concludes that faculty development is an appropriate term and still commonly accepted.[60] Stabile and Ritchie identify three belief constructs that serve as motivation for terms used for faculty development: training, development, and enhancement. Their argument is that when faculty experience an enhancement program, rather than training or development, they are more likely to progress as a faculty member. Enhancement is rooted in activities that engage faculty in personal reflection and improvement. Activities include personal core mission evaluation, professional identity, personal beliefs and attitudes, and reflective practices.[61] Others argue that developing faculty is not an issue of selected terminology, but rather, hinges upon the intent of the development. Schuman, Peters, and Olsen address the outdated emphasis on faculty development attempting to train teachers to be better practitioners. Borrowing the concept of "co-creation of value" from the business world, they argue that a better way to assist teachers in becoming effective faculty members is by enabling them to become a personal stakeholder in their own maturation as a professional. Becoming a personal stakeholder increases ownership of values within the faculty development program. This program envisions a cooperative effort by faculty and faculty developers to co-create shared values within learning communities.[62] Still, divergent views exist within faculty mentoring practices surrounding involvement. Within the literature are those who posit that new faculty or

---

Catalyst for Faculty Development," *Innovative Higher Education* 27, no. 3 (2003): 183-94.

[60]Schroeder and Associates, *Coming in from the Margins*, 2011.

[61]Stabile and Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences," 78-80.

[62]David W. Schuman, John Peters, and Taimi Olsen, "Cocreating Value in Teaching and Learning Centers," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 23-24.

newly hired faculty members should only be subjected to faculty development rather than all faculty members being accountable to long-term development practices. Athey and Hoffman counter that faculty development benefits all faculty by keeping them current with education's ever-changing landscape.[63]

Training and Development Practices

In light of the above discussion, the literature revealed that for faculty development activities to be effective, they must go beyond long-established beliefs, constructs, and perceptions by faculty to include a cultural revolution moving faculty to reflect upon themselves as scholars and practitioners and to seek a continual development in their profession.[64] Within the literature, two categories of faculty development practice came to light: individual faculty member development and corporate faculty development. Within that construct, one author categorized faculty development practices as either a one-time event or an ongoing practice.[65] Regardless of the type of development program employed, the choice was typically determined by what the institutional goal for faculty was. If, for example, an institution needed to fulfill a task for an accreditation board, faculty development goals could be focused on simply meeting those obligations; whereas, an institution motivated by student learning and faculty excellence may have divergent goals altogether.[66]

---

[63]Susan Athey and K. Douglass Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative: A Framework for Faculty Development," *Marketing Education Review* 39, no. 6 (Fall 2007): 1-9.

[64]Sam M. Intrator and Robert Kunzman, "Starting with the Soul," *Educational Leadership* (2006): 38-42.

[65]Donna E. Ellis and Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens, "Practical Suggestions for Programs and Activities," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, 117-32.

[66]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*, 41.

Faculty Development as
Individual Development

Two similar themes emerged within the individual faculty member programs:

teacher enrichment and teacher enhancement practices were understood to be among the

best practices for individual faculty member development. Faculty training was generally

removed from the literature, as it was described by Stabile and Ritchie to represent a low-

level form of institutional compliance, satisfying the needs of an accreditation

committee.[67] Therefore, a more acceptable form of individual faculty development was

described as enrichment and enhancement.

Individual faculty member enrichment. Enrichment practices exist to bring

about individual change from within the person.[68] Enrichment practices were described as

those practices that promoted self-reflection leading the faculty member to focus on their

own learning processes. Intrator and Kunzman witnessed that the most effective faculty

development occurred when development emphasized the teacher's inner life and personal

reflection.[69] Kang's research extended Mezirow's Transformative learning theory to what

he coined as "faculty authenticity." In this study, Kang found that professors who practice

"faculty authenticity" were far more effective at rendering transformative learning among

their students.[70] A central component to Kang's findings was that critical reflection by

faculty was a key aspect of faculty authenticity accomplishing transformative learning.[71]

The literature revealed that self-reflection would ideally lead each faculty member to

---

[67]Stabile and Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences," 72.

[68]Fred A. J. Korthagen, "Professional Learning from within," *Studying Teacher Education* 5, no 2. (2009): 195-99.

[69]Intrator and Kuzman, "Starting with the Soul," 40.

[70]Hokyung Paul Kang, "Perceptions and Experience of Transformative Learning and Faculty Authenticity among North American Professors of Christian Education (NAPCE)," *Christian Education Journal* 10 (2013): 339-59.

[71]Ibid., 347.

desire personal and professional continual development. Faculty members becoming aware of how personal beliefs are linked to professional practices motivate enrichment activities.[72] This coincides with the findings of Austin et al., whose research discovered that among the primary goals of faculty development programs was responding to individual faculty members' needs.[73]

Specific enrichment activities include the following reflective practices: core reflection—focusing within on behavior and beliefs causing faculty to desire a change in needed areas;[74] core mission—activities that cause faculty to reflect on the purpose of being an educator;[75] professional identity—times of wrestling through the kind of faculty member one is; and reflection—the practice that leads to deeper understanding and action. This activity specifically consists of four practices:[76] interpretation, identifying a specific event that happened in the classroom; then describe the interpretation by answering the questions who, what, when, where, and how; analysis, this practice leads the faculty member to discover the causes for why the event occurred; and evaluation, a self-guided reflective exercise that allows faculty members to experience needed change and be enriched by the self-improvement process.

Individual faculty member enhancement. Within the literature, faculty enhancement closely resembled comprehensive faculty development practices.[77] The

---

[72]Stabile and Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences," 73.

[73]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development,* 43.

[74]Intrator and Kuzman, "Starting with the Soul," 40.

[75]Stabile and Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences," 78.

[76]J. Feldman and D. McPhee, *The Science of Learning and the Art of Teaching* (Clifton Park, NY: Thompson Delmar Learning, 2007).

[77]Stabile and Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences"; LuAnn Wilkerson and David M. Irby, "Strategies for Improving Teaching Practices: A Comprehensive Approach to Faculty Development," *Academic Medicine* 73, no. 4 (April 1998): 387-96.

literature described comprehensive practices as those development programs that reached beyond activities that focused exclusively on teaching development. Wilkerson and Irby contend that today, more than ever, faculty development programs must empower faculty to become excellent educators and also to become creators of learning communities that value teaching and learning.[78] Unlike the function of training faculty, development undergirds the notion that faculty have the opportunity to participate and guide their need for continual improvement. Pellicer and Anderson argue that among the most important qualities of effective faculty development is making the faculty member the center of the development and helping faculty focus on long-term personal and professional growth.[79] The literature showed that enhancement practices were concerned with the improvement of a faculty member's competency in order to produce individual excellence. The goal of faculty enhancement practices was primarily concerned with empowering faculty to desire and pursue ongoing improvement in areas that were identified through specific assessments.[80] According to Lueddeke's study, faculty enhancement will be the key to responding to the academic landscape and the drastic changes in student population.[81] Synthesizing the literature evidenced that individual faculty enhancement as a comprehensive development practice garnered support from faculty when they were encouraged to intrinsically set their own personal performance standards and participate in the process of continual development.[82]

---

[78]Wilkerson and Irby, "Strategies for Improving Teaching Practices," 387.

[79]Leonard O. Pellicer and Lorin W. Anderson, *A Handbook for Teacher Leaders* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 1995), 152-53.

[80]Wilkerson and Irby, "Strategies for Improving Teaching Practices," 393.

[81]George R. Lueddeke, "Professionalizing Teaching Practices in Higher Education: A Study of Disciplinary Variation and Teaching Scholarship." *Studies in Higher Education* 28, no. 2 (2003): 213.

[82]Stabile and Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences"; Wilkerson and Irby, "Strategies for Improving Teaching Practices"; Lueddeke, "Professionalizing Teaching Practices."

Specific enhancement activities include the following practices: reflection, thinking and talking about what has occurred (although the literature identified various forms of reflection, thinking, talking, and practice were essential elements of the activities); workshops that include practice, self-assessment, and feedback; and teaching evaluations combined with personal consultations.[83]

Faculty Development within Group Settings

Athey and Hoffman assert that the most fundamental reason for faculty development activities are to provide faculty with a repertoire of teaching skills that are necessary for teaching today's students.[84] However, debate exists as to how this should be accomplished. Current faculty development programs are beginning to endorse cohort models like FLC,[85] peer-to-peer development through reading groups, interdisciplinary learning,[86] and faculty mentoring practices.[87] This portion of the literature review will

---

[83]Stabile and Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences"; Wilkerson and Irby, "Strategies for Improving Teaching Practices"; Pellicer and Anderson, *A Handbook for Teacher Leaders*; Lueddeke, "Professionalizing Teaching Practices"; Opre, Adrian, Zaharie, Monica, Opre, Dana. "Faculty Development: Teaching Staff Needs, Knowledge, and Priorities," *Cognition, Brain, Behavior* 7, no. 1 (2008): 29-43; MacKenzie et al., "From Anxiety to Empowerment."

[84]Athey and Hoffman. "The Master Teacher Initiative," 1.

[85]Ibid.; Wilkerson and Irby, "Strategies for Improving Teaching Practices"; Joretta L. Marshall, "Learning about Teaching in Communities: Lessons for Faculty Development," *Teaching Theology and Religion* 8, no. 1 (2005): 29-34; Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience"; Phelps and Waalkes, "Christian Friendship."

[86]Marshall, "Learning about Teaching," 29.

[87]Linda L. McCabe and Edward R. B. McCabe, *How to Succeed in Academics* (San Diego: Academic, 1999); Lucas and Murry, *New Faculty*; Mullen, *From Student to Professor*; Valantasis, "Mentoring Younger Faculty," 56-59; Penner, "Mentoring in Higher Education," 45-52; Samuel T. Logan, Jr., "Faculty Development: An Organic Perspective," *Theological Education* 31, no. 2 (1995): 27-36; Jayne Edman, "Best Practices: Mentoring New Full-Time Faculty: Reenergizing and Improving an Existing Formal Mentoring Program" (Ed.D. diss., Rowan University, 2011); Angelina Ambrosetti, "Are You Ready to Be a Mentor? Preparing Teachers for Pre-Service Teachers," *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 39, no. 6 (2014): 30-42; Ellis and Ortquist-Ahrens, "Practical Suggestions."

synthesize the aforementioned practices into two categories: faculty mentoring practices and FLCs.

Faculty mentoring practices. The evolution of faculty development highlights a debate within higher education as it pertains to what methods achieve the best outcomes. The most polarized area regarding faculty development surrounds the topic of mentoring.[88] In particular, Selby and Calhoun call mentoring in higher education a detriment to the career of the protégé.[89] Although areas may exist in a mentoring model that can be abused,[90] research clearly states that to ignore the advantages of a mentoring relationship could negatively impact the well being of a faculty member,[91] including the spiritual well being of a Christian faculty member.[92]

The literature yielded both positive and negative perceptions of mentoring as a faculty development practice. For some, it is difficult to envision that mentoring develops professional faculty into more capable members of the academe. Selby and Calhoun hold the most negative perception of mentoring, especially in faculty who are not novices or new hires. They argue that mentoring faculty fosters a paternalistic culture that will ultimately impede development.[93] Additionally, opponents argue that mentoring

---

[88]Lucas and Murry, *New Faculty*; Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members*; Selby and Calhoun, "Faculty Mentoring?," 210-11.

[89]Selby and Calhoun, "Faculty Mentoring?, 210-11.

[90]Critics of mentoring programs agree that mentoring may be helpful to the development of new faculty, but argue that the disadvantages of forcing faculty to participate in mentoring programs outweigh any advantages that may be experienced by a select few.

[91]McCabe and McCabe, *How to Succeed in Academics*; Lucas and Murry, *New Faculty*; Mullen, *From Student to Professor*; Valantasis, "Mentoring Younger Faculty," 56-59; Penner, "Mentoring in Higher Education"; Logan, "Faculty Development," 27-36; Edman, "Best Practices"; Ambrosetti, "Are You Ready?, 30-42.

[92]Penner, "Mentoring in Higher Education," 49.

[93]Selby and Calhoun, " Faculty Mentoring?," 210.

programs in higher education overtly imply a culture of distrust exists and that there is still a need to be accepted by more competent people. The protégé, in spite of previously establishing credibility through master's thesis and dissertation defenses, must strive to be accepted in a new culture.[94]

Robert Boice influences Selby and Calhoun's perspective. Although an opponent of mentoring, his extensive research[95] revealed that mentoring was in fact rich and rewarding,[96] but that a nagging issue existed: new faculty struggled with asking for help. Novice faculty, according to Boice's preliminary queries, were under the impression that "dissertation rules"[97] still applied while holding a faculty position in higher education.[98] It was assumed by new faculty that any weakness displayed would be conceived as incompetence, thereby rendering the novice unqualified to be a part of the academic community. Johnson agrees that it is easy to assume that doctoral level professors or junior faculty are accomplished and self-sustaining, but rebuts by entering as evidence the abundant research that supports faculty development as a substantial benefit to faculty members.[99]

Boice's negativity stems from a lack of effective mentoring programs that often reflect corporate models that neglect an important aspect of the mentoring process:

---

[94]Selby and Calhoun, " Faculty Mentoring?," 210.

[95]Robert Boice, *The New Faculty Member* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992). Boice's research included a multi-campus, multi-semester study of new faculty that discovered the difficulties involved in the acculturation process. Generally speaking, the acculturation process took four to five semesters to complete.

[96]Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members*, 245. To be fair, Boice is not an advocate of traditional faculty mentoring practices.

[97]Dissertation rules are those rules that apply to a doctoral candidate stating that work should be done alone and it can be shared only when perfect.

[98]Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members*, 233.

[99]W. Brad Johnson, *On Being A Mentor: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2007), 141.

compassion and socialization.[100] Boice's research reinforces his apprehension toward

traditional mentoring based on two key findings: formal practices force conformity and

participation and do not consider the need of the novice, and informal, spontaneous

practices do not suffice for new faculty because it is uncommon and usually

ineffective.[101] In light of this research, Boice's conclusions serve as the impetus for

employing effective mentoring within Christian higher education.

For multiple reasons, positive perspectives of mentoring as a faculty

development practice in higher education are thoroughly represented in the literature. The

common theme centers on the benefits of formal and informal mentoring programs alike;

however, the perceptions are generally applied to novice or new faculty. Although an

advocate of mentoring, Gibson concedes that experienced faculty members will have a

more difficult time taking advice from peers than novice faculty.[102] This notion is the

underlying issue within faculty development practices addressed related to this

mentoring: mentoring for all demographics within higher education can exist when seen

as a critical part of the positive development of faculty members.[103]

Moreover, when contextualized to Christian higher education, there are reasons

to examine faculty-mentoring practices not only because of positive development, but also

because healthy mentoring practices replicate biblical discipleship models. This

relationship between healthy mentoring and biblical discipleship is at the heart of

Cunningham's research in which she concludes that initiating and nurturing workplace

---

[100]Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members*, 237.

[101]Ibid., 238.

[102]Gerald W. Gibson, *Good Start: A Guidebook for New Faculty in Liberal Arts Colleges* (Bolton, MA: Anker, 1992), 3.

[103]Johnson, *On Being A Mentor*, 5, argues that mentorship within higher education is so critical that it is the moral responsibility of institutions to provide structure and systems to facilitate mentoring.

mentoring among faculty members in Christian higher education is crucial.[104] For the

purpose of this review and further study, the following definition of workplace mentoring

will be used.

> Mentoring is relational interaction between two people which one knows something, the mentor, transfers that something (advice, wisdom, information, emotional support, protection, link to resources, career guidance, status) to someone else, the mentoree, at a sensitive time so that it impacts development.[105]

Butler affirms this definition by proposing that mentoring can occur at any

level of the institution and that faculty members who have served a number of years

within higher education can also benefit from a mentor's help in overcoming obstacles

like research block and other midcareer challenges.[106] Because career development takes

time, it is critical that the process of mentoring not be rushed or regulated to short-term

segments.[107] Kram's research concludes that extended time is critical to effective

mentoring occurring.[108]

The literature revealed that when mentoring occurs in higher education "it is

generally limited in quantity and poor in content."[109] Data from Behar-Harenstein,

---

[104]Shelly Cunningham, "Who's Mentoring the Mentors? The Discipling Dimension of Faculty Development in Christian Higher Education," *Theological Education* 34, no. 2 (Spring 1998): 34.

[105]Michelle M. Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships among Faculty Members in Christian Higher Education" (Ph.D. diss., Talbot School of Theology, 1996), 103.

[106]Butler, *The Essential College Professor*, 346.

[107]McCabe, and McCabe, *How to Succeed in Academics*, 2.

[108]K. E. Kram, "Phases of the Mentor Relationship," *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (1983): 608-25. Kram describes four phases as developmental seasons of mentoring that characterize effective mentoring. Phase 1: initiation. This phase occurs during the first several months of interaction. Its goal is to interact enough to adequately assess the potential match. Phase 2: cultivation. This is the longest phase characterized by the mentor actively offering career advice. Typically interpersonal relationships are developed in this phase. Phase 3: separation. This phase begins the process of creating distance and independence. This takes place on a physical and emotional level recognizing the relationship, as it currently exists is no longer needed. Phase 4: redefinition. When separation is complete, the relationship must be redefined to allow for either little or no contact or a collegial friendship. It is this collegial friendship that may serve as an ongoing support to each of the parties involved in the relationship.

[109]D. J. Levinson, *The Season's of a Man's Life* (New York: Ballentine, 1978), 334.

Garvan, and Catalanotto revealed that the most effective faculty development is face-to-face and hands on, yet the majority of faculty assessed had never enjoyed a quality mentoring experience.[110] The literature also demonstrated that seventeen years ago little documentation regarding mentoring practices at Christian higher education institutions existed.[111] Today, the literature provides a base for understanding the breadth of faculty development as it currently stands, but lacks sufficient research and insight for Christian higher education. The literature presented various perceptions of mentoring within the field, explored practices within the context of mentoring, and finally concluded by introducing the array of benefits within faculty mentoring. However, in light of the literature, it is apparent that a deficiency of purpose and mentoring practices exists among Christian faculty.

Faculty Learning Communities (FLC). Similar to faculty mentoring programs, FLC's serve a purpose of addressing faculty needs in a group context. Dissimilar to faculty mentoring programs, FLC's intentionally foster the development of faculty, especially in regard to teaching and only are engaged for a specific amount of time.[112] FLC's are the product from research observed by Milton D. Cox and the Miami University in Ohio.[113] In his research, Cox notes the success evidenced in Student Learning Communities (SLC) and applied the same principles to FLCs.

An FLC is comprised of six to ten faculty members from a cross-disciplinary spectrum who participate in a year-long collaboration focused on the development of

---

[110]Linda S. Behar-Horenstein, Cynthia W. Garvan, and Frank A. Catalonotto, "The Role of Needs Assessment for Faculty Development Initiatives," *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (2014): 80.

[111]Cunningham, "Who's Mentoring the Mentors?," 34.

[112]Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience," 35.

[113]Milton D. Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning through Faculty Learning Communities," *Excellence in College Teaching* 14 (2003): 162.

research, enhancing teaching and learning methods, building community, and providing opportunities to establish friendships with other faculty members.[114] The focus of an FLC is to improve student learning through the improvement of teaching. FLCs are either cohort-based or topic-based, each serving to address specific faculty needs. A cohort-based FLC typically consists of peers within the faculty hierarchy. Whereas a topic-based FLC is open to all ranks of faculty and is guided by a specific theme.[115]

While research shows that only 40 percent of universities have FLCs,[116] the findings reveal that increased faculty retention, greater intellectual development, and more active, learner-centered, interdisciplinary approaches to teaching are all direct results through faculty's shared experiences with FLCs.[117] In spite of the positive outcomes, the literature brought to light existing obstacles that discouraged the implementation of FLCs. The first obstacle was the culture of the individual institutions. Because the priority of an FLC is to facilitate learning communities for faculty rather than solely instructional communities, institutions have not adjusted to the new paradigm.[118] Second, individual departments within the institutions are challenged by the scheduling difficulties of organizing FLCs from interdisciplinary learning.[119] Third, FLCs

---

[114]Cox, "Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities"; Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience"; Athey and Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative"; Phelps and Waalkes, "Christian Friendship"; Patricia S. O'Sullivan and David Irby, "Reframing Research on Faculty Development," *Academic Medicine* 86, no. 4 (2004): 421-28; Ellis and Ortquist-Ahrens, "Practical Suggestions."

[115]Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship," 163; Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience," 36; Marshall, "Learning about Teaching in Communities," 29.

[116]Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience," 35-36.

[117]Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship," 166; Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience," 39; Athey and Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative," 1; Marshall, "Learning about Teaching," 31.

[118]Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship"; Cox, "Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities"; Marshall, "Learning about Teaching"; Athey and Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative"; MacKenzie et al., "From Anxiety to Empowerment."

[119]Marshall, "Learning about Teaching," 31.

work against the institution's traditional faculty development program thus diminishing the innovation, community, and self-care an FLC provides.[120] Finally, FLCs face the challenge of meeting the needs of faculty representing both online and brick and mortar education.[121]

From the literature, five themes emerged as positive outcomes of the FLC model. First, because FLCs encourage cross-discipline groups, participating faculty experienced an increase in interdisciplinary learning and connections. Interdisciplinary learning environments provide opportunities for participants to develop skills from other disciplines and institutional settings.[122] The interdisciplinary learning environment also allowed faculty to create networks and learn about other peer's research and gave each faculty member an understanding of the larger network of research taking place beyond their own department.[123] Interdisciplinary learning encouraged faculty by helping them see unexpected connections between diverse disciplines in the institution.[124] For instance, members learned about teaching and evaluation methods either through discussion or in regular meetings.[125] Participants also reported an added depth and richness of experience from other faculty who were scholars in other disciplines being a critical component to growing in learning and teaching skill.[126]

---

[120]Ibid.; MacKenzie et al. "From Anxiety to Empowerment"; O'Sullivan and Irby, "Reframing Research."

[121]Cox, "Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities."

[122]Marshall, "Learning about Teaching," 31.

[123]Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience," 38.

[124]Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship," 368.

[125]MacKenzie et al., "From Anxiety to Empowerment," 368; O'Sullivan and Irby, "Reframing Research."

[126]Marshall, "Learning about Teaching," 31; Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship," 367; Athey and Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative."

Second, participating faculty experienced a belonging and a deep sense of community absent from traditional faculty development programs.[127] Within the research that Holmes and Kozlowski performed, focus groups unanimously described the FLC experience as a sense of fellowship with other faculty and expressed feelings of inclusiveness in the collaborative language used as the FLC progressed. Central to the philosophy of the FLC is that critical needs are met for educational professionals by providing arenas of support wherein faculty may learn by trial and error through honest dialogue within a community encouraging such transparency.[128] The literature also noted that an FLC group increased the sense of belonging especially for new faculty.[129]

Third, faculty naturally sought out meaningful relationships that welcomed accountability and reflected faculty-mentoring practices.[130] Additionally, increased accountability to other colleagues in the areas of academic productivity and FLC attendance were also evidenced in the literature.[131] In FLC groups, Holmes and Kozlowski's research identified two categories of mentoring: a traditional, hierarchal model favored by new faculty or a modern, peer-to-peer mentorship favored by mid-career faculty. In essence, the literature revealed that mentoring was more than a byproduct of the FLC group meetings and was described as an overall rich and rewarding

[127]Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience," 38-39. Athey and Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative," 5.

[128]Parker Palmer, *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1998), 144; Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship," 368, MacKenzie et al., "From Anxiety to Empowerment," 278.

[129]Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members*; Lucas and Murry, *New Faculty*.

[130]Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience"; Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members*; S. Colon-Emeric, Lynn Bowlby, and Laura Svetkey, "Establishing Faculty Needs and Priorities for Peer-Mentoring Groups Using a Nominal Group Technique," *Journal of Medical Teacher* 35 (2012): 631-34.

[131]MacKenzie et al., "From Anxiety to Empowerment," 273-84; Schuman et al., "Cocreating Value," 21-32: Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship"; Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience"; Marshall, "Learning about Teaching."

experience characterized by mutual support and encouragement.

Fourth, participating faculty evidenced a desire to pursue continued improvement. The literature indicated that faculty identified tangible results of achievement and empowerment through an involvement with FLC groups.[132] It is this sense of achievement and empowerment that provided the impetus for faculty to pursue an ongoing cultivation in teaching and learning. Because FLCs set out to broaden the awareness of teaching and learning among faculty, the outcomes reveal that this successfully occurred as evidenced by faculty's increased interest in teaching and learning practices. Furthermore, Cox's findings reveal five evidences that FLCs work: (1) students' abilities to apply principles and generalizations, students' abilities to ask good questions, increased abilities to collaborate, and the increased capacity to think for themselves; (2) better class discussion, better papers written, and better student engagement; (3) student-centered learning increased, collaborative learning increased, active learning increased, and use of technology; (4) student learning increased as a direct result of FLC teaching projects; (5) teachers reflected a change in students' learning due to a change in their own attitude toward teaching.[133] Additionally, Richlin and Cox use the scholarship of teaching concept to explain the positive outcome that occurs when both ongoing instruction about teaching and the demonstration of teaching knowledge are combined.[134] In fact, when faculty pursued continued improvement through the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), the literature synthesized that SoTL was among the highest positive outcomes.[135]

---

[132]MacKenzie et al., "Faculty Experience," 279.

[133]Cox, "Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities," 11-12.

[134]Laurie Richlin and Amy Essington, "Overview of Faculty Learning Communities," *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 127.

[135]Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship." Milton Cox's study describes the SoTL—FLC connection and the individual development evidenced in its success.

Finally, faculty cultures increasingly were committed to foster collaboration, scholarship, peer feedback, and a high value placed on teaching and learning.[136] Cox's research showed that FLC groups actually nourish the scholarship of teaching and its application in student learning.[137] While Lueddeke identified scholarship of teaching as being inadequate in preparing students for an uncertain and unchanging world, it was not in the context of FLCs.[138] Richlin and Cox, however, reported the following aspects of FLCs increasing scholarship of teaching and learning: support and safety from a community that encourages innovation in teaching, developmental steps taken individually and as a group, availability of forums and community presentations, mentoring of new participants, and experiencing multiple perspectives of SoTL.[139] The FLC groups served an important role in helping faculty examine their position as a faculty member. In particular, FLC groups created by topic enjoyed a collegiality that was expressed through learning and teaching about learning and teaching.[140] The format of the FLC group encouraged faculty to discuss among peers their own teaching and learning while providing opportunities for immediate feedback.

Within small colleges, the literature encouraged a mixture of both individual and group faculty development practices because of the diverse responsibilities of a small

---

[136]Don Haviland, Shin Seon-Hi, and Steve Turley, "Now I'm Ready: The Impact of a Professional Development Initiative on Faculty Concerns with Program Assessment," *Innovation of Higher Education* 35 (2010): 261-75; Athey and Hoffman, "The Master Teacher Initiative"; Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship"; Cox, "Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities"; Marshall, "Learning about Teaching"; MacKenzie et al., "Faculty Experience"; Phelps and Waalkes, "Christian Friendship"; Intrator and Kunzman, "Starting with the Soul"; Laurie Richlin and Milton D. Cox, "Developing Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning through Faculty Learning Communities," *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 124-35.

[137]Cox, "Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities," 368.

[138]Lueddeke, "Professionalizing Teaching Practice," 223.

[139]Richlin and Cox, "Developing Scholarly Teaching," 133.

[140]Marshall, "Learning about Teaching," 30; Cox, "Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities"; Cox, "Fostering the Scholarship," 178.

college faculty member. These practices included assisting teachers to become reflective, critical practitioners, value diversity in teaching styles, and attempt to create a culture in which teaching and scholarship are equally supported.[141]

The literature identified FLCs as a helpful means to increase satisfaction of faculty, improve learning and teaching skill, and assist faculty in feeling a sense of belonging, while also helping individual institutions transform into learning communities. Although the literature shows an increasing involvement by faculty development directors and universities, little research exists concerning the unique factors represented in Christian higher education.

Faculty Development Program Assessment

Without exception, institutions are demanding more accountability from faculty. Teaching performance, research productivity, accreditation standards and criteria, and adaptation of technological advancements are all examples of areas of scrutiny for faculty. To best respond to this accountability, higher education institutions have empowered some form of faculty development program (FDP) to assist faculty with such demands. Consequently, FDPs may be a helpful means to assist faculty with the ever-changing landscape and increasing accountability within higher education. Research has shown the impact of FDPs to be positive on a faculty member's professional and personal life.[142] Ironically, the literature bears out that research of long-term impact has not been sufficiently conducted. Nor has there been any conclusive link to a specific practice. Therefore, assessment of FDPs is critical to its ongoing presence in higher education. This section of the literature review will describe FDP assessment and examine faculty development practices in use today.

[141]Reder, "Effective Practices," 293-306.

[142]Amy M. Knight, Joseph A. Carrese, and Scott M. Wright, "Qualitative Assessment of the Long-Term Impact of a Faculty Development Program in Teaching Skills," Medical Education 41 (2007): 592.

Faculty Development Program
Assessment Context

As varied as higher education institutions are, faculty development programs are equally varied based on meeting the specific needs of the faculty and different institutions. Some programs exist to primarily serve faculty. Others exist to meet accreditation criteria, while others exist to fulfill the mission of the institution. Because of this diversity, FDPs face multiple challenges when assessing its program. First, the FDP must take into account the multiple characteristics of the faculty and institution. For instance, prior to assessment even taking place, the size of the faculty, the size of the institution, the budget created for the faculty development program, the institutional mission, the level of the faculty member, and the age of the program are just some of the characteristics that must be addressed by the FDP.[143] Second, time is a challenge to fruitful assessment.[144] Not only is it difficult to implement faculty development practices, but assessing those practices may encroach on a faculty member's schedule even more. In light of this challenge, assessment of FDPs is still an important part of faculty development because it will enable programs to specifically meet the needs of those whom they serve. Third, what purpose is the assessment serving? Typically, collecting data is critical to the accreditation process, but FDPs should be concerned with other purposes this data will serve. In light of the data being collected in a Christian college or university, how will this data specifically assist the Christian faculty member become the person best suited to train the next generation? Data should be used for more than external agencies and purposed to improve teaching and learning.[145] Finally, what

---

[143]Kathyrn M. Plank and Alan Kalish, "Program Assessment for Faculty Development," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, 135.

[144]Ibid., 139.

[145]Barbara Walvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010): 6; Catherine M. Wehlburg, "Assessment Practices Related to Student Learning," in *A Guide to Faculty Development*, 171.

specific faculty development practice will assessment encourage?

Assessment of FDPs is as critical to the success of the program as teacher assessments are to quality learning in the classroom. But assessment is not always well received.[146] In her comprehensive work, *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education*, Barbara Walvoord offers this advice,

> People don't want to "do assessment;" they want to realize a dream, improve what they're doing, or be excited by a new initiative. So when you are asked to "do assessment," link it to institutional dreams, goals, and processes that are important to the campus.[147]

Walvoord's desire is to create better practices within faculty development by putting forth assessment as the means to accomplish not only faculty development but also the preparation of student learners to become ethical decision makers and good citizens. There is much at stake if faculty development programs are not assessed.

Faculty Development Program
Assessment Described

In light of the aforementioned challenges facing the FDP, how can assessment fulfill the immense task of measuring effectiveness well and assist those in making faculty development decisions? The literature identified a key practice of successful FDP assessment was integration of assessment into the daily routine of faculty development, making it a natural part of the teaching process.[148] A helpful study in the literature was

---

[146] Haviland, Seon-Hi, and Turley, "Now I'm Ready."

[147] Walvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple*, 12.

[148] Dee L. Fink, "Innovative Ways of Assessing Faculty Development," *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 47-59; Plank and Kalish, "Program Assessment"; Knight, Carrese, and Wright, "Qualitative Assessment"; Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*; Harry Dangel and Peter Lindsay, "What Are Our Students (Really) Telling Us?" *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (May 2014): 27-33; Wolvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple*; Opre, Zaharie, and Opre, "Faculty Development"; Richard M. Feldman and Rebecca Brent, "The National Effective Teaching Institute: Assessment of Impact and Implications for Faculty Development," *Journal of Engineering Education* (April 2010): 121-34; Haviland, Seon-Hi, and Turley, "Now I'm Ready"; Wehlburg, "Assessment Practices."

Haviland, Seon-Hi, and Turley's four-part assessment workshop, which conducted an instrumental case study reporting the long-term effectiveness of faculty development and faculty members' acceptance of assessment programs. The literature identified this as "transformative assessment," where assessment becomes a part of the faculty member's already existing practices and is practiced as a faculty-owned and driven endeavor.[149] Wehlburg argues that transformative assessment respects the context and goals of individual programs, builds on existing work, captures data that are meaningful to the program faculty, and is sustainable.[150] Elsewhere Wehlburg contends that because student development is already focused on teaching and learning, faculty will be more likely to incorporate transformative assessments because it too is a focus on student learning. The literature also identified that when mentoring and FLCs value metacognition through self-reflection and self-learning, assessment of teaching and student learning naturally is embedded into their courses.[151] This assessment supports successful FDP self-assessment in a teacher's daily routine. FDP assessment, like all assessment, is intended to shape practice and culture within an institution and can become a central determinant in the planning of ongoing faculty development.[152]

Satisfaction of Faculty as Assessment

Central to the argument that mentoring as faculty development can be detrimental to faculty is the thought that faculty do not desire enhancement or do not

---

[149]Haviland, Seon-Hi, and Turley, "Now I'm Ready," 264; Wehlburg, "Assessment Practices," 179.

[150]Catherine M. Wehlburg, *Promoting Integrative and Transformative Assessment: A Deeper Focus on Student Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008): 170.

[151]Harry Hubball, Anthony Clarke, and Andrea L. Beach, "Assessing Faculty Learning Communities," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 95-96.

[152]Schroeder and Associates, *Coming in from the Margins*, 3-5; Wehlburg, "Assessment Practices," 147.

benefit from these relationships.[153] In his study regarding administration and faculty satisfaction in private Christian higher education, Ralph Schroder indicated a noticeable amount of variance from faculty and administration satisfaction in Christian higher education. The most variance in the study was based on factors that include salary, working conditions, and achievement. However, the highest level of satisfaction came from personal growth and religious commitment. Therefore, if FDPs can provide satisfaction to faculty, mentoring that promotes personal growth and encourages religious commitment may be the tool to best accomplish this task.[154] Schroder recommended that as a model predictor, "FDPs should facilitate opportunities for professional and personal development (including time for reflection on personal and professional goals, opportunities for networking, role changes, and continuous education)."[155]

A key assessment practice dealt with faculty satisfaction of the FDP and the impact it had on the faculty member's professional and personal life. The literature revealed favorable outcomes with respect to the satisfaction of faculty members, but little research had been done to go beyond measuring satisfaction, particularly in the context of faculty mentoring other faculty in Christian higher education.

Knight, Carrese, and Wright conducted quantitative research followed by a qualitative analysis hoping to bridge this post event assessment gap.[156] Their research set out to identify the long-term impact of FDPs. Their research discovered that FDPs that include mentoring and FLCs have a broader and more substantial positive impact on faculty than previously thought. Their study revealed 83 percent of faculty characterized

---

[153]Fink, "Innovative Ways"; Knight, Carrese, and Wright, "Qualitative Assessment"; O'Sullivan and Irby, "Reframing Research"; Plank and Khalish, "Program Assessment"; Haviland, Seon-Hi, and Turley, "Now I'm Ready"; Feldman and Brent, "The National Effective Teaching Institute"; Opre, Zaharie, and Opre, "Faculty Development."

[154]Hubball, Clarke, and Beach, "Assessing Faculty Learning Communities," 87-88.

[155]Schroder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment," 93.

[156]Knight, Carrese, and Wright, "Qualitative Assessment," 595-98.

the FDP as having "a lot of impact" on the personal and professional life. However, this research did not consider the unique aspect of Christian faculty mentoring other Christian faculty.

Four primary outcomes were discovered in the study: (1) intrapersonal development, which led to a personal commitment to reflect, set goals, and become more organized; (2) interpersonal development, characterized by healthier relationships across personal and professional contexts, improved communication skills with colleagues, improved ability to provide feedback to peers, and better conflict management skills; (3) development as a teacher, evidenced through improved teaching skills and abilities, confidence boost as a teacher, greater enjoyment as a teacher, and a continuance of an implementation of methods learned in FDPs; (4) career development, characterized through perceived benefits from exposure to FDP and other peers, influence of career path, and new opportunities due to expertise gained.[157]

Intrator and Kunzman note that effective FDPs result in significant growth. They contend that the following outcomes evidence faculty approval of professional development: showed a renewed sense of passion for their work, fostered hospitable learning environments for student learning, devoted more time to framing better questions and listening to students, renewed core beliefs about students and teaching, took on leadership roles, and deepened their appreciation for collegial relationships.[158] Felder and Brent also conducted research assessing the National Effective Teaching Institute. They too discovered a high satisfaction rate among faculty who had participated in FDP workshops.[159] Their study revealed a 79 percent "excellent" rating when faculty members were provided the opportunity to rate FDPs. Other research conducted by Ralph

---

[157]Knight, Carrese, and Wright, "Qualitative Assessment," 595-98.

[158]Intrator and Kunzman, "Starting with the Soul," 41.

[159]Feldman and Brent, "The National Effective Teaching Institute," 127.

Schroeder regarding job satisfaction in Christian higher education revealed that faculty valued programs that enhanced relationships with peers and students and was in fact one of more significant sources of job satisfaction.[160] Although a helpful and meaningful assessment for FDPs, Fink acknowledged that more must be done by going beyond measuring participant reaction or satisfaction to include "the extent to which development experiences improve the professor's teaching practices so that improvement in student engagement and student learning are accomplished."[161]

Future of Faculty Development in Higher Education

What is the future of faculty development? What direction should faculty development consider to best adapt to a world characterized by uncertainty, unpredictability, challenges, and contestability.[162] This section of the literature review will synthesize the future of faculty development by describing the current context and the ideal culture of faculty development.

The Current Context of
Faculty Development

Faculty development is a critical piece to the educational puzzle and should be considered a strategic means to address the issues noted hereafter. However, when surveyed, chief academic offices reported that less than 20 percent of faculty used academic release time to achieve faculty development or had used the appropriated funds for faculty development.[163] The context of faculty development is characterized by change in faculty structure, financial limitations, student diversity, lack of community, and rapid technological advancements. The following challenges were synthesized from

---

[160]Schroder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment," 81-97.

[161]Fink, "Innovative Ways," 48.

[162]Lueddeke, "Professionalizing Teaching Practice," 223.

[163]McKee, Johnson, and Tew, "Professional Development," 15-20.

the literature depicting the current context of faculty development in higher education.

Change in faculty structure. The structural changes taking place in faculty development can be described by the multiple, complex roles that faculty are being called on to assume in institutions. The research of Austin et al., identifies this as one of the top three issues facing faculty today.[164] Traditional roles included teaching, research, and service; however, today's faculty member is expected to improve student learning through the use of technology, assume roles in the management of departments, engage leadership development, participate in research while fulfilling these responsibilities, and spend more time in the classroom teaching.[165] Responding to this challenge will be critical to adequately support teachers who lack preparation from many doctoral programs.[166]

Financial limitations. Higher education institutions face a serious challenge in the increasing cost of education. Austin and Sorcinelli report that because the economic climate is intensifying and skepticism surrounds educational costs, there will be fiscal pressure added to every higher education institution.[167] This limitation has already resulted in institutions reducing budgets of all departments and administrators requiring efficiency and higher accountability in FDPs. With the increased pressure, FDPs must either seek revenue from outside sources or adapt to the difficult requirements set by the institution.

---

[164]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*, 105.

[165]Laurie Richlin and Amy Essington, "Overview of Faculty Learning Communities," *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 25-39; Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development," 85-96; Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*; Ouellett, "Overview of Faculty Development"; Schroder and Associates, *Coming in from the Margins*; Lueddeke, "Professionalizing Teaching Practice."

[166]Richlin and Essington, "Overview of Faculty Learning Communities," 149.

[167]Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development," 86.

Student diversity. Because higher education is more available to students, the demographics of students have changed considerably compared to higher education in the past. Today's student population varies in age, race, economic stature, religious background, and academic experience. This reality presents a serious challenge to FDPs to ensure that the needs of this diverse population are met. Underprepared students represent one of the greatest challenges in student diversity. Faculty developers and faculty questioned in Sorcinelli's research identified the lack of student preparation as a top priority for FDPs to address in development.[168] FDPs have an important task in empowering and enabling faculty to fulfill their passion and purpose as a teacher rather than allowing students and the challenges that diversity brings to discourage or threaten institutional standards of excellence. The literature clearly argued that FDPs are one of the solutions in addressing this educational challenge.

Lack of community. The literature identified a need for FDPs to integrate enhancement and enrichment activities across personal and professional lines. Because today's faculty member is expected to fulfill such complex responsibilities there is less time to enjoy collegial friendships, engage in professional learning and enrichment communities, or for Christian education time to develop Christian friendships with other Christians.

Technology.[169] The challenge that faces faculty is no longer, "should I use technology?" but rather, "how much should I use technology?" In the past, this shift was evidenced by the stark contrast of a student's dependence on technology and a faculty

---

[168]Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development," 115.

[169]Richlin and Essington, "Overview of Faculty Learning Communities"; Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development"; Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*; Ouellett, "Overview of Faculty Development"; Schroder and Associates, *Coming in from the Margins*; Lueddeke, "Professionalizing Teaching Practice"; Kuhlenschmidt, "Issues in Technology and Faculty Development," 259-74.

member's resistance to use technology. Challenges include social media, constant availability, instant communication, blurred relational lines with students, online teaching, the internet, and the pace of work that technology affords. Currently though, faculty members are increasingly willing to learn, employ, and assimilate technological practices into their curricula.[170] This reality presents a serious challenge to FDPs in navigating technological innovations while also preparing faculty to remain confident in their technology use.[171]

The Future to Be Cultivated

Faculty development sits within an existing culture of higher education that in many ways stands apart from faculty development's influence. However, the literature identified components that can be instrumental in creating an academic culture for faculty development to flourish. Central to the success of higher education institutions will be the culture of support for faculty created and fostered through FDPs.

The faculty development culture cannot be generic. FDPs must incorporate development for the diverse culture that faculty represent including development focused on institutional type: based on religion, size of student population and faculty, private versus public, and research or strictly undergraduate; faculty member's career stage: new faculty, mid-career faculty, or tenured; type of faculty member: adjunct, online, full-time, part-time, and blended traditional and online; and the various disciplines of teaching represented.

The faculty development culture must be innovative. FDPs must be willing to include the latest advancements in teaching and learning practices while existing within financial constraints of the institution. Research reveals that innovation in FDPs structure

---

[170]Ouellett, "Overview of Faculty Development," 11.

[171]Eugene R. Rice, Mary D. Sorcinelli, and Anne E. Austin, *Heeding New Voices: Academic Careers for a New Generation* (Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education, 2000).

and how FDPs will operate within the institution will enable faculty development to continue to meet the individual needs of the institution and faculty member.[172] Innovations will need to include the way faculty development is transmitted,[173] interdisciplinary benefits evidenced in the success of FLCs,[174] influence of technology, changing landscape of a diverse student population, and new knowledge and skill of teachers.

The faculty development culture must strive for campus-wide acceptance. No single part of an institution can address the current educational challenges alone[175] and in light of the aforementioned challenges, FDPs are positioned to impact organizational change possibly better than other departments.[176] Austin and Sorcinelli's extensive research concludes that FDPs "constitute a strategic lever for institutional excellence and quality, and a critically important tool for fostering institutional readiness and change in response to the array of complex demands facing universities and colleges."[177] This acceptance will require increased FDP research, inter-department collaboration, the support of institutional leadership, new thinking about ideal structures, professionalization of faculty development as a respectable discipline, and attempts for faculty developers to assume stronger leadership roles in the institution.[178]

---

[172]Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development," 94-95.

[173]Ibid., 93.

[174]Richlin and Essington, "Overview of Faculty Learning Communities," 150.

[175]Catherine E. Frerichs et al., "Leading from the Middle: A Faculty Development Center at the Heart of Institutional Change," in Schroeder and Associates, *Coming in from the Margins*, 143.

[176]Ibid.; Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*; Richlin and Essington, "Overview of Faculty Learning Communities"; McKee and Tew, "Setting the Stage"; Schuman et al., "Cocreating Value"; Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development."

[177]Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development," 95.

[178]Catherine E. Frerichs, Diana G. Pace, and Tamara Rosier, "Leading from the Middle"; Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*"; Richlin and Essington, "Overview of Faculty Learning Communities"; McKee and Tew, "Setting the Stage Teaching"; Schuman et al., "Cocreating

The faculty development culture must be collaborative. Future FDPs must look to foster collaborative efforts among all stakeholders within the institution and resist the notion that autonomy is acceptable.[179] According to Austin et al., the general history of faculty development likens the current age of faculty development as the "Age of Network."[180] The Age of Network is described by Austin et al., as the time when faculty, developers, and institutional leaders must cooperatively work together to have impact on student learning and to meet the increasing pressure mounting from a lack of funding and increased accountability. It is in this "age" that faculty development must work in an interdepartmental manner, serving faculty and fulfilling its obligation to perform well. Three areas will most impact the collaborative efforts of FDPs: how to meet the needs of the various stages of the faculty; addressing the needs of a diverse student population; and balancing development with the multiple roles of teaching, learning, and scholarship. Austin et al., eloquently summarizes this collaborative culture of faculty development and institutional leadership that must exist in higher education: "Both institutional leaders and professionals in the field of faculty development must think carefully about what purposes faculty development should serve and what forms it should take as the 21st century unfolds."[181]

Definitions

The following section identifies important terms to understanding the context and research of faculty development. Included in this section are programs, organizations, models, and instruments related to the field of faculty development.

Value"; Austin and Sorcinelli, "The Future of Faculty Development."

[179]Lueddeke, "Professionalizing Teaching Practice," 224.

[180]Austin et al,. *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*, 2-5.

[181]Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development,* 157.

Assessment. Assessment consists of a series of decisions that the person(s) doing the assessment must make.[182]

Best mentoring practices. Those practices that increase the overall effectiveness of the institution while nurturing the faculty members participating in the mentoring process.[183]

Christian higher education. Cunningham describes this term:

Degree granting institutions which provide formal schooling following graduation from high school. Christian higher education schools provide education from a worldview that is based on the values and teachings of orthodox Judeo-Christianity as recorded in the Protestant Bible. Christian faculty believe that Jesus is God; that He was born into a human family and took on human form without losing His divinity, His God-nature; lived a sinless life on earth; died on a cross; came to life again and returned to heaven.[184]

Enhancement. Faculty development activities that engage faculty in personal reflection and improvement.

Enrichment. Faculty development practices that intend to bring about individual change from within the person.[185] Enrichment practices are described as those practices that promote self-reflection, leading the faculty member to focus on their own learning processes.[186]

---

[182]Fink, "Innovative Ways," 48.

[183]Guskey, *Evaluating Professional Development*, 16, writes, "Those processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might, in turn, improve the learning of students. In some cases, it also involves learning how to redesign educational structures and cultures." However, for a private Christian postsecondary institution this definition must include a spiritual dynamic. Therefore, a hybrid definition using Guskey and Cunningham is used for this thesis. Cunningham identifies successful mentoring when a mentor is seen as someone who guides, teaches, and influences another within the same profession.

[184]Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships," 8

[185]Korthagen, "Professional Learning"; Stabile and Ritchie, "Clarifying the Differences," 79.

[186]York-Barr et al., *Reflective Practice*, 67-68.

Faculty development. This term describes the multiple tasks and areas of expertise of the faculty developer seeking to develop the teaching and learning skills of the teacher.

Faculty Learning Communities (FLC). FLCs exist to develop and foster growth, particularly with regard to teaching.[187] Generally, there are two types of FLCs: cohort and topic based.[188]

Faculty member. A person hired to teach in a full-time capacity at the university level.

Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (IRMS). Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale is described as one of the most psychometrically sound measure of intrinsic/extrinsic religious commitment.[189]

Mentoring. Cunningham describes this term:

> Relational interaction between two people which one knows something, the mentor, transfers that something (advice, wisdom, information, emotional support, protection, link to resources, career guidance, status) to someone else, the mentoree, at a sensitive time so that it impacts development.[190]

Teaching circles. Teaching circles are comprised of six to eight faculty members who gather around a topic of interest for a predetermined amount of time to engage in faculty development practices.[191]

The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD Network). The POD Network was formed in 1974 to support faculty development and organizational improvements initiatives.[192]

---

[187]Holmes and Kozlowski, "Faculty Experience," 35.

[188]Lee, "Program Types and Prototypes," 28.

[189]Schroder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment," 87.

[190]Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships," 7.

[191]Lee, "Program Types and Prototypes," 27.

[192]McKee and Tew, "Setting the Stage," 16.

Transformative assessment. This assessment becomes a part of the faculty member's already existing practices.[193] Transformative assessment respects the context and goals of individual programs, builds on existing work, captures data that are meaningful to the program faculty, and is sustainable.

Conclusion

What is the current status of research being conducted to mature and expand faculty development in Christian higher education? This question was answered through examining four primary categories: faculty development in higher education and where it stands today, training best practices in the field of faculty development, faculty development program assessment, and a look at the future of faculty development.

Within the current context of faculty development, this literature review explored the evolution of faculty development and the ongoing changes the discipline is experiencing. This ongoing evolution has led to certain structural changes that have emerged to represent current faculty development programs. Currently, research unique to faculty development in Christian higher education is not robust.

Second, training best practices were examined in higher education. A debate within the field emerged in light of terminology and purpose. Two types of faculty development in this literature were identified as effective training practices: individual development through enrichment and enhancement and group training through mentoring practices and FLCs. The literature revealed a favorable consensus among faculty developers toward FLC and their effectiveness as a training best practice.

Third, assessment of the faculty development program was addressed in this review. Within this portion of the review, assessment was defined, described, and demonstrated tremendous impact on training best practices selected by an institution.

---

[193] Haviland, Seon-Hi, and Turley, "Now I'm Ready," 264; Wehlburg, "Assessment Practices," 179.

Finally, the future of faculty development is bright. This literature review examined the culture that can exist to effectively serve both institutional mission and faculty development when training best practices are observed.

In light of the literature review, faculty development in Christian higher education would benefit from focused research regarding training best practices within the context of Christian colleges and universities. Research needs to be conducted examining the impact of faculty development in Christian higher education.

Research Hypothesis

Christian higher education requires faculty development that considers the unique calling of the faculty member, the unique context the faculty member works within, and the unique responsibilities the faculty member shares. The literature shows no current research relating to the practices of mentoring as development in Christian higher education contexts, the health of mentoring relationships, or the institutional priority for mentoring in CCCU member schools.

Because a gap exists in preparing Christian higher education faculty for this ever-changing educational climate, the following research hypothesis is proposed: Christian higher education institutions who emphasize the practice of mentoring as faculty development are more likely to create opportunities for faculty to enhance teaching skill, nurture spiritual health, ask questions, and seek the career guidance often needed.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this thesis was to gather quantitative and qualitative data that examines mentoring in Christian higher education institutions among full-time faculty. Despite the volume of existing literature, little is known about mentoring among faculty in Christian higher educational contexts. Additionally, when examining the literature it became evident that members of Christian higher education faculty are unique from secular undergraduate and postgraduate faculty, and therefore should be given specific attention when research is being conducted.[1]

Chapter 1 of this thesis introduced the research problem and explored the unique characteristics of faculty in Christian higher education. Unique characteristics that differentiate Christian faculty from secular faculty include the unique mission of the institution where they instruct, the sense of calling Christian faculty members generally possesses, and the assumed responsibility of nurturing and discipling one another and their students. Simply stated, there is a need for research to be conducted examining the impact of mentoring between faculty members in Christian higher education.

---

[1]Matthew P. Phelps and Scott Waalkes, "Christian Friendship as Faculty Development: A Narrative Account," *Journal of Education and Christian Belief* 13, no. 2 (2009): 125-39; Ron Penner, "Mentoring in Higher Education," *Directions* 30, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 45-52; Samuel T. Logan, Jr., "Faculty Development: An Organic Perspective," *Theological Education* 31, no. 2 (1995): 27-36; Ralph Schroeder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment for Faculty and Administrators of a Private Christian University," *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, no. 17 (2008): 81-97; Shelly Cunningham, "Who's Mentoring the Mentors? The Discipling Dimension of Faculty Development in Christian Higher Education," *Theological Education* 34, no. 2 (Spring 1998): 31-49; James A. Sweezy, "Faculty Sense of Religious Calling at a Christian University," *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 18 (2009): 316-32; Hokyung Paul Kang, "Perceptions and Experience of Transformative Learning and Faculty Authenticity among North American Professors of Christian Education (NAPCE)," *Christian Education Journal* 10 (2013): 339-59.

Chapter 2 of this thesis reviewed literature in four main categories: faculty development as it stands today, training best practices in faculty development, faculty development program assessment, and the future of faculty development. Within the current context of faculty development in Christian higher education, the literature review explored the evolution of mentoring as faculty development. This ongoing evolution has led to certain structural changes that have emerged to represent current formal mentoring programs. At present, there is little specific research in the area of faculty development at Christian higher educational institutions. Therefore, faculty development in Christian higher education would benefit from focused research regarding mentoring among faculty within the context of Christian colleges and universities.

This chapter describes the methodology this study used to gather and analyze data, and discover consensus on mentoring among full-time faculty in Christian higher education. This chapter is arranged by the subsequent categories: design overview, population, sample, delimitations, limitations of generalizations, instrumentation, and procedures.

Purpose Statement

This study was designed to explain the nature of mentoring among faculty within Christian higher education, the issues undergirding these practices, and the benefits, if any, of implementing such practices.

Design Overview

To answer the research questions, this study used mixed-methods procedures for collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in the research process within a single study.[2] This study was a replication of an original study first

---

[2]Paul D. Leedy and Jeanne Ellis Ormrod, *Practical Research: Planning and Design*, 10th ed. (Boston: Pearson, 2013), 260.

conducted by Sands, Parson, and Duane in 1991 at a public university in the midwest.[3] In 1996, Cunningham adapted the study to report on the nature of mentoring in Christian higher education.[4] To extend this research, it was determined that an explanatory sequential design would best fit the research needs,[5] which means that quantitative data was collected first, then analyzed, followed by the qualitative phase that was constructed from the analysis of quantitative data, and then concluded with the interpretation of the qualitative. [6]

The explanatory sequential study determination emerged for two reasons. This design best reported aspects of mentoring that are currently being practiced by faculty in Christian higher education. This design reported various factors perceived by faculty in Christian higher education to be significant in mentoring relationships.

In the case of this thesis, the first phase adapted the descriptive study of Cunningham[7] examining perceptions of mentoring among full-time faculty members of CCCU schools and further examined the quantitative data by conducting semi-structured interviews with volunteer participants during the qualitative phase.

Research Question Synopsis

The following questions guided the collection and analysis of this study.

1. What is the nature of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education institutions?

2. Do Christian higher education institutions prioritize mentoring as a faculty development practice based on current understanding of the research?

---

[3]Roberta G. Sands, L. Alayne Parson, and Josann Duane," Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University," *The Journal of Higher Education* 62, no. 2 (1991): 174-93.

[4]Michelle M. Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships among Faculty Members in Christian Higher Education" (Ed.D. diss., Talbot School of Theology, 1996).

[5]John W. Creswell and Vicki L Plano-Clark, *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, 2nd ed. (Los Angeles: SAGE, 2011), 110.

[6]Leedy and Ormrod, *Practical Research*, 260.

[7]Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships."

3.   What activities are practiced in faculty mentoring relationships?

4.   What differences exist between the rank of the mentor and the rank of the protégé?

5.   What conditions might impact the development of mentoring relationships among faculty?

Population

Because this study sought to explain the nature of mentoring among faculty within Christian higher education, the population consisted of full-time faculty members at confessional Christian liberal arts colleges or universities. For this study, confessional was defined as "educational institutions that entail a Christian environment as it relates to community and curriculum, guided and governed by a Protestant-evangelical statement of faith."[8] The selected institutions were committed to building and supporting a Christian faculty that reflect Christ-centered values and a desire to transform lives by faithfully relating scholarship and service to a biblical theology.

Sample

The research involved purposive sampling of universities and colleges that represent four-year Christian institutions. The purposive sampling for this study was drawn from CCCU member schools that have self-identified with the Protestant tradition according to the Integrated Postsecondary Date System (IPEDS)[9] and are committed to a confessional, Protestant-evangelical statement of faith. The list represents a total of 120 potential schools.[10]

---

[8]John David Trentham, "Epistemological Development in Pre-Ministry Undergraduates: A Cross Institutional Application of the Perry Scheme" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012), 18.

[9]International Affairs Office, US Department of Education, "Organization of U.S. Education: Tertiary Institutions," accessed September 6, 2015. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/international/usnei/us/postsec-inst.doc.

[10]Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, "About the CCCU," accessed July 27, 2015, http://www.cccu.org/about.

Table 1. CCCU selected institutions

Name of Institution	Geographical Location
Anderson University	Anderson, South Carolina
Arizona Christian University	Phoenix, Arizona
Bluefield College	Bluefield, Virginia
Bryan College	Bryan, Tennessee
Campbellsville University	Campbellsville, Kentucky
Corban University	Salem, Oregon
Covenant College	Lookout Mountain, Georgia
Dordt College	Sioux Center, Iowa
Hannibal- La Grange University	Hannibal, Missouri
Howard Payne University	Brownwood, Texas
Houston Baptist University	Houston, Texas
John Brown University	Siloam Springs, Arkansas
Judson University	Elgin, Illinois
Missouri Baptist University	Saint Louis, Missouri
Oklahoma Baptist University	Shawnee, Oklahoma
San Diego Christian College	Santee, California
Shorter University	Rome, Georgia
Taylor University	Anderson, Indiana
Trinity Christian College	Palos Heights, Illinois

Of the 120 CCCU institutions, 32 institutions meeting the selected criteria were invited to be a part of the study. Based on purposive sampling, the potential population size was 2,803 full time faculty. From the selected population of 32 institutions, initially 5 institutions (16 percent) agreed to participate in the study while 13 schools (40 percent) declined and 14 institutions (44 percent) did not respond. Using only the institutions that agreed to participate, the new population would have been 285 full-time faculty, thus requiring only 164 returned surveys to meet the statistical requirements to gain a 95 percent confidence interval. Because this representative sample would not meet an adequate sample size, I began pursuing full-time faculty from the selected non-responding institution's websites. Through this final effort, I was able to acquire email addresses in order to increase the population to include 19 institutions. This effort increased the research population to 1,405[11] full-time faculty members. To acquire an

---

[11]College Factual, "2016 College Comparison," accessed March 11, 2016,

adequate representative sample, it was determined that the sample size would need to be 302 to gain enough usable returns to meet statistical requirements. The desired research sample proportion was within + or - .05 of the population proportion with a 95 percent confidence level.

Delimitations

Several delimitations shaped the design of this study. First, the population of this study was limited to include only full-time faculty at four-year Christian higher education institutions from the Protestant-evangelical tradition. Although training schools, Bible colleges, and mission institutes exist and are often considered Christian higher education, this study intentionally did not consider input from these schools.

Second, this explanatory sequential study was limited to the nature of mentoring based on research conducted among full-time faculty engaged in peer-to-peer mentoring relationships at Protestant-evangelical CCCU schools. This study was not open to administration that participated in development unless there was an overlap in the faculty/administrative position. Although mentoring relationships exist between faculty and students, this study focused only on those relationships that exist among peers within the institution.

Third, questions 4 to 10 were delimited to those subjects who had participated in a mentoring relationship within the context of a CCCU member school.

Fourth, the qualitative portion of this study focused solely on the input from faculty on the topic of faculty mentoring in Christian higher education.

Limitations of Generalizations

The focus of this explanatory sequential study may limit its generalizations to the areas of full-time faculty, mentoring relationships, Protestant-evangelical four-year

www.collegefactual.com.

schools. Because this study was aimed at full-time faculty members employed at confessional Christian liberal arts colleges or universities, this research may not generalize to faculty in all higher education institutions.

The second limitation of generalization is based upon the homogenous group characterized by a "like-faith[12]" that is representative of evangelical Christianity. Christian faculty believe that Jesus is God; that He was born into a human family and took on human form without losing His divinity, His God-nature; lived a sinless life on earth; died on a cross; came to life again and returned to heaven. This "like-faith" limitation goes beyond a worldview to include a personal relationship with Jesus Christ. Generalization may not occur among faculty who do not fall into this "like-faith" category within evangelical Christianity.[13]

Instrumentation

This study used an adapted instrument first developed in 1991 by the research team of Sands, Parsons, and Duane.[14] The instrument was created to examine mentoring relationships among faculty at a public university. The original study was broad and included a focus on affirmative action and forms of career mentoring. In 1996, Cunningham adapted this instrument, using only sections relative to gathering information about mentoring practices.[15] The sections selected by Sands, Parsons, and

---

[12]Robert D. Woodberry et al., "The Measure of American Religious Traditions: Theoretical and Measurement Considerations," *Journal of Social Forces* 91, no. 1 (September 2012): 66. Like-faith, similar to religious tradition is a grouping of denominations and local churches that share a set of beliefs, practices, similar historical roots and organizational ties that distinguish them from other religious groups.

[13]Ibid., 65-66. This definition argues that although meanings may change over time, evangelical Christianity can be denoted by specific religious affiliations, doctrinal markers, or religious movements.

[14]Sands, Parson, and Duane, "Faculty Mentoring," 174-93.

[15]Permission to use and modify the survey was granted by Sands, Parson, and Duane on November 16, 2015. Permission to use and modify the adapted instrument was granted by Cunningham on November 14, 2015. See appendix 10 for written permissions.

Duane were (1) demographic and academic information: sex, age, faculty rank, tenure status, minority status, and college parental/familial/household responsibilities; (2) mentoring experiences: personal definition of mentor, personal experience as a mentor or mentee, functions of mentor, gender match, reasons for becoming a mentor, reasons (if any) for not selecting a mentor, how the mentoring relationship started, responsibilities for mentoring, obstacles to mentoring, problems and barriers; (3) conditions that may inhibit the development of supportive relationships with colleagues. Cunningham sectioned the study as Demographic and Academic Information, Mentoring Experiences, and Career Pressures.

The original study of Sands, Parson, and Duane[16] utilized a list of 29 activities related to mentoring practices. This study rated these activities using a Likert scale from "1" (not very important) to "5" (very important). The adapted study by Cunningham used this list and extended it by adding 6 functions that related to discipleship as mentoring. The added functions were

1. Help in integrating biblical principles with teaching, research, and scholarship.

2. Involvement in studying the Bible with mentee

3. Prayer support

4. Caring relationships

5. Encouragement to obey the teachings of Jesus Christ as evidenced in the Bible

6. Affirmation about how God is working in the mentee's life.

Additional adaptations to the original instrument included conditions suggested by faculty in pre-test interviews by Cunningham. The added conditions include

1. No prior experience in a mentoring relationship

2. Individualistic/competitive mindset in academe

3. Emphasis on being experts

4. No intentional development or formal training programs for new faculty

---

[16]Sands, Parson, and Duane, "Faculty Mentoring Faculty," 174-93.

5. Unsure of how to mentor

6. Fear of opening up to another person in an honest way

7. High task performance expectations leave little time for developing personal relationships

8. Humility and freedom to admit weakness is discouraged

9. Lack of awareness about the mentoring process

10. Lack of knowledge about the mentoring process

11. Academic "professional aura" blocks intimacy

12. No institutional value placed on mentoring

13. Lack of organized, formal mentoring program in place

14. Not stated as part of school mission statement or purpose statement.

Phase 1 of this study utilized Cunningham's instrument[17] reflecting the literature of this thesis and the purpose of this study.

Phase 2 of this study applied a semi-structured interview protocol among five participants who expressed interest in the field of mentoring.[18] The represented disciplines of the interviewees were religion, professional studies, and arts and humanities. The semi-structured interview protocol explored the perceptions and opinions of the respondents regarding complex and sometimes sensitive issues and enabled the probing for more information and clarification of answers.[19] Probing questions were used to follow the open-ended questions ensuring reliability of the data as it allowed for the clarification of interesting and relevant issues raised by the respondents; provided opportunities to explore sensitive issues; elicited valuable and complete information;

---

[17]See appendix 12.

[18]K. Louise Barriball and Allison While, "Collecting Data Using a Semi Structured Interview: A Discussion Paper," *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 19 (May 1994): 328-35.

[19]Ibid., 330.

enabled the interviewer to explore and clarify inconsistencies within respondents'
accounts; and helped respondents recall information for questions involving memory.[20]

Procedures

The procedures of this explanatory sequential study observed the guidelines
outlined by Creswell and Clark and Barriball and While.[21] Duane, Sands, and Parson's
original study utilized a descriptive design while this study collected both quantitative
and qualitative data. Both sets of data were related to each other and were not
independent.

Phase 1: Survey

To begin this study, permission was acquired by Cunningham to use the
adapted instrument from her study, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships
among Faculty Members in Christian Higher Education."[22] Then, permission was
acquired from Sands, Parsons, and Duane to use the original instrument from the study,
"Faculty Mentoring Faculty in A Public University."[23]

After the schools were identified, a thorough search of each institution's
website was conducted to determine the best path to gain access to the institution's
faculty. After this was determined, I sent an email introducing myself, explaining the
nature of the study, and requesting permission to conduct a survey among the institution's
faculty to the Chief Academic Officer, the Director of Institution Effectiveness, the
Academic Affairs Office, or the Office of the Provost. Within the email was a request for

---

[20]Barriball and While, "Collecting Data," 331.

[21]Creswell and Clark, *Designing and Conducting*, 185-87; Barriball and While, "Collecting Data," 328-35.

[22]Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships."

[23]Sands, Parson, and Duane, "Faculty Mentoring Faculty."

a response from the institution.[24] If no response was given within one month, a second email, with a copy of the original email, was sent to the corresponding administrative assistant requesting a response. After six weeks, if the institution had given no response, the researcher began pursuing full-time faculty of those selected schools through the institution's websites.

After receiving permission to conduct research by the institution or individual, I sent an email to introduce myself and explain the nature of the research, and included a request to participate with an anonymous link to the survey to share with the full-time faculty. Among those schools that did not respond, faculty member's emails were retrieved from the institution's website. I sent an email to each full-time faculty member to introduce myself and explain the nature of the research, and included a request to participate and an anonymous link to the survey. Four weeks after the initial email was sent, I sent a second email serving as a follow-up reminder to all institutions and faculty in the population.[25] This procedure resulted in a return of 288 surveys representing a return rate of 20 percent. Following similar procedures, the Cunningham study returned 287 surveys with a return rate of 47 percent.

Qualtrics survey software was used to administer the survey and to collect data. The completed surveys were recorded in a database identified only by numbers and IP addresses ensuring confidentiality. The Qualtrics software was also used to conduct the statistical analysis. As in the Cunningham study, mean scores were computed from Likert items not subjected to factor analysis. Data was also tested for significant differences using the Chi-Square Procedure.

The instrument also contained a list of 23 functions and/or activities associated with the ideal mentor. Using a Likert scale, participants rated these functions from "1"

---

[24]See appendix 5.

[25]See appendix 10.

(not at all important) to "5" (very important). Responses were subjected to factor analysis to look for mentor typology groups. Qualitative data was analyzed using the *SPSS Standard Grad Pack 23 for Students*, which then was used to inform the follow-up quantitative data collection.

Phase 2: Interviews

Because of the difficulty acquiring the necessary sample size, during phase 1, participants were invited to take part in phase 2 of this study through a qualitative semi-structured interview. Fifteen participants expressed an interest in the field of mentoring and responded to the invitation to participate in a semi-structured interview. Volunteers were contacted by email about availability and to set up an interview. The format of each interview consisted of asking participants questions taken from the quantitative instrument of the study. Open-ended questions were followed by probing questions. The open-ended questions were based upon significant results yielded by the responses to phase 1 instrumentation. Additionally, opportunities were provided for the interviewees to expand on Likert scale answers.

Following the collection of the data in the qualitative phase, manual processes were employed for analyzing the data. The recorded interviews were transcribed using Rev transcription services.[26] I used a manual content analysis procedure known as directed content analysis.[27]

The data was represented through discussions of themes and categories found in the data analysis process. Validation employed triangulation methods based on the data from the quantitative phase of this study. Additional validation involved faculty not affiliated with the research or content area of the research, but are familiar with

---

[26]Rev, accessed March 11, 2016, Rev.com.

[27]Hsiu-Fang Hsieh and Sarah E. Shannon, "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis," *Qualitative Health Research* 15, no. 9 (November 2005): 1281-82.

qualitative research methods reviewing the database and the qualitative results to confirm accuracy of the data. Finally, this data was further assessed to see if it answered the research questions and how the qualitative data helped to explain the quantitative phase.

Summary

This chapter described the methodology I used to gather data, analyze data, and discover consensus on mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education. This chapter described the methodology of the explanatory sequential design employed.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This research explored the nature, benefits (whether perceived or real) and the development of faculty in Christian higher education through mentoring. Using a mixed-methods approach, this explanatory sequential design analyzed the specific nature of mentoring among faculty members in Christian higher education, the issues undergirding these practices, and the benefits, if any, of implementing such practices. The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings of the research. Material in this chapter includes statistical analysis of the participants and analysis of the semi-structured interviews from the qualitative phase.

Compilation Protocols

Phase 1: The Survey

Phase 1 of this study used an instrument that was first developed in 1991, by the research team of Sands, Parsons, and Duane and was designed to understand mentoring relationships among faculty at a public university.[1] The Cunningham study adapted the instrument in 1996 using only specific sections relevant to gathering information about mentoring practices.[2]

Using Cunningham's adapted instrument, Qualtrics software was employed to create and distribute the survey through a shared link via electronic mail.[3] The survey

---

[1]Roberta G. Sands, L. Alayne Parson, and Josann Duane. "Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University," *The Journal of Higher Education* 62, no. 2 (1991): 174-93.

[2]Michelle M. Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships among Faculty Members in Christian Higher Education" (Ed.D. diss., Talbot School of Theology, 1996).

[3]Qualtrics, "Online Survey Software & Insight Platform," accessed June 18, 2016,

utilized Likert-type questions. The survey allowed participants to rate individual statements on their level of importance. The Likert-items were 1 "not at all important," 2 "slightly important," 3 "moderately important," 4 "very important," and 5 "extremely important." The purpose of the survey was to explore the perceptions and opinions of respondents regarding issues related to best practices of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education.

Each respondent consented to take the survey, was permitted to decline participation in this study at any point, and was free to decline any questions that the respondent did not feel comfortable with. Careful measures were taken to maintain anonymity throughout phase 1 by recording only participant's IP addresses. Respondents were given three weeks to take the survey. The research window for this study was five months. Once phase 1 answers were received, answers were recorded and analyzed using Qualtrics survey software and the *SPSS Standard Grad Pack 23 for Students* for further statistical analysis. The statistical analysis of this phase is presented using tables later in this chapter.

Phase 2: The Interview

Phase 2 of this study applied a semi-structured interview protocol.[4] The purpose of this phase was to support the exploration of the perceptions and opinions of respondents regarding complex and sensitive issues, to probe for more information, and give opportunity for clarification of answers.[5]

Respondents were asked in phase 1 if they would like to be contacted to participate in a phone interview. Of the 302 respondents, 15 responded affirmatively. The

---

http://www.qualtrics.com/.

[4]K. Louise Barriball and Allison While, "Collecting Data Using A Semi Structured Interview: A Discussion Paper," *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 19 (May 1994): 328-35.

[5]Ibid., 330.

first five respondents that were identified from unique institutions were selected to participate in phase 2.

Email invitations were sent to each respondent who had indicated a desire to be interviewed (see appendix 11). A request to provide a best available time and contact phone number was included in the invitation. Once a time and date was selected, the interview took place over the phone. Using a semi-structured interview protocol, participants were asked the same questions as in the survey, but were allowed to follow-up on comments or statements.

Recording software was used and files were transcribed. Transcriptions were analyzed for themes and coded based on their content using NVivo 11 software. First, a word frequency count was conducted and then words were analyzed according to context. Second, themes were identified within the interview transcription that fit into the categories revealed within the literature: priority of mentoring, mentoring practices, conditions that impact development, and perceptions about faculty mentoring. Themes that emerged from the interviews, but did not fit into these categories, were included as emergent data. Examples directly from the transcription of the interviews are included in the content analysis.

Synthesis of Data from Phases 1 and 2

To acquire the findings from this study, both phases served a purpose. The quantitative phase served as the central source for information, while the qualitative phase explained the data from phase 1. To report the findings from this data, I used Creswell's data analysis spiral. The interview data was specifically used as a means to explain the quantitative data further.[6] In the summary of findings section, the structure included both the survey data and the interview summaries within the answers to the following main categories: demographic data, the nature of mentoring from the

---

[6]John W. Creswell, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2007), 183.

perspective of the mentoree, the nature of mentoring from the perspective of the mentor, and findings related to the development of mentoring relationships.

Summary of Findings

Research Questions

The following research questions shaped this study:

1. What is the nature of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education institutions?

2. Do Christian higher education institutions prioritize mentoring as a faculty development practice based on current understanding of the research?

3. What activities are practiced in faculty mentoring relationships?

4. What differences exist between the rank of the mentor and the rank of the mentoree?

5. What conditions might impact the development of mentoring relationships among faculty?

Table 2. Research questions and corresponding instrumentation

Data Category	Corresponding Research Question	Corresponding Survey Questions
Demographic Data		19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26
Mentoring Data	RQ 1	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16
Mentoring Data	RQ 2	1, 9, 10, 13,
Mentoring Data	RQ 3	11, 12
Mentoring Data	RQ 4	5, 6,
Mentoring Data	RQ 5	17, 18

Round 1: Findings from the Survey

The first section summarizes nine specific questions on the survey identifying demographic data and characteristics. Tables and discussion are included. The following categories presented in this section are gender, age, rank, tenure status, terminal degree, length of service, college of discipline, and current responsibilities.

The second section includes survey findings regarding the nature of mentoring from the perspective of the mentoree and includes the following categories: initiation of

mentoring relationships, rank of faculty at time of being mentored, rank of mentor, gender, and hours per month spent with mentor.

The third section includes survey findings regarding the nature of mentoring from the perspective of the mentor and includes the following categories: initiation of mentoring relationships, rank of mentoree, rank of mentor, gender, hours per month spent with mentoree, reasons for becoming a mentor.

The final section includes survey findings related to the development of mentoring relationships and includes the following categories: considerations in developing mentoring relationships, uncomfortable aspects of mentoring, conditions which might affect the development of mentoring relationships, functions experienced in faculty mentoring relationships.

Round 2: Findings from the Interview

The following components represent phase 2 of the study: guidelines for selection of interview participants, guidelines for interview protocol, transcription of data, and the manual processes of content analysis used in the study that assisted with data collected from the participants interview findings.

The final question of the survey asked if participants would be willing to volunteer for a recorded, semi-structured interview. The only selection criterion was that each volunteer had to be employed by a discrete university than the other interviewees. Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded into the four main categories of the survey.

I used a manual content analysis procedure following Hsieh and Shannon's directed content analysis method.[7] This method allowed me to validate and extend

---

[7]Hsiu-Fang Hsieh and Sarah E. Shannon, "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis," *Qualitative Health Research* 15, no. 9 (November 2005): 1281-82.

Cunningham's framework and theory. The manual process of direct content analysis consisted of

1. Identifying key concepts as initial coding categories

2. Determining operational definitions for each category from the Cunningham study

3. Coding transcriptions with pre-determined codes. The researcher specifically analyzed the data by pre-determined coding themes and categories from the Cunningham study, assigning labels to each unit within the data. Data that could not be determined is represented in new categories or sub-categories of an existing code

4. Using the findings to offer either support or non-supporting evidence for the theory.

Demographic Data

The survey contained eight questions that revealed characteristics of the survey participants. The following discussion and tables summarize these findings.

Gender, question 25. As shown in table 3, out of 288 surveys, 285 people indicated their gender. In the Cunningham study, gender representation was consistent with the characteristics of the Christian College Coalition—the population of the original study. However, in this study, the gender representation did not parallel the characteristics of the CCCU population as research indicates the majority of faculty are male (60 percent).[8]

Table 3. Frequency distribution according to gender

Study	Thomas		Cunningham	
Group	n	%	n	%
Female	134	47	98	35
Male	151	53	184	65
	N=285	100	N=282	100

[8]Samuel Joeckel and Thomas Chesnes, "The Challenge of Gender Equity within the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities," *Christian Higher Education* 8, no. 2 (2009): 115; Vicki D. McBride Cleveland, Neil F. McBride, and Mark A. Wyatt, "The State of Higher Education among Baptist Colleges and Universities," *A Research Study by California Baptist University* (2013): 50.

Age, question 24. As shown in table 4, out of 288 surveys, 283 participants indicated their age. The responses ranged from a maximum age of 75 years old to a minimum age of 27 years old (N=281). By comparison, the mean of the sample was 49 years old. The Cunningham study ranged from a minimum age of 28 years old to a maximum age of 72 years old. The mean of the sample was 48 years of age.

Table 4. Age demographic findings

Age Bracket	Count	Percentage
27-36	45	16
37-46	75	27
47-56	72	25
57-66	73	26
67+	16	6
N=281		100

Rank, question 19. The survey requested faculty members to indicate their rank at their current academic institution. Using a four-level rank system shown in table 5, from the 287 responses, the level with the fewest faculty (13 responses) was the Instructor rank. The next lowest number was the Associate Professor rank (66 responses). The final categories paralleled the original study by almost totaling an equal number of responses respectively (Assistant Professor, 100 responses; Professor, 108 responses).

Table 5. Frequency distribution by rank

Group	n	%
Professor	108	38
Assistant Professor	100	35
Associate Professor	66	23
Instructor	13	5
N=287		100

Tenure status, question 20, 21. Of the 287 faculty members that responded to the question regarding tenure status, 83 (29 percent) indicated they were tenured while

204 (71 percent) indicated they were not in a tenured position. Of those subjects not in a tenured position, 49 percent reported not being in a tenure track position, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Frequency distribution tenure status of faculty

Study	Thomas		Cunningham	
Group	n	%	n	%
Tenured	83	29	130	46
Non-tenured	204	71	153	54
	N=287	100	N=283	100

Terminal degrees, question 22. Table 7 shows that this study discovered that CCCU faculty today are more likely to have a terminal degree than they did in 1996. Of the 284 faculty members that responded to this question, the highest percentage (77 percent) had their doctorates (n=218). The remainder of the respondents (n=66) reported their highest academic degree from the master's degree level (23 percent).

Table 7. Frequency distribution terminal degrees

Study	Thomas		Cunningham	
Group	n	%	n	%
Doctorates	218	77	157	56
Master's Degree	66	23	121	43
	N=284	100	N=283	100

Length of service, question 23. Research from chapter 2 suggests that the length of service at an institution may factor in the development of mentoring relationships. In light of this, respondents were asked how long they had been at their current CCCU institution. In answer to this question, responses (n=285) ranged from less than 1 year to a maximum of 43 years. The mean number of years was 10, but the highest percentage (51 percent) of faculty have been at their current CCCU institution less than 6 years with the mode at less than three years (28 percent).

College of Discipline, question 26. Participants were provided four options to identify their college of discipline. Table 8 shows the percentages among the disciplines.

Table 8. Frequency according to college of discipline

Study	Thomas		Cunningham	
Group	n	%	n	%
Arts and Sciences	154	54	157	55
Professional Schools	99	35	96	34
Religious Studies	27	9	23	8
Other	6	2	8	3
	N=286	100	N=286	100

Each college of discipline included the following colleges: Arts and Sciences (arts, humanities, the biological sciences, mathematics and physical sciences, social and behavior sciences); Professional and Pre-Professional Schools (allied medical professionals, business, dentistry, education, engineering, law, medicine, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, social work, veterinary medicine); Religious Studies (Bible, Christian and religious education, pre-seminary and seminary studies); Other (agriculture, home economics, unspecified).

Mentoring Data

The survey contained questions that revealed the nature of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education. The following discussion and tables summarize these findings.

Prevalence of mentoring, question 1, 2, 3. Before participants were given a definition of mentoring, subjects were asked to indicate if there had been a person in the past or present who had helped or currently was helping them in their career. Table 9 shows the four categories available as a selection. Of the 287 responses, 270 respondents

(94 percent) could identify someone who fit this description, while 17 respondents (6 percent) could not identify a person who fit this description.

Table 9. Frequency of prevalence of mentoring

Group	n	%
Yes, at one time, but not now	143	50
Yes, currently	118	41
I'm not sure	9	3
No, I've never had such a person.	17	6
N=287		100

Survey question 2 offered subjects a definition of mentoring and asked according to this definition, if they had ever had a mentor.

> Mentoring is a relational interaction between two people, in which one knows something, the MENTOR, transfers that something (advice, wisdom, information, emotional support, protection, link to resources, career guidance, status, etc.) to someone else, the MENTOREE, at a sensitive time so that it impacts development.

Of the 287 respondents, 267 (93 percent) responded in the affirmative and 20 (7 percent) reported they had never had a mentor that fits this definition.

Nature of mentoring: From the mentoree's perspective. The survey began by exploring the nature of mentoring relationships from the perspective of the mentoree. Survey question 3 related only to those respondents who acknowledged their mentoring fit the description of mentor provided in the survey. This limitation narrowed the number of participants to 268. This question asked subjects to identify the rank they held at the time of the mentoring relationship. Table 10 shows the highest percentage of responses was among new faculty members at their current institution with 115 (43 percent). The next category with the highest percentage was the doctoral student level with 107 responses (40 percent). See table 10 for all the categories.

Table 10. Mentoree's position at time of mentoring commencement

Group	n	%
Faculty member at current institution	115	43
Doctoral level student	107	40
Undergraduate student	85	32
Master level student	73	27
Faculty member at another institution	60	22
Faculty member with an administrative appointment	30	11
Other	22	8
Employee	17	6
Post-doctoral appointment	13	5
N=268		

The next section in the survey (questions 4-10) asked only those participants who have, or have had, a faculty mentor while teaching at their current CCCU member institution. The total of 198 respondents (69 percent) were able to identify a faculty mentor while at their current institution.

Survey question 4. For some participants, multiple mentors could be identified at their current institution. Interviewee 2 had multiple mentors, and he commented, "I have mentors everywhere. I strongly believe in them." In response to the possibility that subjects may have had more than one mentor at their current institution, survey question 4 clarified by asking, "How did your most significant relationship begin?"

Of the 198 responses, 83 of the responses (42 percent) indicated that the mentor and the mentoree mutually initiated the mentoring relationship. Interviewee 1 noted, "It began naturally. I had two relationships like that, one with the Academic Dean that I worked with, and then with my department chair. It kind of came just by position, just because I worked under them. It was more of just a natural interaction." The category with the next highest percentage with 38 responses (19 percent) was identified as those who were assigned a mentor through departmental assignments. Interviewee 3 reported, "It was professional. For the first mentor in my first year it was a consultant who worked with us when we were developing a new program." Data from two categories were closely

aligned with 26 responses (15 percent) indicating the mentor had initiated the mentoring and 20 (10 percent) indicating that the mentoree had initiated the mentoring relationship.

Survey question 5. Participants were asked to indicate their academic rank at the time of the mentoring relationship. A four-level arrangement was used as seen in Table 11. The academic rank with the highest number of faculty was the Assistant Professor level (n=106) while the lowest number of faculty fell into the Professor level (n=9).

Table 11. Frequency distribution by rank of faculty mentoree
(when mentoring relationship began)

Group	n	%
Assistant Professor	106	56
Instructor	63	33
Associate Professor	12	6
Professor	9	5
N=190		100

Survey question 6. Subjects then identified the rank of their mentor at their current CCCU institution. Table 12 shows the four-level arrangement used in this study. The academic rank with the highest number of faculty mentors was the Professor level (n=117), while the lowest number of faculty mentors fell into the Instructor level (n=5).

Table 12. Frequency distribution by rank of faculty mentor
(when mentoring relationship began)

Group	n	%
Professor	118	62
Associate Professor	45	24
Assistant Professor	23	12
Instructor	5	3
N=191		100

The Cunningham study compared the rank of the faculty mentor and the rank of the faculty mentoree by frequency and percentage. To show reliability of the data,

table 13 shows this same analysis using a chi-square statistical analysis performed with a degree of freedom of 9 resulting in a p-value of 0.06.

Table 13. Rank of the mentor by rank of the mentoree

| | Mentor | | | | | | | |
| | Instructor | | Assistant Professor | | Associate Professor | | Professor | | |
Mentoree	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	% Totals
Instructor	5	7.94	11	17.46	12	19.05	35	55.56	100 (63)
Assistant Professor	0	0	11	10.48	27	25.71	67	63.81	100 (105)
Associate Professor	0	0	0	0	4	33.33	8	66.67	100 (12)
Professor	0	0	0	0	2	22.22	7	77.78	100 (9)
Totals	5	2.65	22	11.64	45	23.81	117	61.90	100 (189)
N=189									

Using the data that asked the rank of the mentoree and the rank of the mentor at the time of the mentoring relationship, a cross tabulation was performed comparing rank in terms of count and percentage. Similar to the Cunningham study, the majority of mentors (62 percent) in this study were at the Professor level while the majority of mentorees (64 percent) in this study were at the Assistant Professor level.

Faculty mentorees at the instructor level reported that they were most often mentored by mentors at the full Professor level (56 percent), followed by a significant decrease at the Associate Professor level (19 percent), the Assistant Professor level (17 percent), and the Instructor level (8 percent). Faculty mentorees at the Assistant Professor level reported they were most often mentored by mentors at the Professor level (64 percent). This distribution was closely associated with mentorees at the Instructor level showing significant decreasing percentages in the subsequent categories of Associate Professor (28 percent), and Assistant Professor (10 percent). From the recorded responses, there were no Assistant Professors being mentored by faculty at an equal faculty rank or

lower (0 percent). For mentorees at the Associate Professor level, the highest number of mentors came from the Professor level (67 percent). Additionally, at the Associate Professor level, the remaining responses were attributed to faculty mentors who were at an equal rank of Assistant Professor (33 percent). The final category of mentorees in the Professor level showed that mentoring from other faculty at the Professor rank was (78 percent). Interestingly, mentorees at the full Professor level (22 percent) reported that they participated in a mentoring relationship with a faculty member of a lower rank. This data may be attributed to a Professor being a new faculty member in a CCCU institution.

When survey data from this study was compared to the Cunningham study, faculty mentorees that began the relationship as an Instructor (33 percent) or Assistant Professor (56 percent) remained similar to earlier reported data. However, faculty that reported their mentoring beginning as an Associate Professor has decreased by more than 11 percent.

Rank comparisons were also cross-tabulated in response to survey questions, "What is your gender?" and "What was your rank at the time of the inception of your mentoring relationship?" As noted in table 14, both male and female participants reported that a majority of mentoring was received from mentors at the full professor level, however, when compared to one another, a significant difference (19 percent) between male and female participants was reported. Also, the percentages of mentors were more varied among male participants reporting (72 percent) at the Professor level while only (17 percent) at the Associate Professor level, (9 percent) at the Assistant Professor level, and (2 percent) at the Instructor level. The percentages of mentors were more evenly distributed among female participants reporting (53 percent) at the Professor level while only (30 percent) at the Associate Professor level, (15 percent) at the Assistant Professor level, and (3 percent) at the Instructor level. Table 14 shows this analysis using a chi-square statistical analysis with a degree of freedom of 3 showing a p-value of 0.05.

Table 14. Gender by rank of the mentor

| | Mentor | | | | | | | | |
| | Instructor | | Assistant Professor | | Associate Professor | | Professor | | |
Mentoree	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	% Totals
Male	2	2.22	8	8.89	15	16.67	65	72.22	100 (90)
Female	3	2.97	15	14.85	30	29.70	53	52.48	100 (101)
Totals	5	2.62	23	12.04	45	23.56	118	61.78	100 (191)
N=191									

Survey question 7. Participants were also asked about their mentor's gender. The percentage breakdown in table 15 shows that (77 percent) of all participants had mentors of the same gender and (23 percent) of participants had mentors of the opposite sex. When comparing the data between participants (88 percent) of men identified their mentor as the same gender while only (66 percent) of women noted this similarity. When comparing data from the semi-structured interviews, all four interviewees reported that they had a mentor of the same gender. However, interview 2 noted, "My mentor was the same gender, but I actually prefer mentors who are not because they have a completely different perspective. Most of my most helpful mentors are not the same sex as I am." Although twenty years have passed since the Cunningham study, similar differences continue to exist. The original study reported (91 percent) of male and (65 percent) of female faculty were mentored by the same gender. In light of data from this study, female faculty who are being mentored in CCCU member schools are more likely to be mentored by the opposite gender.

Table 15. Similarities between gender of mentoree and gender of mentor

| | Mentor | | | | |
| Mentoree | Same Gender | | Opposite Gender | | % Total |
	n	%	n	%	
Male	80	87.91	11	12.09	100 (91)
Female	67	66.34	34	33.66	100 (101)
Totals	147	76.56	45	23.44	100 (192)
N=192					

Survey question 8. In the next survey question, subjects were asked if their mentor shared the same racial/ethnic background as you. Of the 192 responses, (94 percent) reported having a mentor of the same racial/ethnic background, while (6 percent) reported having a mentor of a different racial/ethnic background. The mean score was 1.06 with a standard deviation of +/-0.23 as seen in table 16.

Table 16. Similarities between gender of mentoree and gender of mentor

	Mentor				
	Same Race		Different Race		% Total
	n	%	n	%	
Mentoree	181	94	11	6	100 (121)
N=192					

Survey question 9. To address the research question, "Do Christian higher education institutions prioritize mentoring as a faculty development practice based on current understanding of the research?," subjects were asked to estimate the time per month, during the academic year, they spent with their mentor. This question was motivated by research in chapter 2 that implied a necessary component for mentoring relationships to be successful was time. Table 17 shows that (55 percent) of the 192 respondents reported spending less than 5 hours per month with a mentor, (28 percent) reported spending between 5 to 10 hours per month with a mentor, while (17 percent) reported spending more than 10 hours per month with a mentor. The mean score was 1.62 with a standard deviation of +/-0.76.

Table 17. Hours per month spent with mentor

Hours	n	%
Below 5	106	55
Between 5-10	53	28
More than 10	33	17
N=192		100

Survey question 10. To further describe the mentoring relationship, subjects were asked in open-ended form to respond to the question, "What did you find most meaningful in the mentoring relationship?" In total, 255 (89 percent) of the subjects participated in this question, as table 18 illustrates.

Table 18. Key themes: What did you find most meaningful in the mentoring relationship?

Word	Count	Weighted %
Advice	31	3.44
Teaching	16	1.79
Encouragement	14	1.57
Questions	14	1.57
Wisdom	14	1.57
Experience	12	1.34
Share	11	1.23
Ability	8	0.90
Availability	7	0.78
Helping	7	0.78
Invest	7	0.78
Listening	7	0.78
Navigate	7	0.78
Guidance	7	0.78

The most frequently referred to theme was "advice." This is exemplified in the following comment, "My mentor provided confidentiality and personal advice," and "The relationship and trust that was built between the two of us was the most meaningful. I felt coming to him for advice no matter what the situation. I also appreciated the time it took for him to invest in me and helping me to become a better educator."

Another key theme identified in relationship to the development of Christian higher education faculty through mentoring was "teaching." One mentoree commented, "I could go to her with questions that I had regarding teaching in the classroom and fine arts in general," and another noted, "The advice that he gave me about teaching at the collegiate level is very helpful." And yet another stated, "[They] gave me valuable insight

90

not only into how the institution operates, but also how to structure a course most effectively for the students."

Nature of mentoring: From the mentor's perspective. The survey continued by exploring the nature of mentoring from the perspective of the mentor. Of the 288 respondents, 268 (93 percent) reported having served as a mentor to another faculty member at some point.

Survey question 13. For participants who were involved in mentoring as well, it was important to acquire data that reported how much time they invested into the mentoring relationship. Like the mentorees, mentors were asked to estimate the time per month, during the academic year, spent with a mentoree. Table 19 shows that (58 percent) reported spending less than 5 hours per month with a mentor compared to (55 percent) from the mentoree's perspective, (31 percent) reported spending between 5 to 10 hours per month with a mentor compared to (28 percent) from the mentoree's perspective, while (11 percent) reported spending more than 10 hours per month with a mentor compared to (17 percent) from the mentoree's perspective. The reported data indicates that mentors who were mentored at a CCCU member school did not veer from what they had initially experienced. The mean score was 1.53 with a standard deviation of +/-0.69.

Table 19. Hours per month spent with mentoree

Hours	n	%
Below 5	155	58
Between 5-10	83	31
More than 10	30	11
N=268		100

Survey question 14. Subjects were given a list of 10 possible reasons for becoming a mentor. The subjects were asked to determine how important each reason was using a Likert scale where 1 was "not at all important," 2 was "slightly important," 3 was

"moderately important," 4 was "very important," and 5 was "extremely important." Table 20 shows the mean scores and standard deviations reported for each reason. Extreme responses were compared to the Cunningham study and are discussed.

Table 20. Possible reasons for becoming a mentor

Reason	Mean	StD	Function
To pass on the mentoring tradition	3.59	1.18	Psychosocial
To maintain professional standards	3.26	1.10	Career
To experience satisfaction	3.16	1.16	Psychosocial
To repay past mentors	3.11	1.25	Psychosocial
To pass on my ideas or research methods to others	2.96	1.21	Career
To fulfill job responsibilities	2.88	1.12	Career
To aid women	2.74	1.37	Psychosocial
To aid minorities	2.70	1.33	Psychosocial
To recruit people for collaborative research	2.39	1.20	Career
To make friends	2.33	1.02	Psychosocial
N=279			

The literature identified that mentoring functions can be characterized by two categories: psychosocial and career functions. Each of possible reasons that showed the highest mean scores were in fact both psychosocial and career related. Table 20 shows the highest mean score reported was related to passing on the mentoring tradition. Interview respondents indicated that this was very or extremely important. Interviewee 2 stated, "Part of what you're trying to do is set an example, and you hope that other people are inspired to pass that forward." This data may indicate that faculty mentors are motivated to mentor by seeing mentoring relationships continue beyond their existing relationship. The second highest mean score reported was related to fulfilling professional standards. The interviewees ranged in the responses from "not at all important" to "extremely important." The third highest mean score was related to experiencing personal satisfaction in the mentoring relationship. Responses from the interviewees were mainly in the "moderately important" range. One comment indicated, "This may be a benefit but

not necessarily a motivator that's something that more organically happens." Similar to the Cunningham study, the highest mean scores reported also related to functions, motives, and personal satisfaction.

I performed a chi-square analysis for significant differences between each possible reason for becoming a mentor with the gender of the faculty member. Data reported in one factor was extreme. The analysis of "aiding women" as a possible reason for becoming a mentor yielded a chi-square of 24.96 with a degree of freedom of 4 yielding significance at the $p < .05$ level (p=0.00). See table 21.

Table 21. Possible reasons for becoming a mentor and gender

		Male	Female	
Aiding women as a possible reason for becoming a mentor	Not at all important	46	29	70
	Slightly important	38	18	56
	Moderately important	33	28	61
	Very important	20	33	53
	Extremely important	9	26	35
	Total	146	129	N=275

Survey question 15. The Cunningham study reported from the mentor's perspective—many mentoring relationships were mutually initiated (42 percent) and the lowest category by percentage was the mentoree initiating the relationship (8 percent). I similarly found the highest category by percentage to be mutual initiation between mentor and mentoree (46 percent), while the lowest category by percentage to be the mentoree initiating the relationship (13 percent) (see table 22).

Table 22. Initiation of mentoring relationship: From mentor's perspective

Group	n	%
Mutually initiated	121	46
Mentor initiated	57	22
Departmental assignment	50	19
Mentoree initiated	33	13
N=261		100

Interestingly, when cross-referencing comments reported in the semi-structured interviews, responses varied, representing an even distribution of experiences. Interviewee 2 commented,

> It began long before I actually even worked there. I'm one of those weird ones. I was the head of something and she had joined that something and was happy that I was doing a good job. Then, when I interviewed about my current position, she pulled me aside after the interview and kind of told me, "I'm taking you under my wing. This is how it's going to happen. Here are the things that you need to know."

Interviewee 3, representing another perspective, noted, "I think it was more sought by the mentee. Some of it was just because of the professional connections and the overlaps we had." Additionally, Interviewee 4 described the initiation in this way:

> Both [of those], I suppose, were technically assigned by the dean. However, one of those people I knew before she came to work here, and so we already had a friendship established. I think I would have worked with her regardless of what my official assignment had been.

And finally, Interviewee 5 reported, "I took a position as the chair of the department of nursing. I had many new faculty members that were hired. Some of the senior faculty members, we met and decided to each take on a new faculty member to help with growth in the department."

Development of mentoring relationships: From the mentor's perspective. Survey questions 16, 17, and 18 specifically relate to the conditions in which a mentor may be encouraged to develop mentoring relationships. In this section of the survey, all subjects were asked to participate. Of the 288 total respondents, 285 (99 percent) participated in some part of these questions.

Survey question 16. Survey question 16 had two parts: the first question in this section asked, "Does it seem necessary or unnecessary for senior faculty to have the responsibility for mentoring junior faculty?" and the second questions asked faculty "does this seem like a realistic or unrealistic expectation to you?" Table 23 shows the responses from participating interviewees.

94

Table 23. Senior faculty response to responsibility of mentoring junior faculty

	Not at all necessary		Somewhat necessary		Very necessary		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Does this seem like a necessary or unnecessary suggestion to you?	11	4	111	39	163	57	285	100
Does this seem like a realistic or unrealistic expectation to you?	15	6	129	46	137	48	282	100

Of the 285 subjects that responded to this survey question, 57 percent reported that mentoring junior faculty seemed like a "very necessary" suggestion, 40 percent reported this as "somewhat necessary," and 4 percent reported this being "not at all necessary." The mean score was 2.53 with a standard deviation of +/-0.57. A second portion of this question was included for further description of the mentor's perspective: "Does it seem like an unrealistic or realistic expectation for senior faculty to have the responsibility for mentoring junior faculty?" Interestingly, this insight revealed a closer similarity when mentors viewed the practice of mentoring junior faculty as an expectation rather than a suggestion, meaning senior faculty likely expect to mentor a junior faculty mentor. This is illustrated by Interviewee 3:

> My ideal world, I'd like to think it's a realistic expectation, and I think there is some senior faculty who would be really good at it. I think there are others who maybe are too burned out or too cynical or haven't adapted well to higher education in the last number of years who would not be great mentors.

Another interviewee qualified the response by stating, "I think it's realistic, unless we're talking about one person mentoring ten junior faculty members in a semester or something. I think the premise that you should help your junior colleagues is very realistic." Of the 282 responses, 48 percent reported the mentoring of junior faculty as a "very necessary" suggestion, 46 percent reported this as "somewhat necessary," and 6 percent reported this being "not at all necessary." The mean score was 2.43 with a standard deviation of +/-0.60 (see table 24).

Table 24. Survey question 16 responses by interviewees

Interviewee	Answer
2	There's a caveat to that. Only certain types of people lend themselves well to mentoring and only certain types of people are mentored well. It has to be people who are both open enough to give and receive criticism. I mean I've had several mentoring relationships where it's been me versus the dean and the dean has asked me, "What are the things that you identify that are my weaknesses that I need to get better?" I haven't been able to answer those. I think that it can be extremely important. My institution has a policy that all faculty, regardless of how long you've been at the university and regardless if you've been teaching when you come to the university, you are assigned a mentor. Very new faculty. Those have been really helpful. It's always outside of department and outside of your college. For science people, we get English people and philosophy people and art people.
3	I like the idea of senior faculty taking responsibility of kind of leading the next generation or guiding the next generation. I think it probably depends on how someone interprets responsibility. If they kind of see it as an altruistic, this is a way of kind of shaping the next generation for higher education; I think it can be really good. If they see it as a committee responsibility or something like that, it might have an adverse effect.
4	I feel like for me that's a true statement, but I don't know that it necessarily needs to be said. This may be pie-in-the-sky, but I feel like we have responsibilities whenever we can in life to help others feel comfortable in various situations, and to help people excel wherever we can. I would hope that, especially if we're talking about primarily Christian higher education, that those faculty members would do that as a natural outpouring of Christian love, and that it wouldn't need to be suggested or explicitly expected.
5	I do think it's necessary in building a cohesive department. I think that it needs to be more than just the senior faculty members saying this is how you do it but also being a partner with the new faculty member and listening to their ideas and collaborating to create a cohesive unit.

Survey questions 17, 18. Research question 5 asked, "What conditions might impact the development of mentoring relationships among faculty?" Subjects were given a list of fifteen conditions that might affect the development and maintenance of faculty mentoring relationships. A Likert scale was used where 1 was "not a hindrance," 2 was "slight hindrance," 3 was "some hindrance," 4 was "moderate hindrance," and 5 was "great hindrance." Subjects were given space to comment on conditions not mentioned in the stated fifteen conditions in the survey that might affect mentoring relationships.

As seen in table 25, the highest reported mean score related to "heavy teaching load." The mean score was 4.44 with a standard deviation of 0.76. Of the 282 respondents, 57 percent reported this category as a "great hindrance," while 31 percent reported this category as "moderate hindrance." Corresponding with this data, Interviewee 1 commented, "The heavy teaching load [is] pretty significant. Usually having a large number of students in class produces the student load." The second highest was "demand from students," with a mean score of 3.90 with a standard deviation of 0.96. Of the 283 respondents, 46 percent reported this category as a "moderate hindrance" while 28 percent reported this as a "great hindrance." Interviewee 2 commented with respect to this question: "If you're super pro student, then it's a pretty big hindrance. If you're not super pro student, then it's moderate hindrance." The third highest was "committee work," with a mean score of 3.73 with a standard deviation of 1.01. Of the 280 respondents, 39 percent reported this category as a "moderate hindrance" while 25 percent reported this as a "some hindrance." In light of this data, one interviewee transparently reported, "[It can be] somewhat of a hindrance. For all of our grousing, the committee work is not as bad." The fourth highest was "responsibilities for my family or other intimate network" with a mean score of 3.50 with a standard deviation of 1.13. Of the 280 respondents, 39 percent reported this category as a "moderate hindrance," while 23 percent reported this as "some hindrance." One interviewee acknowledged this was not as great of a hindrance: "I don't think that [family responsibilities] impacted the mentoring relationship, because we were able to do it as a part of our job." Data revealed that, for some faculty, mentoring was included as part of a faculty job function and did not require additional time outside of the scope of the regular responsibilities of the faculty member.

Table 25 shows the chi-square analysis for significant differences between each condition that might affect the development and maintenance of mentoring relationships with the rank of the faculty member. The corresponding analysis of "heavy teaching load" with rank of faculty yielded a chi-square of 11.14 with a degree of freedom of 12

yielding significance at the p < .05 level (p=0.52). Analysis of "demands from students" yielded a chi-square of 12.82 with a degree of freedom of 12 yielding significance at the p < .05 level (p=0.38). Analysis of "committee work" yielded a chi-square of 11.94 with a degree of freedom of 12 yielding significance at the p < .05 level (p=0.45).

Table 25. Conditions that might affect the development and
maintenance of mentoring relationships

Condition	Mean	StD
Heavy teaching load	4.44	0.76
Demands from students	3.90	0.96
Committee work	3.73	1.01
Responsibility for my family or intimate network	3.50	1.13
High task performance/expectations leave little time for developing personal relationships	3.49	1.21
Demands from supplemental work involvement	3.27	1.15
No intentional development or formal training programs for new faculty	3.27	1.37
Social isolation, alienation	3.14	3.33
No prior experience in mentoring relationships	2.76	1.27
Fear of opening up to a person in an honest way	2.76	1.36
Individualistic/competitive mindset in the academe	2.74	1.41
Emphasis n being an expert	2.68	1.27
Humility and freedom to admit	2.59	1.27
Academic "professional aura" blocks intimacy	2.54	1.26
Personal problems	2.46	1.30
N=283		

Types of mentors. Survey questions 11 and 12 consisted of 23 mentoring functions and activities that were taken from the Cunningham study. The original study contained 35 mentoring functions but I found only 23 to be relevant to this literature review and focus of this study. Subjects were asked to answer only one of the two survey questions. Question 11 limited the respondents to only those whom had not been mentored as a faculty member at a CCCU institution. Subjects were asked to indicate in the "ideal" the importance placed on each item with regard to faculty mentoring other faculty. Question 12 limited the respondents to only those whom had been mentored as a

faculty member at a CCCU institution. Subjects were asked to indicate in the "actual" the importance placed on each item with regard to faculty mentoring other faculty. Items were evaluated using a Likert scale ranging from 1 "not at all important," 2 "slightly important," 3 "moderately important," 4 "very important," and 5 "extremely important."

Survey question 11. Similar to the Cunningham study, the responses subjected this question to a factor analysis to identify mentor typology groups to determine if enough correlation would be evident in this survey questions. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy noted that the statistical analysis for the sampling adequacy should be greater than .500. The total sampling adequacy for survey question 11 was .809. Based on this total, it was determined to be an appropriate procedure to conduct.[9]

I then conducted a principal component analysis with a varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. This extraction yielded four factors with eigenvalues of 1.0 or more. The scree plot analysis indicated that a four-factor model could be used. The adapted Cunningham study produced a four-factor model closely aligned to the Sands, Parson, and Duane study. The common factors used by Cunningham and Sands, Parson, and Duane were "Career Guide," "Friend," and "Information Source." Cunningham had a unique factor related to the study's emphasis on discipleship titled "Discipleship Guide."

Tables 26 to 29 show the four-factor model and those factors with a loading of .50 or more. The same four-factor model in the Cunningham study confirmed the four-factor model produced in this study. The following factors and corresponding table shows the prominence of findings. Factor 1 was "Information Source," factor 2 was "Career Guide," factor 3 was "Friend" and factor 4 was "Discipleship." Like the Cunningham

---

[9]Charles D. Dziuban and Edwin C. Shirkey, "When Is a Correlation Matrix Appropriate for Factor Analysis? Some Decision Rules," *Psychological Bulletin* 81, no. 6 (1974): 358.

study, this study paralleled the Sands, Parson, and Duane study in three of the four factors. Discipleship was the only factor not confirmed by the Sands, Parson, and Duane study.

Factor 1. The rotated component matrix showed that factor 1 had a factor loading of .851 and was categorized as "Information Source." The Cunningham study used this categorization to emphasize the unwritten information and rules often not known to the mentoree but generally accompanying the mentoring relationship. In this study, this category incorporated ideal functions like information source about school policies, information source about formal expectations for promotion and tenure, and introduction to professional networks. Of the twenty-three ideal functions, four factors loaded above .50 (see table 26).

Table 26. Factor 1: Principal component analysis of ideal
mentoring functions—information source

Measure and Variable	Factor Loading
Information source about school policies and procedures	.851
Information source about formal expectations for promotion and tenure	.756
Fostering of professional visibility	.679
Introduction to professional networks	.618

Factor 2. The rotated component matrix showed that factor 2 had a factor loading of .843 and was categorized as "Career Guide." The Cunningham study used this categorization to emphasize the professional relationship between the mentor and mentoree. Table 27 shows that in this study, this category incorporated ideal functions, like integration of the Bible into teaching, help with teaching in general, and introduction to persons who could help further their career. Of the twenty-three ideal functions, five factors loaded above the required .50.

100

Table 27. Factor 2: Principal component analysis of ideal
mentoring functions—career guide

Measure and Variable	Factor Loading
Help integrating biblical principles with teaching, research, and scholarship	.843
Affirmation about how God is working in mentoree's life	.781
Help with teaching	.777
Emotional support	.755
Introduction to persons who could further career	.701

Factor 3. The rotated component matrix showed that factor 3 had a factor loading of .813 and was categorized as "Friend." The Cunningham study used this categorization to emphasize the personal and relational aspect of the mentoring relationship. In this study, this category incorporated ideal functions like caring relationships, agape love experienced, encouragement and coaching, and help with personal problems. Of the twenty-three ideal functions, six factors loaded above .50 (see table 28).

Table 28. Factor 3: Principal component analysis of ideal mentoring functions—friend

Measure and Variable	Factor Loading
Informal advice about social norms	.813
Caring relationships, agape love shared	.785
Encouragement and coaching	.732
Collaboration in research or publication	.592
Help with personal problems	.576
Intellectual guidance	.518

Factor 4. The rotated component matrix showed that factor 1 had a factor loading of .761 and was categorized as "Discipleship." The Cunningham study used this categorization to emphasize the discipleship functions that can be experienced within the mentoring relationship. As seen in table 29, this category incorporated ideal functions like prayer support and encouragement to obey the teaching of Jesus as recorded in the Bible. Of the twenty-three ideal functions, four factors loaded above .50.

Table 29. Factor 4: Principal component analysis of ideal
mentoring functions--discipleship

Measure and Variable	Factor Loading
Help making difficult career decisions	.761
Prayer support	.730
Promotion of an equal and collaborative relationship	.644
Encouragement to obey the teachings of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Bible	.503

Survey question 12. The same functions used in question 11 were used to describe the "actual," mentoring relationships that had taken place at a CCCU member school. Table 30 reports data from this study. Items were evaluated using a Likert scale ranging from 1 "not at all important" to 5 "extremely important."

The overall functions that had the highest mean scores were "encouragement and coaching," "constructive criticism," and "information source about school policies and procedures." In light of constructive criticism, Interviewee 2 noted, "I think that's important, learning how to grow and once again that experience that others can share with you." In the context of information about school policies, this interviewee went on to say, "I think that's important in that sometimes to have someone who's been through it to kind of translate the experience from what's written on paper to translate it into practical real life and give examples of what that can look like, I think that's very helpful."

The functions with the lowest mean scores were "help with personal problems" (3.45), "collaboration in research" (2.31), and "involvement in studying the Bible" (2.23). When describing the function of involvement in studying the Bible, one interviewee said, "I put that as a little less important in my situation in that I felt pretty comfortable in that area. While I still definitely feel like I have room to grow always, as a new faculty member there were other areas that were more pressing needs at the time."

When comparing the factor analysis and factor 1 (career guide), the highest loading function was "affirmation about how God is working in mentoree's life," with a mean score of 3.67. In relation to factor 2 (friend), the highest loading function was

"caring relationship, agape love shared," with a mean score of 3.45. In relation to factor 3 (discipleship), the highest loading function was "prayer support," with a mean score of 3.57. And in relation to factor 4 (information source), the highest loading function was "information source about school policies and procedure," with a mean score of 4.05.

Table 30. Functions actually experienced in faculty mentoring relationships at CCCU schools

Function	Mean	StD
Encouragement and coaching	4.15	0.83
Constructive criticism and feedback	4.05	0.84
Information source about school policies and procedures	4.05	1.14
Intellectual guidance	3.87	0.89
Affirmation about how God is working in mentoree's life	3.67	1.05
Emotional support	3.63	0.99
Friendship	3.59	0.91
Help with teaching	3.59	1.13
Prayer support	3.53	1.09
Information source about formal expectations for promotion and tenure	3.48	1.19
Informal advice about committee work	3.48	1.07
Help integrating biblical principles with teaching, research, and scholarship	3.45	1.09
Caring relationships; agape love shared	3.45	1.03
Promotion of an equal and collaborative relationship	3.39	1.13
Informal advice about social norms (dress code, relationships with students, etc.)	3.38	1.16
Help making difficult career decisions	3.33	1.14
Encouragement to obey the teachings of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Bible	3.24	1.23
Fostering of professional visibility	3.21	1.17
Introductions to professional networks	3.15	1.19
Introductions to persons who could further career	3.12	1.22
Help with personal problems	2.45	1.05
Collaboration in research or publications	2.31	1.25
Involvement in studying the Bible	2.23	1.09
N=142		

When comparing the factor analysis and factor 1 (career guide), the lowest loading function was "introduction to person who further career" and had a mean score of

3.12. In relation to factor 2 (friend), the lowest loading function was "help with personal problems," with a mean score of 2.45. In relation to factor 3 (discipleship), the lowest loading function was "encouragement to obey the teachings of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Bible," with a mean score of 3.24. And in relation to factor 4 (information source), the lowest loading function was "introductions to professional networks," with a mean score of 3.15.

Evaluation of Research Design

This section describes the research design by highlighting the strengths and weaknesses evidenced in this study, which may be helpful for future studies. The obstacles I encountered may or may not have been avoidable, but will serve as a help to future studies. Overall, the research design's strengths far outweighed the weaknesses.

Strengths of the Design

This study was a replication of a study completed by Cunningham in 1996. Cunningham's study was a replication of the original study by Sands, Parson, and Duane, in 1991. The original study was designed to be conducted on a public university campus in the mid-west. Cunningham sought to expand this study by exploring faculty-mentoring relationships on Christian college campuses. This current study was designed to extend the Cunningham study since little research had been done regarding faculty-mentoring relationships in twenty years. Because this study had successfully been completed twice, several elements within the original design were found to be reliable, valid, and established. One such example was the instrument. Although the original instrument had been adapted by Cunningham, numerous pre-test interviews, a pilot study, and consultation from several sources who had direct knowledge of faculty mentoring in Christian higher education were conducted prior to the instrument being used. The survey was easy to access, available on mobile devices, and did not take long to complete. The survey software indicated that subjects averaged 10 minutes when taking the survey.

104

A second strength of this design was the technological resources made available, such as Qualtrics survey software, the *SPSS Standard Grad Pack 23 for Students* for further statistical analysis, membership to online communities that assisted in using the SPSS software, TapeACall recording software, Red Transcription services, and email for easier access to the population. The technology used in this study made sharing the instrument with over 1,400 faculty members effortless, contained features that assisted in the interpreting the data, allowed for quick processing of data, and provided me with an effective means of communication with the population.

A final strength to this research design was the access gained to the population via the institution's websites. I was able to pursue the population by visiting each selected CCCU member school's website to find full-time faculty that met the criteria to participate in this study.

Weaknesses of the Design

There are five areas of weakness observed through the course of this study. First, and probably the most significant weakness in the design, was the attempt to work through individual institutions to gain a path to population. I encountered numerous obstacles when pursuing the population through the identified representative of the institutions. The institutions that declined to participate in the study gave few reasons. Of the reasons shared, the primary grounds for declination were lack of available time and the inconvenience the survey would impose on the faculty members. Among the institutions that agreed to participate, one obstacle encountered was the unique standards that each institution's Internal Review Board set before the study could be dispersed among the faculty. Another institution required additional certification from the National Institute of Health Office of Extramural Research.[10] Of the institutions that agreed to participate, only one institution shared faculty email addresses with me. The remaining participating

---

[10]See appendix of certificate of completion from NIH.

institutions dispersed the survey link and the reminder email among the faculty on my behalf.

A second weakness in the design of this study was the timing in which I attempted to pursue this population. I began inviting the population in April, but did not conclude the study until August. The late spring and summer months were not ideal times to access full-time faculty due to end of school year demands and time away from the office throughout the summer.

A third observed weakness was my inability to acquire the necessary sample size to meet the statistical requirements set forth earlier in this study. The desired sample size was 302, but because of the responsiveness of the population and the timing of the study, only 288 could be acquired. I made repeated efforts to incentivize the survey and sent multiple email reminders, to the point of being told to "stop sending the reminders."

A fourth weakness in the study design was encountered when I began to pursue individual full-time faculty through the school's website. In some cases, gaining access to the population was impossible because the website did not share adequate information to send an invitation to the study. For this reason, some schools were excluded from participating in the study.

A final weakness in the study was related to research based on changes in higher education calling for a concerted focus of current faculty development practices: the complex roles of the faculty member, diversity within the student body, and the increased use of technology. This study mainly addressed the areas of the complex roles of faculty, while the effectiveness and relevance of diversity within the student body and the increased use of technology were not addressed.

Summary of Analysis

This chapter was a statistical analysis of 288 full-time faculty that participated in this study who are currently teaching at a CCCU member school. This chapter also analyzed five semi-structured interviews from participants who volunteered to expand on

their answers in the quantitative phase. The structure of this chapter was categorized by demographic data, the nature of mentoring from the mentoree's perspective, and the nature of mentoring from the mentor's perspective.

The research described the nature of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education institutions by explaining the actual mentoring practices taking places in CCCU member schools. Of the total number of participants, 133 participants reported having been mentored at their current CCCU institution. Additionally, 268 reported being a mentor currently or in the past in a CCCU institution. Using a list of 23 mentoring functions, participants identified how important each function was. A factor analysis yielded a four-factor model used as a descriptor to categorize the mentoring functions. The four factors were Career Guide, Friend, Discipleship, and Information Source.

The research examined the institution's prioritization of mentoring based on current understanding of the research by asking subjects how their significant mentoring relationship began, how much time was devoted to those relationships, and by asking an open-ended question about what they enjoyed most about the mentoring relationship.

The research described the activities practiced in faculty mentoring relationships and the conditions that might affect the development and maintenance of successful mentoring relationships by asking participants to identify specific conditions that impact those mentoring relationships. Subjects were given opportunity to answer through a Likert type survey using a list of 15 conditions that might affect the development and maintenance of faculty mentoring relationships. I employed a chi-square analysis for significant differences between each condition that might affect the development and maintenance of mentoring relationships with the rank of the faculty member and with the gender of the mentor and mentoree.

The research described the similarities that exist among rank, gender, and ethnicity. The rank of the mentor and the rank of the mentoree were examined by asking subjects to indicate their academic rank at the time of the mentoring relationship, which

was cross tabulated with the academic rank of their mentor using a chi-square statistical analysis. Further, the research described the differences that exist between the gender of the mentor and the mentoree by asking subjects to identify their own gender and the gender of their mentoree. Finally, the research examined the differences between the mentor's ethnicity and the mentoree's ethnicity by asking subjects to identify their ethnicity and the ethnicity of their mentor.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter summarizes the findings of the research and discusses the significance of the findings for academic deans, faculty, faculty developers, and administrators that may desire to enhance faculty development in Christian higher education institutions. This chapter also answers the five research questions proposed in this study and concludes with potential recommendations for further research.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this research was to explain the development of Christian higher education faculty through mentoring, the issues undergirding these practices, and the benefits, if any, of implementing such practices. This study served as a replication of the Cunningham study among faculty at Christian colleges in 1996.[1] The primary purpose in this study was to explain the current state of faculty development and mentoring in Christian colleges and universities who are members of the CCCU. Cunningham's study was completed twenty years prior to this study. Since some research has been completed in the area of faculty-to-faculty mentoring, an important reason for this study was to expand those earlier findings.

The population consisted of full-time faculty members at confessional Christian liberal arts colleges or universities. For this study, confessional was defined as "educational institutions that entail a Christian environment as it relates to community

---

[1]Michelle M. Cunningham, "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships among Faculty Members in Christian Higher Education" (Ed.D. diss., Talbot School of Theology, 1996).

and curriculum, guided and governed by a Protestant-evangelical statement of faith."[2] Fourteen hundred and five surveys were electronically mailed in the spring of 2016. In response to the invitation to participate, 282 subjects responded.

After analyzing the data returned in the surveys and conducting analysis of the semi-structured interviews, research questions were analyzed using descriptive statistical measurements. To replicate the Cunningham study, factor analysis and chi-square analysis were performed to test for significant differences. Additionally, a multiple regression analysis was performed on two of the survey questions with multiple answers to test for significant relationships. As in the Cunningham study, mean scores were computed for survey questions that used a Likert type scale not subjected to factor analysis.

Research Questions

This research was guided by five questions that assisted in collecting and analyzing data in this explanatory sequential study.

1. What is the nature of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education institutions?

2. Do Christian higher education institutions prioritize mentoring as a faculty development practice based on current understanding of the research?

3. What activities are practiced in faculty mentoring relationships?

4. What differences exist between the rank of the mentor and the rank of the mentoree?

5. What conditions might impact the development of mentoring relationships among faculty?

Research Implications

The following implications are from the findings of this research. Because this study is a replication, this section consists of similar and dissimilar implications to the

---

[2]John David Trentham, "Epistemological Development in Pre-Ministry Undergraduates: A Cross Institutional Application of the Perry Scheme" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012), 18.

Cunningham study, and new implications from research regarding mentoring and faculty development.

Research Implication 1

Faculty mentoring among CCCU member schools is taking place at a significant level. However, long-term mentoring relationships do not appear to be characteristic of the faculty experience at CCCU member schools. Research question 1 asked, "What is the nature of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education institutions?" Participants were given a definition of mentoring and asked to indicate if a person in the past or present is currently mentoring them in their career. In response, 6 percent indicated never having a mentor in their academic career and 50 percent reported having a mentor at one time, but no longer engaging in a mentoring relationship. The Cunningham study reported that, to a wide extent, mentoring as defined in this study did not appear to be taking place among faculty at CCCU member schools (45 percent). In contrast, the data from this study indicated that 93 percent of faculty had received mentoring according to the definition used in this study. This is further supported by the number of CCCU faculty (94 percent) reporting that they have participated as the mentor in the mentoring relationship according to this context.

The significant change may be connected to the increased number of faculty that reported mentoring relationships were initiated as a result of departmental assignments. The literature shows that faculty mentoring through departmental assignment, like other areas in the professional sector, has become a popular way of orienting new hires and helping new employees acclimate to a new work environment.[3] This mentoring trend is also evidenced in this research, and when compared to the Cunningham study (57 percent) shows a decrease in mutual initiated mentoring

---

[3]Brad W. Johnson, *On Being A Mentor: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2007), 13.

relationships (43 percent). Research concerning the initiation of faculty mentoring relationships in this study found that only 41 percent of faculty mentoring relationships were mutually initiated, while the Cunningham study reported over 80 percent of faculty mentoring relationships had formed voluntarily. These significant changes may be a result of the attempt by CCCU institutions to incorporate current research on faculty development and the implementation of programs that promote mentoring relationships.

In light of this dissimilarity, the data from this study does not indicate that these mentoring relationships are ongoing. The literature discussed that time was an element needed for successful, ongoing mentoring to occur.[4] In this study, the largest percentage of faculty reported that they spent less than five hours per month with either their mentor or mentoree. Other implications related to ongoing mentoring relationships are length of service that a faculty member has served at an institution and the function of the mentor within the mentoring relationship. While current research suggests that the length of service at an institution may factor in the development of mentoring relationships, the majority (51 percent) of faculty in this study reported that they had served less than six years at their current institution and many, less than three years (28 percent). Finally, mentorees also reported that the top actual functions experienced in their mentoring relationship related to career needs and providing institutional information, neither were indicative of ongoing mentoring relationships. Many of the functions that faculty reported occurring most often were categorized as "career guide" and not necessarily within a category that would indicate the existence of long-term relationship.

Research Implication 2

Faculty in CCCU institutions perceive the mentoring relationship to be effective as a faculty development practice, incorporating functions based on current

---

[4]K. E. Kram, "Phases of the Mentor Relationship," *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (1983): 608-10.

understanding of the research. Research question 2 asked, "Do Christian higher education institutions prioritize mentoring as a faculty development practice based on current understanding of the research?" According to research conducted by the POD Network[5] and discussed in chapter 2, three dynamic changes in higher education should be the focus of current faculty development practices: the complex roles of the faculty member, diversity within the student body, and the increased use of technology. Research in this study only reported the "actual" experiences of mentorees in the mentoring relationship while serving at CCCU schools. The overall functions reported by mentorees as being the most helpful were "encouragement and coaching," "constructive criticism," "information source about school policies and procedures," and "intellectual guidance." Because of the wide application of these top functions, mentoring relationships are likely addressing some of the critical areas identified in current research. The implication from this study is that mentoring in CCCU member schools is addressing the areas of the complex roles of faculty; however, the effectiveness and relevance of diversity within the student body and the increased use of technology were not addressed. Open answers within the study also support the findings. Addressing the function of encouragement and coaching, one faculty member said, "[My mentor] taught me how to do things and advised me with teaching and advising students." And another stated, "He [mentor] guided me in teaching techniques and how to interact with other faculty members, particularly the department head." Addressing the function of "information source about school policies," one participant noted that her mentor had "helped make the transition from graduate student to full-time faculty member; helping me to understand and navigate the organizational culture of the university."

---

[5]Anne Austin et al., *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present* (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2006). William C., McKee, Mitzy Johnson, and Mark W. Tew, "Professional Development of the Faculty: Past and Present." *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives,*133 (Spring 2013): 15-20, synthesize the POD Network study in 2001 in their article, "Professional Development of the Faculty: Past and Present."

When conducting a factor analysis, one of the top factor scores in this study is uniquely categorized as "disciple guide." As noted in chapter 2, faculty at Christian higher education institutions are unique because it is assumed that participation in this population is based on the presence of a personal relationship with Christ and that Christians find their unity in Christ and Christian fellowship rather than human pursuits. In light of this unique aspect of faculty at Christian higher education institutions, the overall function reported by mentorees as being the most helpful was "prayer support." Faculty at CCCU schools reported that prayer and agape love were important functions within the mentoring relationship. One interviewee stated, "[Agape love] was probably the difference between someone being just my supervisor, and someone actually helping me grow and develop." Open comments from the study also reflected on the function of Christian friendship within the mentoring relationship. One participant affirmed this by reflecting on the input from his mentor: "Timely conversations with a wise godly sage who had traveled this journey before me and would willingly invest in a younger colleague." In response to "what did you most enjoy about the mentoring relationship," a faculty member commented, "Motorcycle rides, coffee meetings, Bible study, time with each others families." The inclusion of relational functions within mentoring relationships at CCCU schools imply that Christian faculty often enjoy a deep level of friendship and intimacy that extends beyond the distinct areas of dynamic change in higher education.

Research Implication 3

The four-factor mentoring model that emerged in this study affirmed the Cunningham study and current faculty development research. Research question 3 asked, "What activities are practiced in faculty mentoring relationships?" The literature discussed faculty mentoring as being an "advocacy on behalf of the protégé"[6] as an image

---

[6]Christopher J. Lucas and John W. Murry, Jr., *New Faculty: A Practical Guide for Academic*

of "one standing at a door and fighting the good fight on behalf of the protégé."[7] Additionally, the literature identified mentoring as development that can provide the underpinning for the growth of the mentoree's skills, further stating that at the core of successful mentoring is a developmental relationship.[8] Chapter 2 notes that mentoring relationships made available to faculty can offer unique developmental opportunities in two specific areas: career skills and psychosocial support.[9]

Within this study, a four-factor model emerged identical to the functions identified in the Cunningham study. Based on the ideal functions of a mentor, this study identified four factors as most important: Career Guide, Discipling Guide, Friend, and Information Source. This data indicates that when mentor/mentoree relationships are pursued, specific functions may be more beneficial to the success of the relationship.

This four-factor model may be helpful to those responsible for faculty development in CCCU institutions. Comments from open responses indicate that faculty may not understand the point of faculty mentoring or may not possess the necessary skill to effectively mentor. One faculty member said, "A mismatch between goals of the relationship [is a negative condition]; mentors have certain goals, mentorees may have different goals." This response indicates that within the mentoring relationship there are unmet expectations. Therefore, to increase satisfaction in the mentoring relationship, institutions should clearly define what constitutes a mentoring relationship and what specific functions should occur within them.

Beginners (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 21.

[7]Richard Valantasis, "Mentoring Younger Faculty," *Teaching Theology and Religion* 8, no. 1 (2005): 57.

[8]M. Elizabeth Lewis-Hall and Lauren E. Maltby, "Mentoring: The View from Both Sides," *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 32, no. 1 (2013): 71.

[9]Ibid., 72.

Research Implication 4

In CCCU member schools, faculty mentoring with respect to rank generally takes place among junior faculty at the assistant professor level with faculty that hold the rank of full-professor or associate professor. Research question 4 asked, "What differences exist between the rank of the mentor and the rank of the mentoree?" The highest percentage of mentors (38 percent) in this study held the rank of full professor narrowly edging the rank of associate professor (35 percent). When analyzing each category by rank of the mentoree, the percentage of higher rank faculty acting as mentor decreased significantly with each lesser faculty rank. Based on the findings in this study that only 49 percent of faculty have been at their current school more than six years and 28 percent of faculty have been at their current school less than three years, mentorees are likely to be mentored by faculty of higher rank. This is supported by the findings from this study related to senior faculty mentor's perspective on mentoring. This study revealed that 57 percent of senior faculty viewed mentoring as a "very necessary" expectation, not a suggestion—meaning senior faculty likely expect to mentor junior faculty. Also, findings from this study related to the junior faculty rank revealed that 43 percent of the mentoring relationships started when junior faculty were new faculty members at their respective CCCU member school. When compared to the findings in this study reporting that 50 percent of faculty were at one time mentored but are no longer being mentored, junior faculty are likely to receive mentoring from a senior faculty mentor but are not likely to receive mentoring beyond their initial "new faculty" status. When participants were given opportunity to speak to this issue, one warned of the "importance of mentoring often being overlooked, especially for experienced faculty at a new institution."

Research Implication 5

Faculty at CCCU member schools indicated that the maintenance of mentoring relationships includes building trust. While faculty mentoring is occurring at CCCU

member schools between senior and junior faculty, the quality of these relationships may not be indicative that healthy mentoring is taking place. When given opportunity to discuss the conditions that impede development and maintenance of mentoring relationships, faculty members most frequently discussed a lack of trust. The findings in this study indicate that while mentoring is taking place, many participants experienced coldness or a lack of transparency and genuineness in the relationship. Faculty comments supporting this include, "Trust among faculty can be difficult in competitive or conflicting environments," "[Participants] need to develop trust before opening up to another faculty member." "[there is a] lack of trust between colleagues, a fear of openness in discussing contemporary social issues (LGBTQ, transgender, politics)," "some faculty need to be more Christ-Centered and less self-centered," "keeping confidences—not talking to students about interior faculty matters—never talking about another teacher in class— even in fun," and "the mentor must truly care about the mentoree and the university they are working for or the process of mentoring can go amiss." Additional negative conditions related by faculty in this study include

1. lack of cultural sensitivity

2. one or both of the persons is uncooperative

3. resistant to mentoring

4. mentoree not willing to accept advice

5. existing political climate

6. and biblical illiteracy

7. focus on self

8. does not exercise the gifts of love and admonition

9. not being a Christian

10. and being a gossip

117

Research Implication 6

Career pressures continue to negatively impact faculty and their ability to develop and maintain mentoring relationships. Research question 5 asked, "What conditions might impact the development of mentoring relationships among faculty?" The increasing pressures that faculty in higher education encounter is well documented in the literature in chapter 2. In today's educational context, research reveals the complexity of issues encountered and responsibilities assumed by faculty members have significantly increased. Similarities between this study and the Cunningham were striking. Although twenty years have passed since the Cunningham study, faculty continue to report the same conditions that prohibit the development and maintenance of mentoring relationships. Have institutions taken the necessary measures to create environments that support the mentoring of faculty? One faculty member plainly said, "Faculty-to-faculty mentoring is inhibited by too much busy work and a lack of intentional social time." When faculty were given opportunity to address this issue, numerous faculty members admitted that a culture of mentoring in higher education is lacking. Another faculty member candidly noted, "[There is] no formal mentoring process at my university or a way to volunteer to be one, " while yet another voiced, "[There are] unreasonable and/or unvoiced expectations for time and purpose of the relationship."

Research Implication 7

Diversity within faculty mentoring in CCCU member schools is not reflected in full-time instructional faculty in degree-granting postsecondary public institutions. In this study, the gender representation (51 percent male to 49 percent female) did not parallel the gender demographics of the CCCU population as research indicates the majority of faculty are male (60 percent). While it is evident in this study that men are more likely to be mentored by someone of the same gender and race, the reason is likely due to the makeup of the faculty of the institution. Also, when subjects were asked if aiding women was a valid reason for becoming a mentor, 46 percent of females reported that this was

either "very important" or "extremely important," while only 20 percent of males did. When findings from this study were compared to findings from the Cunningham study, the same inconsistent ratios and percentages were present. In fact, data reported in this study appear to be out of line with diversity norms of institutions outside of the population of this study. This study reported that 94 percent of faculty at CCCU member schools had not been mentored by someone of another ethnicity/race, and that 77 percent of faculty at CCCU member schools had not been mentored by someone of a different gender. In terms of ethnicity/race and mentoring, this study implies that there may be a lack of racial diversity within faculty at CCCU schools. In terms of gender and mentoring, this study implies that the majority of male and female mentorees will experience a same gender mentoring relationship. However, the quality of mentoring may not be equal by gender. Because there are fewer women in faculty positions, they are less likely to be mentored by a full professor, while men are more likely to be mentored by a full professor. Current CCCU demographics state that full-time faculty consist of 62 percent male and 38 percent female. When compared to degree-granting postsecondary public institutions, diversity ratios of gender and race among faculty at CCCU schools are not comparable. With respect to gender, in the fall of 2013, of all full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary public institutions, 52 percent were male and 48 percent were female.[10] With respect to race, of all full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary public institutions, 78 percent were white, while only 22 percent were races other than Caucasian, compared to just 4 percent of CCCU faculty being a race other than Caucasian.[11] The ratios of CCCU member schools may never be able to mirror degree-granting postsecondary

---

[10]National Center for Education Statistics, "Fast Facts," accessed August 25, 2016, https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61.

[11]Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, "National Profile on Ethnic/Racial Diversity of Enrollment, Graduation Rates, Faculty, and Administrators Among the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities," 35th Annual CCCU Presidents Conference, accessed August 25, 2016, https://www.cccu.org/~/media/filefolder/CCCU-Diversity-Report-2011-1-25-11.pdf.

public institutions for various reasons; however, institutions should look for ways to encourage greater diversity among faculty and faculty mentoring relationships.

Research Applications

The purpose of this study was to explain the nature of mentoring among faculty within Christian higher education, the issues undergirding these practices, and the benefits of implementing such practices. In light of this study, specific practices should be considered by Christian higher education institutions to address the growing responsibilities of the faculty member and the ever-changing educational climate. For faculty development in Christian higher education to respond to the current context and challenges evidenced in higher education, six applications are derived from this study.

First, as noted in chapter 2, for the future of faculty development within Christian higher education to be bright, Christian institutions must represent best practices within the context of the field. If Christian institutions use mentoring as a faculty development practice, senior faculty must administer more than career advice, and will by necessity need to consider the unique calling of each mentoree, the unique context the mentoree works within, and the unique responsibilities each faculty member shares as Christians.

Second, this research would benefit Christian higher education personnel who are responsible for cultivating a climate for effective faculty development. Additionally, this research would benefit Christian higher education institutions that are committed to enhancing faculty teaching skill, supporting faculty ongoing development, and providing sufficient resources for faculty mentoring relationships to succeed.[12]

Third, this research would benefit faculty mentors seeking to develop and maintain healthy mentoring relationships within Christian education institutions by

---

[12]A multi-year action plan for the development of Christian higher education faculty through mentoring can be found in appendix 13.

outlining specific mentoring functions that would best meet the needs of the mentoree. Senior faculty who mentor should work to develop the necessary skills to best support junior faculty in the aforementioned areas, while junior faculty should be encouraged to seek from his or her mentor the functions that promote development in areas of deficiency or unfamiliarity. Faculty mentoring relationships should seek to embrace all factors that emerged in this study; however, appropriate time should be given for these factors to evolve to their full potential.

Additionally, faculty mentors may find this research helpful in creating an action plan to influence current mentoring functions within the mentoring relationship or to shape future mentoring functions within mentoring relationships. As evidenced in the four-factor mentoring model, this research can equip faculty to address the unique challenges and responsibilities of Christian higher education faculty by developing the mentoring skills of "career guide," "friend," "disciple guide," and "information source." Faculty already engaged in mentoring may also use this research and the four-factor mentoring model as a matrix to assess the effectiveness of current mentoring relationships.

Fourth, this research would benefit faculty seeking to be mentored by other, more experienced Christian higher education faculty by informing and preparing them for the unique challenges and responsibilities faced by a Christian higher education faculty member. This study offers a realistic perspective from mentorees who are engaged in mentoring relationships at CCCU member schools. Insight from this research would benefit the mentoree specifically by acclimating them to the academic culture they are entering. Mentorees may use this research as an action plan in seeking to strengthen the mentoring relationship by acting in ways that gain trust, by heeding counsel, practicing humility, and reciprocating transparency. These qualities make for more effective mentoring relationships and can be influenced by the mentoree. Mentorees desiring to participate in ongoing mentoring relationships should also consider the amount of time

mentors have and the career pressures working against the success of the mentoring relationship. Understanding the obstacles that are generally beyond the control of the mentor will foster a culture of appreciation and understanding within the mentoring relationship.

Fifth, this research would benefit Christian higher educational institutions and faculty development programs seeking to address and keep pace with the changing educational landscape. In this study, the top three conditions related to career pressures that negatively impact the development and maintenance of mentoring relationships were institutional commitments representing heavy teaching loads, demands from students, and committee work. These were the same conditions reported in the Cunningham study. The fourth was related to psychosocial commitments representing a faculty member's responsibility for family or intimate network. Again, this finding was similar to the Cunningham study. Coupled with current research that shows faculty need development at every step of their career, this research is a call for Christian institutions to continue to make progress by exploring solutions to heavy teaching loads, the demands students have on faculty, and possibly limiting committee assignments.

Finally, this research would benefit organizations that exclusively employ Christian employees. This study was concerned with workplace mentoring relationships at CCCU schools; therefore, other Christian organizations that represent workplace environments like church staffs, Christian day schools faculty, Bible college faculty, and seminary faculty would benefit from this research by assessing the quality of training/mentoring relationships within their organization. Because it is assumed that membership in each of the aforementioned groups is based on a personal relationship with Jesus Christ, similar to membership in Christian higher education institutions, research implications can be applied to these Christian communities.

Research Limitations

There were several limitations within this study. The first limitation was the nature of the population. This population was limited by the narrow definition of confessional that was defined as "educational institutions that entail a Christian environment as it relates to community and curriculum, guided and governed by a Protestant-evangelical statement of faith" in this study. Therefore, research from this study will not generalize to institutions that do not comprise a Christian environment.

The second limitation of this research relates to the context in which mentoring took place. This study assumed that mentoring relationships occurred between two faculty members; however, current research shows that there are additional ways that mentoring relationships may be incorporating the functions and outcomes through Faculty Learning Communities and communities of Christian friendship. It is possible that faculty were not able to speak to the benefits of belonging to such a group since the survey used language that limited mentoring to a specific person.

A third limitation was the population within the CCCU member schools. Only full-time faculty were invited to participate in this study. It is likely that adjunct and part-time faculty have engaged in mentoring relationships to some extent, therefore research among all types of faculty may reveal unique factors if all faculty participated in this study.

A fourth limitation in this research relates to the inability to determine what type of mentoring fosters organic and ongoing mentoring relationships. Although factors of ideal mentoring relationships emerged, this study did not connect those functions with the longevity and effectiveness of mentoring relationships.

A final limitation of this research concerned the survey instrument. The Cunningham study did not focus on an emerging issue relevant to today's faculty: the increased use of technology. Therefore, this study did not explore the nature of mentoring as it relates to technology use by the faculty member. Research among faculty outside the scope of this study may indicate that this area of focus is in fact being addressed at CCCU member schools.

Contribution of Research to the Precedent Literature

This study filled a void in the existing literature by identifying the benefits of mentoring in a Christian higher education context. Research and resources are available to faculty in Christian higher education institutions, but these sources do not account for the unique relationship and responsibility Christian faculty share. This research extended Cunningham's four factors with new specific functions that should guide the development and maintenance of mentoring relationships as faculty development in Christian higher education.

Recommendations for Practice

As a result of this research, Christian higher education institutions seeking to build or expand a faculty development program should consider the implementation of faculty mentoring relationships. Christian higher education institutions seeking to support faculty in the development and maintenance of mentoring relationships should consider the following recommendations.

Furthermore, administrators of Christian higher education institutions are encouraged to consult appendix 13 for a strategic action plan outlining the process of assessment and implementation of mentoring as a faculty development program. The creation of this action plan was a result of the lack of practical material in the literature serving as a guide to enhancing faculty development, specifically in the area of faculty mentoring relationships in Christian higher education. This action plan is directly linked to the outcomes of this research.

Assess

Assessment of FDPs is critical to its ongoing presence in higher education. Institutions should evaluate the existing philosophy regarding faculty development *practices* by examining the amount of resources committed, the institutional support for faculty members who mentor, how connected assessment is to institutional goals, processes

that are important to the campus, and the impact it had on each faculty member's professional and personal life.

Invite

Faculty should be asked to participate in a multi-year faculty mentoring program seeking to address the complex roles of Christian faculty.

Encourage

Faculty should be encouraged to address the diverse needs within the student body by pairing senior faculty with junior faculty and then providing adequate time for related conversations to develop addressing specific areas of need.

Equip

Equipping would include training faculty members for the increasing institutional expectations to improve student learning through the use of technology, assuming roles in the management of departments, engaging leadership development, participating in research while fulfilling these responsibilities, and spending more time in the classroom teaching.

This study explores the unique challenges Christian faculty face, providing insight to Christian institutions that are equipping faculty mentors to transfer advice, wisdom, information, emotional support, protection, link to resources, career guidance, and status, to someone else, at a sensitive time so that it impacts development.

<center>**Further Research**</center>

As a result of this research, this section includes recommendations for research that can be undertaken for faculty development among Christian higher education institutions. This research is intended to serve those responsible for the critical task of developing faculty. The following may be areas for further research conducted on the topic of mentoring as a tool for development among Christian higher education faculty.

1. Additional research is needed within contexts not included in this research. This research was concerned with institutions that were categorized as liberal arts institutions, therefore, contexts should include Bible colleges, training schools, mission institutes, seminaries, and multi-level Christian higher education institutions that accommodate a Bible college, Masters level, and Graduate institutions on a single campus.

2. Additional research is needed exploring the most effective ways for mentoring relationships to begin. Existing exemplar academic environments that encourage organic mentoring relationships should be studies further. Research should measure the effectiveness of these environments in producing ongoing mentoring relationships compared to departmentally assigned mentoring relationships. Future research should compare existing mentoring relationships initiated mutually with relationships initiated through a program measuring mentor/mentoree satisfaction. Research should explore the tensions that exist as a result of non-voluntary selection.

3. Additional research is needed to explore what, if any, measures are being taken by Christian institutions to alleviate the institutional pressures that accompany faculty positions. Additional research should include exploring whether these institutional pressures are unique to CCCU schools. Research should explore full-time faculty from degree granting postsecondary public institutions and the obstacles they encounter.

4. Additional research is needed to explore why faculty in Christian higher education institutions are more likely to prefer mentoring relationships involving functions that are career related rather than spiritual in nature. Research should explore how the four functions identified in this study impact the mentor/mentoree relationship. Research should also include examining the long-term affect mentoring may have on spiritual life and academic career.

5. Additional research should be focused on the effectiveness of top mentoring functions addressed in the literature, especially related to the complex roles of the faculty member, diversity within the student body, and the increased use of technology.

6. Future research should be focused on gender and race. Research should include gender preferences and desired outcomes from mentoring relationships, the basis for beginning mentoring relationships, and the functions that are most satisfying within mentoring relationships. Research should also explore what measures are successfully working to enhance diversity within mentoring among Christian higher education institutions.

7. Additional research is needed to explain the effects of mentoring relationships within Christian higher education. What is the length of time for the most satisfying mentoring relationships? What impact does length of time spent per month have on the relationship? As mentoring relationships evolve, to what degree do desired mentoring functions change?

8. Additional research is needed to explore the impact of mentoring and the rank of mentor/mentoree. Do mentorees who enjoy mentoring relationships with mentors of a higher rank experience more satisfaction? What functions are represented in the mentoring relationship when the mentor is of a higher faculty rank?

9. Further research in needed to explore reasons for becoming a mentor. What are the primary motivations behind mentors engaging in mentoring relationships? Can these reasons be nurtured or fostered by an institution in order to promote better mentoring?

As noted in chapter 2, the changing nature of education is a reality from which Christian higher education is not exempt. Because these changes cannot be avoided, Christian higher education must not only anticipate these changes but also must prepare those who will interact with these changes on a regular basis. Christian higher education must create opportunities for faculty to develop teaching skill, nurture spiritual health, ask questions, and seek the career guidance often needed. This research suggests that mentoring may be an effective means to accomplish this task.

The purpose of this research sought to explain the nature of mentoring among faculty within Christian higher education, the issues undergirding these practices, and the benefits, if any, of implementing such practices. Based upon the data from this research, mentoring is taking place at a high rate in CCCU institutions; however, *actual* mentoring by mentors appears to be disconnected from the *ideal* needs of mentorees. The hope of this research is to fill a void that exists in identifying the benefits of mentoring in a Christian higher education context and to equip the faculty member in Christian higher education to glorify God through the best use of their giftedness.

APPENDIX 1

EMAIL SEEKING PERMISSION TO USE
ADAPTED INSTRUMENT

Dr. Shelly Cunningham
BIOLA University
Office of Educational Effectiveness
Director of Faculty Development
13800 Biola Ave.
La Mirada CA 90639

Dear Madam:
I am a doctoral student from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary writing my dissertation titled *Faculty Development and Training Best Practices in Christian Higher Education,* under the direction of my dissertation committee, chaired by Dr. Anthony Foster. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Committee Chair can be contacted by mail at 2825 Lexington Road, Louisville, KY 40280.

I have found your research regarding discipleship and mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education intriguing and at the center of a growing interest of mine. In light of my future research, I would like your permission to use your survey/questionnaire instrument that you developed based on the Sands, Parson, and Duane study in your research, "Who's Mentoring the Mentors? The Discipling Dimension of Faculty Development in Christian Higher Education." I would like to use and print your survey under the following conditions:

- I will use the surveys only for my research study and will not sell or use it with any compensated or curriculum development activities.
- I will only amend the wording to apply to the intended sampling of this study.
- I will include the copyright statement on all copies of the instrument.
- I will send a copy of my completed research study to your attention upon completion of the study.

If these are acceptable terms and conditions, please indicate so by replying to me through e-mail: mthomas233@students.sbts.edu

Sincerely,

Matt Thomas

APPENDIX 2

EMAIL RESPONSE GRANTING ADAPTED
INSTRUMENT USE

Hi, Matt,

Are you referencing the faculty mentoring survey instrument? If you have a copy of my dissertation, you will note that my survey is an adaptation of one developed by Sands, Parson & Duane. You are welcome to use what I developed; however, I think you might want to contact them as the developers of the original instrument just to get their permission. I don't think you will have any trouble. They gave me permission to use their instrument and make adaptations.

It sounds like an interesting dissertation topic. I hope I will be able to find and read your final report upon completion.

Shelly Cunningham

APPENDIX 3

EMAIL SEEKING PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT

Good Day Dr. Sands,
I am a doctoral student from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary writing my dissertation titled *Faculty Development and Training Best Practices in Christian Higher Education,* under the direction of my dissertation committee chaired by Dr. Anthony Foster who can be reached at awfoster@sbts.edu. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Committee Chair can be contacted by mail at 2825 Lexington Road, Louisville, KY 40280.

I have found your research regarding mentoring among faculty in higher education intriguing and at the center of a growing interest of mine. In light of my future research, I would like your permission to use your survey/questionnaire instrument that you developed for your research with Drs. Parson and Duane, "Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University." For my context I will be adapting your instrument with the help of Dr. Shelly Cunningham's dissertation work that also utilized your instrument.
With your permission, I would like to use and print your survey under the following conditions:

- I will use the surveys only for my research study and will not sell or use it with any compensated or curriculum development activities.
- I will only amend the wording to apply to the intended sampling of this study.
- I will include the copyright statement on all copies of the instrument.
- I will send a copy of my completed research study to your attention upon completion of the study.

If these are acceptable terms and conditions, please indicate so by simply replying to me through e-mail.

Sincerely,

Matt Thomas

APPENDIX 4

EMAIL RESPONSE GRANTING INSTRUMENT USE

Dear Mr. Thomas:

You may use the instrument under the conditions you mentioned plus one other: In the dissertation and in any publications or presentations that come out of the dissertation, you will cite the authors of the instrument. If you agree to this, I will send you a copy of the instrument.

Sincerely,
Roberta G. Sands
Professor Emerita
University of Pennsylvania
School of Social Policy & Practice

APPENDIX 5

REQUEST AND RESPONSE FORM TO ACADEMIC
DEAN OR CHIEF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR

March 19, 2016
Dean
Name of University

Dear (Dean)

Thank you for taking the time to read this request. I am a graduate candidate working on research and need your faculty's assistance in conducting a study to complete my research requirements. My topic concerns the development of Christian higher education faculty through mentoring at Christian colleges and universities. It is my belief that this study will assist Christian colleges and seminaries in the area of healthy faculty development.

As you may know, mentoring relationships are attracting attention in almost every profession and their value to professional growth has become a popular discussion and focus in training and development programs.

Upon your approval, I would like to involve your faculty in this project. It would entail their completion of a brief survey. Participants' names and schools will be kept confidential and participation is voluntary.

If your faculty agrees to participate, I will ask your permission to obtain a list of the names and email addresses of only your full-time faculty and will send the questionnaire to them. I will handle all further details without inconveniencing your staff.

Thank you for considering involvement in this study. You may indicate your support by replying to this email with one of three responses. Also, if you would like to examine a copy of the survey, you may indicate your desire in the same response.

Sincerely,

Matt Thomas

APPENDIX 6

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE FORM

_____   Yes! This appears to be a valuable study. I will encourage our faculty to participate.

Please contact _____ to obtain a list of our full-time faculty information.

_____   Please send me a copy of the questionnaire to examine.

_____   No, thank you. I would rather not involve our faculty in this study.

APPENDIX 7

EMAIL ADMINISTRATIVE PERMISSION REMINDER

FROM: Matt Thomas

DATE: April 19, 2016

RE: Mentoring Study

Greetings!   I am working on my doctorate and have requested from your (Dean or Faculty Development Administrative) the help of your faculty in conducting my thesis study. The study is seeking to examine faculty mentoring as a best training practice among faculty at Christian colleges and universities.

In January an email was sent to your Dean/FDA requesting the participation of your school in this study. Attached is a copy of the original email request.

I have also shared another link to a response form that was included in the original request. Would you be willing to follow up on this request with your Dean/FDA? It is entirely possible that the original request was sent to junk mail or even simply overlooked. I would greatly appreciate any assistance you could offer along this line.

As explained in the original request, your Dean/FDA need only reply with a Yes or No and identify a contact person for me for me to call or email with further details. The study is completely voluntary and confidentiality will be guaranteed.

For your convenience, I have shared a link with you so that your reply to the original response form may be filled out.

Thank you.

I look forward to receiving your reply.

Matt Thomas

APPENDIX 8

EMAIL TO DEAN/CHIEF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR
NAME ACQUISITION

TO: Faculty Development Designee

FROM: Matt Thomas

DATE: April 19, 2016

RE: Mentoring Study

Greetings!   I am working on my doctorate and have requested from your Dean the help of your faculty in conducting my doctoral research. The study is seeking to examine faculty mentoring as a best training practice among faculty at Christian colleges and universities.

I have attached a copy of the response from your Dean/Faculty Development Administrator. I was given your name as the person I should contact in order to receive a list of FULL-TIME FACULTY names. The study will be completely voluntary and confidential and the names will only be used to send your faculty a copy of the questionnaire. I will email my questionnaire directly to them and will not bother your administrative team for any further details.

For your convenience, both my physical address and email address are at the bottom of this memo. You may use either to make your reply.

I look forward to receiving the faculty names from you.

Thank you.

APPENDIX 9

FACULTY EMAIL INVITATION TO
PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Dear Professor,

Have you ever been a mentor? Have you had a mentor?

My name is Matt Thomas and I am a doctoral student at The Southern Baptist
Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. I have always been intrigued with the
value of mentoring and the potential benefits it holds in relationships. In the context of
my research, I am asking the question, do faculty mentoring each other? If so, who is
mentoring whom and what do these relation ships look like?

In an attempt to answer these questions, I have shared a survey at the link provided in an
attempt to further study these questions as part of my doctoral work. Your reply will be
anonymous and no attempt will be made to identify a response with any specific college.
Participants have averaged 10 minutes in completing the survey.

You may decline to participate in this study at any point and will be free to decline any
questions that you may feel uncomfortable with. If you should experience undue concern
with the survey, feel free to contact me at mthomas233@students.sbts.edu.

This study has been approved by the Southern Seminary Institutional Review Board as
meeting their standards for such research. Participating in this study will greatly be
appreciated. If you are interested in receiving the results of the survey, you may simply
email me under separate cover.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated participation and prompt response.

Sincerely,

Matt Thomas
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

APPENDIX 10

FACULTY EMAIL REMINDER TO
PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Dear Professor,

Recently, you should have received an email regarding a survey on mentoring among faculty at Christian colleges and universities. If you have not yet completed the survey, please take the time to follow the link below.

Users have averaged 10 minutes in completing the survey. <u>Should you choose to participate in this study, please leave your contact information in the last question to be entered into a drawing on</u> **June 21st** <u>to receive a $250.00 Amazon gift card.</u>

Once again, the survey is anonymous and will not retain personally identifiable information, outside of information provided for the gift card. If you have already participated, thank you for your response and please disregard this follow up reminder.

Again, please feel free to contact me if you have any questions at mthomas233@students.sbts.edu.

Thank you for your assistance,

Matt Thomas
Doctoral Candidate
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

APPENDIX 11

EMAIL SEEKING PERMISSION TO INTERVIEW

Dear Professor,

Recently, you participated in a study regarding the nature of mentoring as a best practice of faculty development within Christian higher education, the issues undergirding these practices, and the benefits, if any, of implementing such practices. For this research to be complete, a second phase of semi-structured interviews is necessary for exploration of the perceptions and opinions of respondents regarding complex and sometimes sensitive issues.

This semi-structured interview will allow participants to be asked the same questions, while given opportunity to clarify or expand answers. The interview should last no more than 20 minutes and will be recorded for data collecting purpose. Recorded files will be discarded after transcriptions have been complete.

If you are available and willing to participate, please indicate by selecting a time for either a phone or in person interview. Setting the interview time will be prioritized by your availability. You may decline to participate in this phase at any point and will be free to decline any questions that you may feel uncomfortable with. If you should experience undue concern with the interview, feel free to contact me at mthomas233@students.sbts.edu.

Participating in this phase of the study will greatly be appreciated. If you are interested in receiving the results of the study, you may simply email me under separate cover.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated participation and prompt response.

Matt Thomas
Doctoral Candidate
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

APPENDIX 12

INSTRUMENT

Agreement to Participate
The research in which you are about to participate is designed to examine mentoring in Christian higher education institutions among full time faculty. This research is being conducted by Matt Thomas for purposes of Doctor of Education Thesis research. In this research, you will complete an online survey. Any information you provide will be held *strictly confidential,* and at no time will your name be reported, or your name identified with your responses. A request to participate in a follow up interview is included. If you desire to participate, you will indicate this communicating your desire to participate under separate email cover. Within the separate email, please list your contact information and select a time for either a phone or in person interview. Setting the interview time will be prioritized by your availability. You may decline to participate in this phase at any point and will be free to decline any questions with which you are not comfortable. *Participation in this study is totally voluntary, and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time.*

MENTORING AMONG FACULTY

Q1 Think of a person who has helped you the most in your academic career:

Someone who helped you find out what you wanted to do?

Someone who helped you achieve the success you achieved?

Someone in whom you most strongly identified as a model of what an effective

individual at work looked like?

Someone in whom you identified characteristics you'd like to obtain in your own

work-life?

Was, or is, there such a person in your own life?
- ❍ Yes, at one time, but not now
- ❍ Yes, currently
- ❍ I'm not sure
- ❍ No, I've never had such a person

Q2 In the questions that follow, the definition of "mentoring," "mentor," and "mentoree" will be:

> "Mentoring is a relational interaction between two people, in which one knows something, the MENTOR, transfers that something (advice, wisdom, information, emotional support, protection, link to resources, guidance, etc.) to someone else, the MENTOREE, at a sensitive time so that it impacts development."

Using this definition, have you ever had a mentor?
- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Q3 If YES, what was your position at the time? Check all that apply.
- ❑ Undergraduate student
- ❑ Master level student
- ❑ Doctoral level student
- ❑ Post-doctoral appointment
- ❑ Faculty member at another academic institution
- ❑ Faculty member at current academic institution
- ❑ Faculty member with an administrative appointment
- ❑ Employee
- ❑ Other _____

Please answer questions 4-10 ONLY IF YOU CURRENTLY HAVE, OR HAVE HAD, A FACULTY MENTOR while teaching at your current institution. Due to personal, professional, and institutional constraints, many faculty are not able to participate in mentoring relationships as either a mentor or as a mentoree.

IF YOU HAVE NOT HAD A MENTOR, PROCEED TO QUESTION 11.

Q4 How did your most significant mentoring relationship begin?
- ○ I initiated the relationship
- ○ My mentor initiated the relationship
- ○ It was mutually initiated
- ○ Departmental assignment
- ○ Other _____

Q5 What was your rank at the time?
- ○ Instructor
- ○ Assistant Professor
- ○ Associate Professor
- ○ Professor

Q6 What was the rank of your mentor?
- ○ Instructor
- ○ Assistant Professor
- ○ Associate Professor
- ○ Professor

Q7 Was your mentor of the same gender as you?
- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Q8 Was your mentor of the same ethnic/racial background as you?
- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Q9 Estimate the time PER MONTH, during the regular academic year, you spent with your mentor.
- ○ Less than 5 hours
- ○ 5-10 hours
- ○ More than 10 hours

Q10 What did you find most meaningful to you in the mentoring experience or relationship?

Q11 PLEASE EITHER COMPLETE QUESTION 11 or 12. Do not answer both. Below is a list of functions and activities that may be performed by mentors. If you have NOT been mentored as a faculty member at your current institution, using the following scale, indicate in the "IDEAL" the importance you place on each item with regard to faculty mentoring other faculty.

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important
Friendship	○	○	○	○	○
Intellectual guidance	○	○	○	○	○
Collaboration in research or publications	○	○	○	○	○
Constructive criticism and feedback	○	○	○	○	○
Information source about school policies and procedures	○	○	○	○	○
Affirmation about how God is working in mentoree's life	○	○	○	○	○
Help integrating biblical principles with teaching, research, and scholarship	○	○	○	○	○
Information source about formal expectations for promotion and tenure	○	○	○	○	○

Involvement in studying the Bible with mentoree	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Emotional support	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Prayer support	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Introductions to persons who could further career	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Informal advice about social norms (dress code, relationships with students, etc).	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Introductions to professional network	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Caring relationships; agape love shared	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Help making difficult career decisions	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Help with personal problems	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Promotion of an equal and collaborative relationship	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Encouragement to obey the teachings of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Bible	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Help with teaching	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Informal advice about committee work	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Fostering of professional visibility	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Encouragement and coaching	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q12 PLEASE EITHER COMPLETE QUESTION 11 or 12. Do not answer both. Below is a list of functions and activities that may be performed by mentors. If you have been mentored as a faculty member at your current institution, using the following scale, indicate in the "ACTUAL" the importance you place on each item with regard to faculty mentoring other faculty.

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important
Friendship	O	O	O	O	O
Intellectual guidance	O	O	O	O	O
Collaboration in research or publications	O	O	O	O	O
Constructive criticism and feedback	O	O	O	O	O
Information source about school policies and procedures	O	O	O	O	O
Affirmation about how God is working in mentoree's life	O	O	O	O	O
Help integrating biblical principles with teaching, research, and scholarship	O	O	O	O	O
Information source about formal expectations for promotion and tenure	O	O	O	O	O
Involvement in studying the Bible with mentoree	O	O	O	O	O
Emotional support	O	O	O	O	O
Prayer support	O	O	O	O	O
Introductions to persons who could further career	O	O	O	O	O
Informal advice about social norms (dress code, relationships with students, etc).	O	O	O	O	O
Introductions to professional network	O	O	O	O	O

Caring relationships; agape love shared	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Help making difficult career decisions	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Help with personal problems	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Promotion of an equal and collaborative relationship	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Encouragement to obey the teachings of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Bible	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Help with teaching	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Informal advice about committee work	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Fostering of professional visibility	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Encouragement and coaching	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q13 Estimate the average time PER MONTH that you spend (or have spent) mentoring other faculty members during the academic year.
- ❍ Less than 5 hours
- ❍ 5-10 hours
- ❍ More than 10 hours

144

Q14 The following is a list of possible reasons for becoming a mentor. Determine how important these reasons were/are for you by selecting the appropriate category.

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important
To make friends	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
To fulfill job responsibilities	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
To maintain professional standards	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
To repay past mentors	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
To pass on the mentoring tradition	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
To aid women	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
To aid minorities	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
To recruit people for collaborative research	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
To experience satisfaction	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
To pass on my ideas or research methods to others	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q15 How did your mentoring relationships usually begin?
- ❍ I initiated the relationship
- ❍ My mentor initiated the relationship
- ❍ It was mutually initiated
- ❍ Departmental assignment

Q16 It has been suggested that senior faculty members have a responsibility to mentor junior faculty members.

	Not at all necessary	Somewhat necessary	Very necessary
Does this seem like a necessary or unnecessary suggestion to you?	❍	❍	❍
Does this seem like a realistic or unrealistic expectation to you?	❍	❍	❍

Q17 Using the following scale, please indicate to what extent the following conditions might affect the development and maintenance of mentoring relationships among faculty.

	Not a Hindrance	Slight Hindrance	Some Hindrance	Moderate Hindrance	Great Hindrance	NA
Heavy teaching load	○	○	○	○	○	○
Demands from students	○	○	○	○	○	○
Committee work	○	○	○	○	○	○
Social isolation, alienation	○	○	○	○	○	○
Demands from my supplemental works involvement	○	○	○	○	○	○
Responsibilities for my family or intimate network	○	○	○	○	○	○
No prior experience in mentoring relationships	○	○	○	○	○	○
Individualistic/ competitive mindset in academe	○	○	○	○	○	○
Emphasis on being experts	○	○	○	○	○	○
No intentional development or formal training programs for new faculty	○	○	○	○	○	○
Fear of opening up to another person in an honest way	○	○	○	○	○	○
High task performance expectations leave little time for developing personal relationships	○	○	○	○	○	○
Humility and freedom to admit	○	○	○	○	○	○

Academic "professional aura" blocks intimacy	○	○	○	○	○	○
Personal problems	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q18 Please identify any other conditions you consider inhibiting in developing mentoring relationships in the space provided.

Q19 Please indicate your current academic rank.
- ○ Instructor
- ○ Assistant Professor
- ○ Associate Professor
- ○ Professor

Q20 Are you tenured?
- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Q21 Are you in a tenure track position?
- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Q22 What is your highest academic degree? _____

Q23 How long have you been at your current school? _____

Q24 What is the year of your birth? _____

Q25 What is your gender?
- ○ Male
- ○ Female

Q26 What is the college of your discipline?
- ○ Arts and Sciences (arts, humanities, the biological sciences, mathematics and physical sciences, social and behavior sciences)
- ○ Professional Schools and Pre-Professional Programs (allied medical professionals, business, dentistry, education, engineering, law, medicine, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, social work, veterinary medicine)
- ○ Religious Studies (Bible, Christian and religious education, pre-seminary and seminary studies)
- ○ Other (agriculture, home economics, unspecified)

APPENDIX 13

MULTI-YEAR ACTION PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF FACULTY IN CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION
THROUGH MENTORING

This action plan should be used as a model for implementing effective

mentoring among faculty at Christian higher education institutions.

- Mentorees will benefit from this action plan by quickly acclimating to a new work environment, learning the best way to select a mentor, and understanding the career pressures faced by senior faculty.
- Mentors will benefit from this action plan by outlining specific mentoring functions that would best meet the needs of the mentoree.
- Administrators responsible for professional development who are responsible for cultivating a climate for effective faculty development. Additionally, this research would benefit Christian higher education institutions that are committed to enhancing faculty teaching skill, supporting faculty ongoing development, and providing sufficient resources for faculty mentoring relationships to succeed.
- This action plan would benefit organizations that exclusively employ Christian employees. Christian organizations that represent workplace environments like church staffs, Christian day schools faculty, Bible college faculty, and seminary faculty would benefit by implementing this action plan to effectively assess the quality of training/mentoring relationships within their organization.

The process of creating this plan is a result of the research conducted by the author and the existing literature related to faculty mentoring. The purpose of this action plan is to develop Christian faculty members through the practice of mentoring other faculty members. Institutions should seek written permission from the author before copying or distributing the material. Institutions will benefit from using this action plan in a professional development setting or in the equipping of the faculty members who will engage in the mentoring process.

Year 1- Development: Information and Implementation

Information process: Because the literature revealed that when mentoring

occurs in higher education "it is generally limited in quantity and poor in content," the

development of faculty through mentoring must be a philosophical belief held by all

faculty members. The literature highlighted three common misconceptions about faculty

148

development in small colleges emphasizing teaching as central: (1) "faculty development is remedial, (2) faculty development only promotes one "right way" way to teach, (3) and that faculty development forces faculty to choose between teaching and scholarship." To counter this belief, development of faculty should include research concerning the long-term impact of mentoring as faculty development in higher education.[1] Research in Chapter 2 revealed that mentoring has a broader and more substantial positive impact on faculty than previously thought. (83%) of faculty characterized mentoring as having "a lot of impact" on the personal and professional life. The information stage would include pre-semester workshops that seek to build a culture across the institution that fosters mentoring relationships, to train faculty mentors in best practices of faculty mentoring in light of the four-factor mentoring model, to enhance the use of available technological resources, to provide institutional support, to demonstrate how to adapt when the mentor or mentoree encounter conditions that may prevent the development and maintenance of mentoring relationships.

Implementation process: The development of faculty through mentoring must be balanced with a programmatic structure while maintaining an organic feel. Research in this study indicates that mentoring relationships that are initiated through the course of natural interaction and even friendships were more likely to be meaningful and ongoing. In this stage, faculty should be given opportunity to seek out colleagues that would be characterized as a best fit. If this is not available to faculty mentors, mentoring assignments should be provided through the faculty development director based on a faculty questionnaire filled out by each faculty member. This stage includes reporting frequency of meetings and mentoring progress in the development of the mentoring relationship, while being careful not to violate the trust being established.

---

[1]Amy M. Knight, Joseph A. Carrese, and Scott M. Wright, "Qualitative Assessment of the Long-Term Impact of a Faculty Development Program in Teaching Skills," *Medical Education* 41 (2007): 595-98.

Year 2- Maintenance: Assessment and Adaptation

The second year in this mentoring model must assess the health of each mentoring relationship. Critical to maintaining mentoring relationships will be the institution's ability to assess and adapt where necessary. As noted in Chapter 2, assessment practice should deal with faculty satisfaction in the mentoring relationship and the impact it is having on the faculty member's professional and personal life. Mentoring that includes personal growth and encourages religious commitment may be the tool to best accomplish this task.[2] Using Schroder's model predictor, assessment would include,

1. time for reflection on personal and professional goals,
2. opportunities for networking,
3. opportunities for role changes,
4. resources that encourage continuous education,
5. and an opportunity to be placed in a new mentoring relationship if necessary.[3]

---

[2]Harry Hubball, Anthony Clarke, Andrea L. Beach, "Assessing Faculty Learning Communities,"*Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 87-88.

[3]Ralph Schroder, "Predictors of Organizational Commitment for Faculty and Administrators of a Private Christian University," *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 17 (2008): 93.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ambrosetti, Angelina. "Are You Ready to Be a Mentor? Preparing Teachers for Pre-Service Teachers." *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 39, no. 6 (2014): 30-42.

Athey, Susan, and Douglass K. Hoffman. "The Master Teacher Initiative: A Framework for Faculty Development." *Marketing Education Review* 17 (Fall 2007)*:* 1-9.

Austin, Ann E. "Supporting Faculty Members across Their Careers." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 363-78. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Austin, Anne E., Andrea L. Beach, Pamela L. Eddy, and Mary Deane Sorcinelli. *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning from the Past, Understanding the Present.* Bolton, MA: Anker, 2006.

Austin, Anne E., and Mary Deane Sorcinelli. "The Future of Faculty Development: Where Are We Going?" *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 85-96.

Balmer, Dorren, Donna D'Allessandro, and Maryellen E. Gusic. "How Mentoring Relationships Evolve: A Longitudinal Study of Academic Pediatricians in a Physician Educator Development Faculty Program." *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions* 31, no. 2 (2011): 81-86.

Barriball, K. Louise, and Allison While. "Collecting Data Using a Semi Structured Interview: A Discussion Paper." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 19 (May 1994): 328-35.

Behar-Horenstein, Linda S., Cynthia W. Garvan, Frank A. Catalanotto, and Charisse N. Hudson-Vassell. "The Role of Needs Assessment for Faculty Development Initiatives." *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (May 2014): 75-86.

Berk, Ronald A. "Should Student Outcomes Be Used to Evaluate Teaching?" *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (May 2014): 87-96.

Bers, Trudy H., Diane B. David, and Bill Taylor. "The Use of Syllabi in Assessments: Unobtrusive Indicators and Tools for Faculty Development." *Assessment Update* 12, no. 3 (2000): 3-7.

Blaisdell, Muriel L., and Milton D. Cox. "Midcareer and Senior Faculty Learning Communities: Learning throughout Faculty Careers." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 137-48.

Boice, Robert. *Advice for New Faculty Members.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.

_____. "Lessons Learned about Mentoring." *Developing New and Junior Faculty* 50 (1992): 51-61.

_____. *The New Faculty Member.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Butler, Jeffrey L. *The Essential College Professor: A Practical Guide to an Academic Career*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

The Carnegie Foundation of New York. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* New York: Carnegie Forum on Education, 1986.

Child, Alan J. "Talking It Through: A Way to Raise Teacher Performance." *Management in Education* 2, no. 16 (2002): 11-13.

Cleveland, Vicki D., Neil F. McBride, and Mark A. Wyatt. "The State of Higher Education among Baptist Colleges and Universities." *A Research Study by California Baptist University*, *Riverside* (2013): 1-85.

Cohen, Margaret W. "Listen, Learn, Lead: Getting Started in Faculty Development." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 67-82. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Colon-Emeric, Cathleen S., Lynn Bowlby, and Laura Svetkey. "Establishing Faculty Needs and Priorities for Peer-Mentoring Groups Using a Nominal Group Technique." *Medical Teacher* 34 (2012): 631-34.

Cox, Milton D. "Fostering the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning through Faculty Learning Communities." *Excellence in College Teaching* 14 (2003): 168-91.

_____. "Introduction to Faculty Learning Communities." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 5-23.

Crawley, Arthur L. "Faculty Development Programs at Research Universities: Implications for Senior Faculty Renewal." *To Improve the Academy* 14 (1995): 65-90.

Creswell, John W., and Vicki L. Plano Clark. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research.* 2nd ed. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2011.

Crow, Mary Lynn, Ohmer Milton, W. Edmund Moomaw, and William R. O'Connell, Jr. "Faculty Development Centers in Southern Universities." *Undergraduate Education Reform Project* (1976): 1-62.

Cunningham, Michelle M. "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships among Faculty Members in Christian Higher Education." Ed.D. diss., Talbot School of Theology, 1996.

Cunningham, Shelly. "Who's Mentoring the Mentors? The Discipling Dimension of Faculty Development in Christian Higher Education." *Theological Education* 34, no. 2 (Spring 1998): 31-49.

Davidson, J. C., and D. P. Caddell. "Religion and the Meaning of Work." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33, no. 2 (1994): 135-47.

Dangel, Harry, and Peter Lindsay. "What Are Our Students (Really) Telling Us?" *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (May 2014): 27-33.

Douglass, Jane D. "Faculty Development: A Shared Responsibility." *Theological Education* 28, no. 1 (Autumn 1991): 36-42.

Edman, Jayne. "Best Practices Mentoring New Full-Time Faculty: Reenergizing and Improving an Existing Formal Mentoring Program." Ed.D. diss., Rowan University, 2011.

Ellis, Donna E., and Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens. "Practical Suggestions for Programs and Activities." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 117-32. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Engstrom, Ted W. *The Making of a Leader*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

Erickson, G. "A Survey of Faculty Development Practices." *Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development* 1 (Winter 1986): 182-96.

Felder, Richard M., and Rebecca Brent. "The National Effective Teaching Institute: Assessment of Impact and Implications for Faculty Development." *Journal of Engineering Education* 99, no. 2 (April 2010): 121-34.

Feldman, J., and D. McPhee. *The Science of Learning and the Art of Teaching*. Clifton Park, NY: Thompson Delmar Learning, 2007.

Fink, Dee L. "Innovative Ways of Assessing Faculty Development." *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 47-59.

Forman, Marshal. "The Faculty That Stays Together Grays Together: The Faculty Development Movement." *Princeton Mid-Career Fellowship Program* (Spring 1989): 3-24.

Frerichs, Catherine E., Diana G. Pace, and Tamara Rosier. "Leading from the Middle: A Faculty Development Center at the Heart of Institutional Change." In *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change,* edited by Connie Schroeder, 143-61. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011.

Fry, L. W. "Toward a Theory of Spiritual Leadership." *Leadership Quarterly* 14, no. 6 (2003): 693-727.

Gay, Lorraine R., Geoffrey E. Mills, and Peter W. Airasian. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill, 2000.

Gibson, Gerald W. *Good Start: A Guidebook for New Faculty in Liberal Arts Colleges*. Bolton, MA: Anker, 1992.

Gillespie, Kay J. "Organizational Development." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 375-96. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Guskey, Thomas R. *Evaluating Professional Development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 1999.

Haines, Seena L., and Nicholas G. Popovich. "Faculty Development: Engaging External Senior Faculty Members as Faculty Mentors." *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 5, no. 78 (2014): 1-6.

Hall, M. Elizabeth Lewis, and Lauren E. Maltby. "Mentoring: The View from Both Sides." *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 32, no. 1 (2013): 70-74.

Harvey, Pamela, and Martin Dowson. "Transitional Experiences of New Teachers in Christian Schools: A Case Study." *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 12, no. 2 (Fall 2003): 217-43.

Haviland, Don, Shin Seon-Hi, and Steve Turley. "Now I'm Ready: The Impact of a Professional Development Initiative on Faculty Concerns with Program Assessment." *Innovation of Higher Education* 35 (2010): 261-75.

Holmes, Courney M., and Kelly A. Kozlowski. "Faculty Experience in a Research Learning Community." *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (May 2014): 35-41.

Honan, James, Andrew Westmoreland, and Mark Tew. "Creating a Culture of Appreciation for Faculty Development." *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 33-44.

Hsieh, Hsiu-Fang, and Sarah E. Shannon. "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis." *Qualitative Health Research* 15, no. 9 (November 2005): 1277-88.

Hubball, Harry, Anthony Clark, and Andrea L. Beach, "Assessing Faculty Learning Communities." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 87-100.

Intrator, Sam M., and Robert Kunzman. "Starting with the Soul." *Educational Leadership* 63, no. 6 (006): 38-42.

Joeckel, Samuel, and Thomas Chesnes. "The Challenge of Gender Equity within the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities." *Christian Higher Education* 8, no. 2 (2009): 115-31.

Johnson, W. Brad. *On Being a Mentor: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2007.

Kang, Hokyung Paul. "Perceptions and Experience of Transformative Learning and Faculty Authenticity among North American Professors of Christian Education (NAPCE)." *Christian Education Journal* 10 (2013): 339-59.

Knight, Amy M., Joseph A. Carrese, and Scott M. Wright. "Qualitative Assessment of the Long-Term Impact of a Faculty Development Program in Teaching Skills." *Medical Education* 41 (2007): 592-600.

Korthagen, Fred "Professional Learning from within." *Studying Teacher Education* 5, no. 2 (2009): 195-99.

Kram, K. E. "Phases of the Mentor Relationship." *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (1983): 608-25.

Kuhlenschmidt, Sally. "Issues in Technology and Faculty Development." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 259-74. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Lee, Virgina. "Program and Protoyped." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 21-34. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Leedy, Paul D., and Jeanne Ellis Ormrod. *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. 10th ed. Boston: Pearson, 2013.

Lieberman, Ann. "Practices That Support Teacher Development: Transforming Conceptions of Professional Learning." *Innovating and Evaluating Science Education* 76, no. 8 (1995): 67.

Leiberman, Devorah. "Nurturing Institutional Change: Collaboration and Leadership Between Upper-Level Administrators and Faculty Develops." In *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change,* edited by Connie Schroeder, 60-73. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011.

Levinson, D. J. *The Season's of a Man's Life*. New York: Ballentine, 1978.

Logan, Samuel T., Jr. "Faculty Development: An Organic Perspective." *Theological Education* 31, no. 2 (1995): 27-36.

Loucks-Horsley, Susan. "Professional Development and the Learner Centered School." *Theory Into Practice* 34, no. 4 (Autumn 1995): 265-71.

Lowman, Joseph. "Observing Faculty from a Developmental Perspective." *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (May 2014): 63-68.

Lucas, Christopher J., and John W. Murry. *New Faculty: A Practical Guide for Academic Beginners.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

Lueddeke, George R. "Professionalizing Teaching Practice in Higher Education: A Study of Disciplinary Variation and Teaching Scholarship." *Studies in Higher Education* 28, no. 2 (2003): 213-28.

MacKenzie, Jane, Sheena Bell, Jason Bohan, Andrea Brown, Joanne Burke, Barbara Cogdell, Susan Jamieson, Julie McAdam, Robert McKerlie, Lorna Morrow, Beth Pascke, Paul Rea, and Anne Tierney. "From Anxiety to Empowerment: A Learning Community of University Teachers." *Teaching in Higher Education* 15, no. 3 (June 2010): 273-84.

Marshall, Joretta L. "Learning about Teaching in Communities: Lessons for Faculty Development." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 8, no. 1 (2005): 29-34.

Marston, Susan H., and Gerald J. Brunetti. "Job Satisfaction of Experienced Professors at a Liberal Arts College." *Education* 130, no. 2 (2009): 323-47.

McCabe, Linda L., and Edward R. B. McCabe. *How to Succeed in Academics.* San Diego: Academic, 1999.

McKee, William C., Mitzy Johnson, and Mark W. Tew. "Professional Development of the Faculty: Past and Present." *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 15-20.

McKee, William C., and Mark W. Tew. "Setting the Stage Teaching and Learning in American Higher Education: Making the Case for Faculty Development." *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 3-14.

Michalec P. "A Calling to Teach: Faith and the Spiritual Dimensions of Teaching." *Encounter Education for Meaning and Social Justice* 15 (2002): 5.

Mullen, Carol A. *From Student to Professor: Translating a Graduate Degree into a Career in Academia*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education, 2012.

Opre, Adrian, Monica Zaharie, and Dana Opre. "Faculty Development: Teaching Staff Needs, Knowledge, and Priorities." *Cognition, Brain, Behavior* 7, no. 1 (2008): 29-43.

O'Sullivan, Patricia S., and David Irby. "Reframing Research on Faculty Development." *Academic Medicine* 86, no. 4 (2004): 421-28.

Ouellett, Mathew L. "Overview of Diversity Issues Relating to Faculty Development." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 185-200. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

_____. "Overview of Faculty Development: History and Choices." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 3-19. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Palmer, Parker. *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1998.

Parrott, Roger. *The Longview: Lasting Strategies for Rising Leaders*. Elgin, IL: David C Cook, 2009.

Pellicer, Leonard O., and Lorin W. Anderson. *A Handbook for Teacher Leaders*. Thousand Oak, CA: Corwin, 1995.

Penner, Ron. "Mentoring in Higher Education." *Directions* 30, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 45-52.

Petrone, Martha C. "Supporting Diversity with Faculty Learning Communities: Teaching and Learning across the Boundaries." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 111-25.

Petrone, Martha C., and Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens. "Facilitating Faculty Learning Communities: A Compact Guide to Creating Change and Inspiring Community." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 63-69.

Phelps, Matthew P., and Scott Waalkes. "Christian Friendship as Faculty Development: A Narrative Account." *Journal of Education and Christian Belief* 13, no. 2 (2009): 125-39.

Plank, Kathyrn M., and Alan Kalish. "Program Assessment for Faculty Development." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 135-50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Pruett, Christian D., and Terry Pollard. "Virtual Space (E-Learning) Faculty Development." *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 61-68.

Raines, Shirley C., and Martha Squires Alberg. "The Role of Professional Development in Preparing Academic Leaders." *Identifying and Preparing Academic Leaders* 124 (Winter 2003): 33-39.

Reder, Michael. "Effective Practices in the Context of Small Colleges." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 293-308. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Rees, Amanda, and Kimberly Shaw. "Peer Mentoring Communities of Practice for Early and Mid-Career Faculty: Broad Benefits from a Research-Oriented Female Peer Mentoring Group." *The Journal of Faculty* Development 28, no 2 (Spring 2014): 5-17.

Rice, R. E., M. D. Sorcinelli, and A. E. Austin. *Heeding New Voices: Academic Careers for a New Generation.* Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education, 2000.

Richlin, Laurie, and Milton D. Cox. "Developing Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning through Faculty Learning Communities." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 127-35.

Richlin, Laurie, and Amy Essington. "Faculty Learning Communities for Preparing Future Faculty." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 149-57.

_____. "Overview of Faculty Learning Communities." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 25-39.

Russell, Jeffrey S., and John Nelson. "Completing the Circle of Professional Development through Leadership and Mentoring." *Leadership and Management in Engineering* 9, no. 1 (2009): 40-42.

Sands, Roberta G., L. Alayne Parson, and Josann Duane. "Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University." *The Journal of Higher Education* 62, no. 2 (1991): 174-93.

Schroder, Ralph. "Predictors of Organizational Commitment for Faculty and Administrators of a Private Christian University." *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 17 (2008): 81-97.

Schroeder, Connie M. "Developing and Acting on a Center Vision*."* In *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change,* edited by Connie Schroeder, 178-98. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011.

_____. "Faculty Developers as Institutional Developers." In *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change,* edited by Connie Schroeder, 17-46. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011.

_____. "Knowing and Facilitating Organizational Change Process." In *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change,* edited by Connie Schroeder, 199-217. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011.

Schroeder, Connie M., and Associates. "Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change." In *Coming in from the Margins: Faculty Development's Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change,* edited by Connie Schroeder, preface. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2011.

Schuman, David W., John Peters, and Taimi Olsen. "Cocreating Value in Teaching and Learning Centers." *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 21-32.

Selby, James W., and Lawrence G. Calhoun. "Faculty: Unintended Consequences?" *Teaching of Psychology* 25, no. 3 (1998): 210-11.

Shavelson, R. J., and L. Huang. "Responding Responsibly to the Frenzy to Assess Learning In Higher Education." *Change* 35, no. 1 (January-February 2003): 11-18.

Sherer, Pamela D., Timothy P. Shea, and Erik Kristensen. "Online Communities of Practice: A Catalyst for Faculty Development." *Innovative Higher Education* 27, no. 3 (2003): 183-94.

Shulman, Gary M., Milton D. Cox, and Laurie Richlin. "Institutional Considerations in Developing a Faculty Learning Community Program." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 41-49.

Shulman, L. S. "Counting and Recounting: Assessment and the Quest for Accountability." *Change* 39, no. 1 (2007): 20-25.

Speck, Bruce W. "The Role of Doctoral Programs in Preparing Faculty for Multiple Roles in Academy." *Identifying and Preparing Academic Leaders* 124 (Winter 2003): 41-55.

Stabile, Christopher, and William F. Ritchie. "Clarifying the Differences between Training, Development, and Enrichment: The Role of Institutional Belief Constructs in Creating the Purpose of Faculty Learning Initiatives." *The Breadth of Current Faculty Development: Practitioners' Perspectives* 133 (Spring 2013): 71-84.

Stewart, Kenneth. "Connecting the Dots: The Decline in Meaningful Learning." *The Journal of Faculty Development* 28, no. 2 (May 2014): 53-61.

Swezey, James A. "Faculty Sense of Religious Calling at a Christian University." *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 18 (2009): 316-32.

Theall, Michael, and Jennifer L. Franklin. "Assessing Teaching Practices and Effectiveness for Formative Purposes." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 150-68. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Thomas, John Charles. "Administrative, Staff, and Faculty Perceptions of Organizational Climate and Commitment in Christian Higher Education." *Christian Higher Education* 7 (2008): 226-52.

Trentham, John David. "Epistemological Development in Pre-Ministry Undergraduates: A Cross Institutional Application of the Perry Scheme." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2012.

Valantasis, Richard. "Mentoring Younger Faculty." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 8, no. 1 (2005): 56-59.

Vaughan, Norman. "Technology in Support of Faculty Learning Communities." *Building Faculty Learning Communities* 97 (Spring 2004): 101-9.

Wehlburg, Catherine M. "Assessment Practices Related to Student Learning." In *A Guide to Faculty Development*, edited by Kay J. Gillespie and Douglas L. Robertson, 169-83. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Kindle.

Weimer, Maryellen. *Learner Centered Teaching: Five Keys to Practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2013.

Wilkerson, LuAnn, and David M. Irby. "Strategies for Improving Teaching Practices: A Comprehensive Approach to Faculty Development." *Academic Medicine* 73, no. 4 (April 1998): 387-96.

Wilson, Peter F., and W. Brad Johnson. "Core Virtues for the Practice of Mentoring." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 29, no. 2 (2001): 121-30.

Wolvoord, Barbara E. *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

Woodberry, Robert D., Jerry Z. Park, Lyman A. Kellstedt, Mark D. Regnerus, and Brian Steensland. "The Measure of American Religious Traditions: Theoretical and Measurement Considerations." *Social Forces* 91, no. 1 (September 2013): 65-73.

Yoder, Bob. "Strengthening a Christian College as a Faith Mentoring Environment." *The Journal of Youth Ministry* 11, no. 2 (Spring 2013): 87-129.

York-Barr, Jennifer, William A. Sommers, Gail S. Ghere, and Jo Montie, eds. *Reflective Practice to Improve Schools: An Action Guide for Educators.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2005.

ABSTRACT

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION
FACULTY THROUGH MENTORING

Steven Matthew Thomas, Ed.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016
Chair: Dr. Anthony W. Foster

A debate surrounds the topic of best practices for faculty development. There are those that hold the position that faculty are more likely to develop as a faculty member when they experience an enhancement program, rather than training and development. Still others argue the opposite position claiming that there are unintended negative consequences from faculty mentoring programs. This research examined the practices of mentoring among full-time faculty at member schools of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU).

This study was adapted from "The Nature of Workplace Mentoring Relationships among Faculty Members in Christian Higher Education," a study done by Cunningham (1996). This research described the nature of mentoring among faculty in Christian higher education institutions by explaining the actual mentoring practices taking places in CCCU member schools, by examining the institution's prioritization of mentoring, and by describing the conditions that might affect the development and maintenance of successful, ongoing mentoring relationships. Finally, this research provided a four-factor description of mentoring's best practices: Career Guide, Friend, Discipleship, and Information Source.

This study provides a clear picture of mentoring practices and how they might be generalized to best fit all Christian higher education institutions. Because Christian higher education institutions are uniquely positioned within society to have significant

impact on current and future generations, and because the literature base is lacking in the area of Christian higher education faculty development and mentoring practices, this study provides a convincing argument for the use of mentoring as a best training practice in Christian higher education.

VITA

Steven Matthew Thomas

EDUCATIONAL
        B.A., Pacific Coast Baptist Bible College, 1995
        M.A.C.E., Azusa Pacific University, 2005

MINISTERIAL
        Associate Pastor, Bethel Baptist Church, Santa Ana, California, 1994-2007
        Pastor for Families, Kindred Community Church, Anaheim, California, 2011-
            2014

PROFESSIONAL
        Executive Director, Know the Truth, Inc., Anaheim Hills, California, 2014-

ACADEMIC
        Instructor, Pacific Baptist College, La Verne, California, 2002-2006
        Head Principal, Bethel Baptist High School, Santa Ana, California, 2007-2011

ORGANIZATIONS
        Society of Professors in Christian Education