GAINING SUPPORT FOR INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN A CONSERVATIVE CONTEXT

Submitted to:

Dr. Barbara Leigh Smith and Dr. Richard Jones
Conference Coordinators

Alternative Higher Education and its Relevance
in the 1980's

The Evergreen State College
Olympia, Washington
Sept. 8-10, 1981

by
J. Nicholls Eastmond, Jr.
Director, Northern Rockies Consortium for Higher Education
UMC 30, Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322

June 30, 1981

ABSTRACT

GAINING SUPPORT FOR INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

IN A CONSERVATIVE CONTEXT

The parallel movements of instructional and faculty development represent a pervasive source of intellectual ferment in higher education. Coming out of conditions in the 1960's, the movement built momentum in the 1970's and searches now for the optimal direction for the 1980's. This paper traces the development of the organizational ideas on one campus which contributed in a major way to a consortium of institutions in four states. Supported by two three-year grants from the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, the project is based upon a philosophy of stability and an incremental, non-obtrusive strategy.

Successive stages in this development, carried out under the leadership of three very different project directors, include the following stages: (1) development of awareness and faculty support for instructional development efforts; (2) the expansion into large-scale, departmental instructional intervention; (3) a transition, re-analysis stage; and (4) an expansion phase, leading to establishment and fostering of instructional and faculty development programs in 26 participating schools in the four state region of Utah, Idaho, Wyoming and Montana through the Northern Rockies Consortium for Higher Education (NORCHE).

The principles imbedded in each stage of the innovation process can be viewed as transfer of technology (e.g. Rogers and Shoemaker), as change agentry (e.g. Havelock), or more recently as networking (e.g. Lindquist and Buhl). Regardless of the framework used, certain underlying features are crucial.

The first is a case for a conservative, incremental approach to instructional improvement. Political and economic considerations must be specifically addressed in ways which may not be immediately obvious. For example, the balance between internal and external sources of funding has major implications for a project's development. Similarly, the internal vs. external focus of such projects must be examined. Success stories, as well as failure episodes, often fail to come to terms with these factors in an overall coherent strategy.

The issue of leadership style, particularly degree of control exercised, makes for intriguing analysis in the Utah State University-Northern Rockies Consortium context. To what extent should program initiative and support come from faculty grassroots, and to what extent should these be derived centrally? When dealing with neighboring institutions, previously rivals, what kind of leadership can move the terms of exchange into cooperative rather than competitive modes? Who can make these connections occur, and at what personal and institutional price? And finally, to what extent is change in leadership a salutory feature of a growing program? Can one person or approach adapt to the shifting factors and constant demands for change required? These and other leadership-related issues deserve further examination.

A final issue being addressed by the Northern Rockies Consortium concerns the question of idea dissemination through networking. At an early meeting of the initiators of the Consortium, it was discovered that three of the four centers represented had developed autotutorial approaches to introductory biology, two using audiotape alone and one using both audiotape and videotape formats. Each of these courses had been developed independently, within a radius of 100 miles, with no knowledge that anyone else was working on the

same instructional problem. The point is not that one center should have done the work, with the others adopting or adapting, but rather that each project could have been enriched by the learnings of the others. Despite considerable attention, the dimensions of this reluctance to reach out and learn from others has proved more intractable than anticipated. After funding numerous exchange visits by consultants and faculty, after development of an extensive computerized listing of worthy projects and publications of directories, newsletters and the like, it is safe to say that this problem has not been resolved in our setting.

This paper examines the legacy of two FIPSE projects, numerous projects with faculty on widely dispersed campuses, of relations within and outside the University setting. The emerging picture is of a coherent approach to instructional improvement which is theory-based, conservative and developmental in nature, and which promises much for the crucible of the eighties.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous reform movements in higher education in the 1970's sprang from student unrest and subsequent public attention in the late 1960's. The parallel movements of instructional development and faculty development are examples of such reforms. In an era when quality of instruction was under fire from students, these programs' promised instructional improvement through institutional change and a convenient reply for administrators that "at least we're doing something."

This paper traces the impact of these movements in a conservative context, in this case Utah State University (USU) in Logan, Utah. Founded in 1888 as a Land Grant institution, Utah State balances a conservative Mormon tradition with an increasing balance of faculty from other regions in a cosmopolitan but stable (and beautiful) setting. Over the decade of the seventies, enrollment has held steady at around 9,000 students.

Experiments with faculty and instructional development at USU span this same decade using a particular approach, namely one of gradualism and incremental change based upon certain modest program expectations.

Two major projects supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) have their roots on the USU campus and share this particular approach to faculty renewal. The first (1974-76) developed a model for department level instructional development. The second (1978-1981) built a consortium of instructional improvement centers in four states.

The distinction between faculty development and instructional development has been provided by Gaff.[1] He views faculty development as the more traditional approach to faculty renewal, focusing upon faculty members' content expertise and teaching skills. Examples of faculty development efforts include sabbatical leaves, professional meetings, workshops, colloquia and similar activities. Instructional development, on the other hand, examines instruction separately from any particular professor. It is concerned with identifying objectives, sequencing content, and evaluating student progress. Instructional development derives many of its concepts from the systems approach (e.g. Roger Kaufman)[2] and from the emerging field of instructional psychology (e.g. Robert Gagne and Leslie Briggs)[3].

In practice, a neat division between the two approaches has been rare. At Utah State University, for example, faculty development and instructional development activities have blended with each receiving more or less emphasis depending upon the predispositions of Director and staff. To some extent, experiment in both is enriching to the other, and an eclectic rather than a strict doctrinaire approach has been taken. Following the convention of Lindquist, et al,[4] "teaching improvement" is used as a descriptor to characterize both approaches.

THE UNDERLYING PHILOSOPHY

The most succinct statement of the philosophy of USU's Instructional Development Division is found in a 1973 article by DeBloois and Alder[5]. In brief, the approach to teaching improvement relies upon faculty initiative to propose change and offers modest support, both financial and informational, to carry it out. The assumptions of the "Theory Y" management style propounded by Douglas MacGregor[6] prevail: namely, that faculty members are knowledgeable, and motivated, and that rather than pressuring faculty into taking action, a program should point out options and allow faculty to choose the course of action best suited to their own situation. This outlook is highly critical of heavy handed doctrinaire approaches which attempt to "sell" the client on any particular innovation -- be it behavioral objectives, use of media, competency-based education -- to the exclusion of other approaches. Descriptors like "modest service agency," "low-profile program," and "faculty initiated reforms" characterize this strategy for instructional improvement.

A central feature of the program is a model set forth in the 1973 article[7] and expanded in a later publication by Eastmond[8]. That model attempts to move activities of an instructional development agency from those promoting awareness, from small to more extensive individual faculty projects, to involvement with entire departments in more extensive development projects. The final stage of the model, supported by a two and one half year grant from the Fund, was

developed extensively between 1974 and 1976, involving one major department each year.

Table 1: A Model for Instructional Development Activity

Stage	Associated Program Activities
1. Awareness	1. Occasional papers Informal lecture series
2. Faculty support	2. Minigrants Limited production/development activities
3. Faculty development	3. Released-time grants Extensive production/development activities
4. Departmental development	4. Formal needs assessment Curricular planning Course development as individuals and teams

Adapted from DeBloois and Alder[7]

The stages of this model are useful benchmarks historically for the Instructional Development office at Utah State. Interwoven with these stages were the differences in leadership style of the three directors. From the office's beginning in 1970, each Director influenced successive periods with long lasting consequences.

BEGINNINGS OF ID: BUILDING AWARENESS AND FACULTY SUPPORT

My first impression of Douglas Alder, the founder of the I. D. Division, was one of intellectual curiousity and surprise. Coming in as I was as the newly-hired evaluation specialist in October 1974, Alder spent nearly a full week with me in extensive orientation sessions, each session grounding me in the purposes and underlying philosophy of the Instructional Development office.

I learned that Alder had been a member of the original committee founding the Learning Resource Program, that his "Office of Instructional Improvement," as it had first been titled, was the one new division added to three existing administrative structures to form the MLLRP -- an acronym I could not remember, much less pronounce (standing for Merrill Library and Learning Resources Program) -- and that relationships with the Learning Resources Director, Dr. Milton Abrams were perpetually rocky. It would be fair to view Doug Alder's perception of his own role in the organization as a change-producing Socratic gadfly, probing and prodding an otherwise lethargic body out of the status quo operating patterns. In an interview engineered between the evaluator (me) and the director (Alder) later published as Candid Comments on an I.D. Center's Beginnings[5], the role of Instructional Development as organizational catalyst becomes increasingly clear. One month after my arrival, Alder's exit from Instructional Development to become Director of the Honors Program left him still teaching History half time, but now directing a new program.

Alder was and is unabashedly intellectual. We commonly kidded him about it. His background as a History Professor shines through in many conversations. What I did not know at the time was that: (1) Alder had recently returned from a sabbatical year at Indiana University as a Fellow for the American Council on Education and was being groomed for administative advancement; (2) he had previously been selected as a Danforth Associate and five years earlier had received the Teacher of the Year award for the campus; (3) pressure from his colleagues in the History Department and from his Dean was mounting to pull him back from the teaching improvement business and into more main-line scholarly publishing in his area of European History. I came to recognize the attraction which USU and Logan had for Doug, strong enough to forego a move which progress up the career ladder clearly mandated. I did not know these features of that situation until much later. I was impressed by Alder's voluability and insight, and what I realized was a legacy of experiment with the office.

Michael DeBloois, made Director one month after my arrival on the job, shared Doug Alder's attraction to Cache Valley and Logan. Having attended USU for undergraduate and masters degrees in History, DeBloois was recruited as an Instructional Developer by Alder in 1972. DeBloois' career to that point had followed a circuitous route from high school teaching to instructing at a junior Hawaiian college, to earning a doctorate in education from the University of Massachusetts to a stint as a faculty member at Florida State University. DeBloois

came in as a professional instructional developer with experience in instructional design. He quickly assumed the leadership of the Instructional Development office during Alder's sabbatical year at Indiana University, made complete with Alders reassignment to direct the USU Honors Program.

At USU DeBloois had several major accomplishments to his credit. Shortly after his arrival he and Alder had coauthored a book length publication called Teach-In, designed in a looseleaf format for easy access by teaching faculty. While Alder maintained the faculty seminar and occasional paper effort (Awareness Level) and promoted the minigrants (Faculty Support Level), DeBloois was able to work more directly with individual faculty on released-time grant projects (Faculty Development Level). A project to bring overhead projectors out of departmental closets and into every campus classroom was begun and sold successfully. A "Seminar on College Teaching" begun by Alder, was maintained. More importantly for me personally was the grant proposal written by DeBloois during Alder's sabbatical year and accepted by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) to begin a program of department level instructional development resulting in Departmental level of the I.D. model.

The contrast between the leadership styles of Alder and DeBloois is useful to highlight at this point. Both were trained as historians, DeBloois at the Masters level and Alder at the Doctoral; both are articulate and maintain excellent rapport with participating faculty. Both had chosen a role of gadfly within the Learning Resources Program

and were sometimes resented by others within the program (including the Director) as unsettling upstart elements.

Alder's approach to faculty was as a colleague who had tried new teaching approaches and had done well. His love of interaction with faculty could lead to extended seminars, debates, and intellectual excursions. Much of his persuasive ability came from an image of respectable professorial conservatism. DeBloois, on the other hand, came across as the instructional design professional with a job to do and timelines to meet. His creativity and entertaining humor won client admiration and faculty support for the program. While Alder had promoted a series of faculty seminars over several years, one of DeBloois's early moves as Director was to let these lapse as too time-consuming and as a tried but exhausted idea. Given the new funding provided by the FIPSE grant, departmental emphasis became the central force, with continued minigrant and released-time grants taken on as needed. In the jargon of the field, a shift from "faculty development" to "instructional development" came with the Alder to DeBloois transition and the name change to "Instructional Development" from "Instructional Improvement".

EXPANSION STAGE: DEPARTMENTAL GRANTS PROGRAM

Several changes were apparent. The Advisory Council of faculty from different departments which had functioned actively under Alder, was used less and less by DeBloois, major decisions on projects undertaken being made within the office. Two new professionals, a specialist

in instructional product development -- Dr. Steven Soulier -- and an evaluation specialist -- myself -- had been recently added to the staff. Soulier and I were both completing doctorates, mine from the nearby University of Utah in Educational Psychology and Steve's in Instructional Systems Technology from Indiana University.

The FIPSE grant opened many new opportunities on our own campus With outside funding added to substantial internal support, we were able to attract and work with many departments which had previously eluded involvement with our office.

Civil Engineering became our first department for extensive work. A needs assessment study began the effort, working through a faculty committee to survey senior students, faculty, graduates and employers of these graduates. Results were compiled and shared with faculty for decisions regarding the most profitable course sequences to work on. The major project undertaken that year was a revision of the Soil Mechanics sequence, a team effort by three faculty members, leading eventually to a restructured course and a new text through a national publisher.

That particular pattern was repeated in successive years with departments of Wildlife Science and Range Science, both departments with little previous involvement with the Instructional Development office. The projects undertaken and the outcomes realized varied somewhat, but the process was the same: departmental commitment, a needs assessment study in year one; major development work on specific courses or sequences year two; and gradual extrication from commitment,

moving on to work with another department in year three. After completing this process in three successive departments, our staff felt confident in the workings of this model. The results of the needs assessment frequently found their way into the professional literature of the field.

Some strong conclusions may be drawn about the project from evaluation reports completed during the grant (1974-76). From a telephone survey of awareness, roughly three-quarters of faculty reported that they had heard of the minigrants, the occasional paper series, and materials development assistance through the I.D. office. Thirty-eight percent (38%) reported that at least one of these programs had effected their teaching. Awareness was highest among those with over half time devoted to teaching and among faculty who had been at USU between five and nine years. Over eighty-percent (80%) of minigrant recipients surveyed by questionnaire reported the overall experience as generally positive, with reactions of the remainder mixed (14%) or negative (5%)[10]. Examining results for nine released-time grants for which data were available (out of 27 total at that time), favorable results in changed student attitudes and achievement were found for all but two of them[11].

TRANSITION AND REANALYSIS STAGE

The end of the FIPSE grant coincided with the opening of a full-time faculty position in the Instructional Media Department which Michael DeBloois took. As a final action by DeBloois as Director, Dr. Roger Croft was recruited from a position at Brigham Young

University for the unfilled position as instructional designer. After some deliberation and consulting, I was selected as the new Director.

A fairly major difference in leadership style became apparent with the emerging group. The three professional staff members -- Eastmond, Soulier, Croft -- had all received their doctorates within one year of each other and were within three years of each other in age. Each had areas of strength to contribute, but given the personalities involved, a more democratic and independent operating mode was pursued. Instead of teaming on each project -- one person doing design, another production, another evaluation as had been done under DeBloois -- each person took full responsibility to follow assigned projects through to completion, drawing upon the expertise of the others as needed. For a time, a mode of providing services to faculty with no written proposal in hand was attempted but discarded after a few months in favor of the competitive proposal mode.

Relationships with the Learning Resources Program improved somewhat. In contrast to my predecessors, I enjoyed relatively good relations with the Library and Learning Resources Program Director, Dr. Milton Abrams. Where DeBloois had begun boycotting Council meetings in protest for their lack of effect, I attempted to attend and to gradually transform them into more open,decision-oriented meetings, with some initial success. I enjoyed reasonably open communication with Abrams and credit him with a magnanimous nature which includes considerable toleration for different views, an ability, in his words, to "disagree without being disagreeable."

I soon found however, that to obtain any budget to support the Instructional Development program beyond basic salaries -- i.e. for minigrant or faculty released-time grants or for graduate assistantships -- that I had to approach our Provost independently, as my predecessors had done. My one attempt to go to the Provost directly with Abrams ended abruptly and convinced me that program survival mandated these "end runs." While these were a source of irritation between Abrams and myself, they were infrequent and were tolerated.

External funding at that point was considerably reduced. While the office continued to select one department for extensive work each year, -- Animal, Dairy and Veterinary Science and later for Communicative Disorders -- the model for intervention changed substantially. Two large workshops for selected colleges were sponsored, the I. D. Council was reinstated, and individual minigrants and released-time grants continued. A pattern of staffing projects with graduate assistants in Instructional Media, used heavily with the FIPSE grant, was continued under the new organizational phase.

It was a time of experimenting and transition. To what extent would the office follow patterns established by mentors from previous years? In what ways would external funding be sought? How would a stable program be maintained? These questions were pursued over the next two years as the new involvement with a consortium began.

EXPANSION PHASE: THE NORCHE EXPERIENCE

A final activity under the first FIPSE grant was a dissemination conference held on USU's campus in spring 1977. At the concluding sessions, DeBloois proposed the idea of building a linking

organization of instructional development centers. The idea remained dormant, however, until fifteen months later when three directors of nearby Instructional Development centers -- Weber State College (Utah), Idaho State University, and Boise State University (Idaho),-- met at my invitation on the Utah State University campus to pursue funding for an instructional development-related consortium.

At the first meeting we discovered that three of the four centers represented had undertaken projects involving the redesign of the freshman level introductory biology course. Two of these centers had used an audio tape format and self instructional mode; the third had used audio tape, and in addition, videotape. In each case the effort was handled independently of the other centers, with no knowledge that others were embarking on a similar course. These were schools located within an eighty mile radius of each other. The point was not that one institution should have done the project and the other two merely implemented or adapted the results of that project, but rather that each could have learned from the others' experience, possibly saving considerable time by learning from the experiences of others. That instance highlighted both the need and the potential benefit from close working relationships among instructional improvement professionals.

The question of how to structure a Consortium and obtain financial backing remained unanswered. Until relatively recently the parallel movements of instructional development and faculty development had realized little impact in the four state region of Utah, Idaho, Montana

and Wyoming. Institutions in this region share similar problems stemming from the rural, isolated nature of many of the schools and the scant population and resource base. With a combined population of 3.6 million (1980 census) and a population density of 8.7 persons per square mile, these states represent virtually the most sparsely populated areas in the United States, excepting Nevada and Alaska.

The early meetings of this group were instructive. Instead of pushing ahead immediately for a proposal, as had been my intention, at the insistence of others in the group, we each approached our own institution to obtain funds to plan and hammer out our agreement. To my own surprise, each of us was successful in obtaining money for that purpose -- from $800 to $1400 per school.

Our early sessions -- and we had four of them prior to proposal submission -- were stormy. With the prospect of major financial gain, people began to operate in a competitive, confrontation mode. Each school had interest in directing and housing the organization. One school, Weber State College, had a large pool of talented people and seemed, to some of us, at least, intent upon obtaining the lions share of benefits including the directorship and the responsibility for the proposal-writing for the fledgling association. A major confrontation occurred when the other participants decided that Weber State ought not to bring more representatives to the meetings than the other schools were sending. The confrontation ended with some hurt feelings, but with a clear message from other schools that: "We will not be railroaded into this thing." As the project developed it

became necessary to limit the input exerted by any one school with the aim of strengthening and diversifying the benefits that were going to all. The eventual resolution of this conflict, accomplished in a series of retreats in locations remote from the campuses, came only after a series of compromise sessions, where, in return for Weber State's receiving the Directorship, other schools were to provide manpower (Idaho State University) and consulting assistance on specific projects (Utah State and Boise State). The final proposal went to FIPSE with reasonable calm. A truce between the four schools was in place.

Then three unexpected occurances came in as many months, each with major impact upon the Consortium. The first was the announcement by Bill Daehling, our candidate for Director, that he would take a position as Academic Vice President at Lewis-Clark College, a contact made on a consulting assignment related to the Consortium. The next surprise came with the decision by BariLynn Guilliard, at Idaho State University, the next candidate for Director, that she would be moving to the Mid-West as her husband took an administrative position with a private college there. The third event was a decision by FIPSE to fund the effort on a much smaller scale, $43,691, for year one rather than the $91,700 proposed.

In a theatrical piece, drama critics are quick to cite major flaws in plot development if too much occurs by chance. This point in the scenario has these flaws, in real life. The three events described above had major immediate impact. After some negotiation,

I emerged as Consortium Director with the office housed at Utah State University. The lower level of funding meant that only one-third of my time could be devoted to the position. It was no longer the lucrative plum that it had seemed in earlier days. And finally, the storm of controversy and compromise had been cathartic -- the outcome was calm cooperation among the proposing schools and a stage set for incremental, relatively conservative mode of operating the Consortium. Indicative of that tone was the first meeting of representatives from fourteen institutions in Jackson Hole, Wyoming in Fall 1978, where a new Board of Directors set a cooperative and generous direction for the new entity.

During the first year, fifteen institutions joined NORCHE. That number increased to twenty-two during the second year, to twenty-four during the current year. The membership fee rose from $25 to $250 in the third year. The mix of schools includes universities and four year colleges as well as community colleges and technical schools. Two private schools supported by different religious denominations are included as members.

The modest level of funding and the extreme distances involved have mandated the use of a small professional staff of consultants from resource schools to assist member schools in a widening scope of instructional improvement activities. In the first year, consultants from four resource schools provided technical assistance to designated pilot schools. As a condition of membership, each institution

was asked to commit the half-time services of one faculty member to coordinate instructional improvement activities on their own campus. Following training in a consortium workshop, this Institutional Representative worked with a faculty committee to assess needs and to develop a specific plan of activities for their particular school. Consortium resources have been matched with those desired in the plan. Examples of these projects were minigrant programs funded for faculty at Carroll College (Montana) and Dixie College (Utah) and specific projects such as a course in intensive Spanish language (USU) or Norwegian grammar (Eastern Montana College).

OVERALL RESULTS OF NORCHE

The results of the Consortium can best be viewed in relation to the top five regional needs identified by a prepoposal (1977) needs assessment survey (25 of 38 institutions responding). Quoting from the proposal to FIPSE, "the top five need areas were as follows:

1. In-service faculty training for teaching.
2. Increase technical service personnel to meet the needs of the instructional faculty in the area of instructional development.
3. Development of mechanisms for exchanging personnel and expertise among and between institutions to solve instructional problems.
4. Exchange of validated instructional programs between faculty members of various institutions.
5. Increase general faculty awareness of instructional development processes."

In-service faculty training has been provided in the series of six conferences held with three yet to be held before January 1982 and in the finding that "a Consortium sponsored event attended by faculty" has occurred at eighteen of the twenty-four campuses.

An example of one such event was the major conference involving nearly 200 people at Eastern Montana College in April 1980. Entitled "Improving Instruction: Technology and the Human Element", this conference was the major happening of the Consortium that year. Proceedings of that conference are now being published through the International Journal of Instructional Media and have added visibility and credibility to the consortium efforts.

Examples of NORCHE sponsored workshops were a series on Science Education conducted by Dr. Jack LaTrielle at Sheridan College (Wyoming) and Carroll College (Montana) or the workshops on microcomputer usage in higher education done more recently by Dr. Paul Merrill at Southern Utah State College and Dixie College (Utah). These are typically events of 1-3 days duration providing inservice faculty training.

Technical service personnel have increased within the region, but given budget cuts, certainly not at the rate originally envisioned. A number of people have been placed throughout the region in either professional job capacity or in internship positions as a result of the consortium. Professional staff members have been placed at Snow College (2), the University of Montana (1), Lewis-Clark College (2) and Boise State University (1), directly as a result of the Consortium activities. Paraprofessional interns have been placed at Snow College (2),

Weber State College (1), Boise State University (1) and Dixie College (2). To what extent these would have occurred without the Consortium is not known. What is known is that in each case, the contacts and placements were made through Consortium channels.

Exchanging personnel and expertise among and between institutions to solve instructional problems has certainly occurred. Under the program of exchange consulting, at least one such visit has occurred at 15 schools (63%) through June 1981. In addition, the various conferences have featured noteworthy projects and sharing of ideas. The Consortium Newsletter, the NORCHE Reporter, edited quarterly by Dr. Joanne Kurfiss at Weber State College, has promoted this end. A final mention should be made of four books in the area of faculty development, two of these donated by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, sent out at regular intervals to institutional representatives.

Exchange of validated instructional programs has clearly been the aim of the Resources Directory. This directory operates from the computer at Boise State University and contains entries for over 300 projects. Each school in the region as well as selected locations outside received the text edition of this directory.

Usage of the Directory, however, remains problematic. A survey of institutional representatives in January 1981, one year after the directory's publication, showed that of 14 respondents, only seven had used the directory more than three times and that most had used it only once or twice.

Traditional patterns for NORCHE institutions have been to look

outside the region for expertise rather than within. People continue to be reluctant to bring in outside people from within the consortium even when they have funds provided for that purpose, preferring instead to send their own people to other campuses or to NORCHE sponsored conferences.

Two suggestions for improving the Resources Directory have promise. One would put the directory on the microcomputer for easier user access, while another would locate the search capability centrally, possibly Boise State University with searches conducted of the NORCHE resources database (300 entries) as well as California's (3,000 + entries) and Wisconsin's (200 + entries). Respondents showed moderate support for the first proposal (microcomputers) and considerable support for the second (telephone based system).

In practice one wonders why this particular problem of cooperation has been so thorny and why it has been so difficult to solve. One suspects that the underlying problem is one of confidence, i.e. trust in someone referred from outside the system. The Rogers and Shoemaker model[12] suggests that while awareness may be accomplished by written materials, face-to-face encounters and personal contact will most convincingly cause people to adopt a new innovation. Applying these findings to our consortium suggests that the Resource Directory combined with some entries in our newsletter could be useful in drawing people's attention to the possibilities for exchange, but that at least for the foreseeable future, personal contacts and referrals will be required before people will risk bringing an expert in from another

site in our region.

Increasing faculty awareness of instructional development processes has surely occurred. The presence of institutional representatives to the Consortium on each campus as well as faculty committees devoted to that activity have certainly boosted that awareness. Table 2 charts the activity of the Consortium in the various schools and provides a measure of the awareness level maintained.

THE CONSORTIUM -- SOME AFTERTHOUGHTS

Activities sponsored by NORCHE over the three year period have included sponsorship of faculty workshops, exchange of consultant expertise, intensive course development, and visits of faculty to other consortium projects.

One finding has been that availability of a wide variety of services and possibilities is important to members of the Consortium. A narrowly focused program, as Lindquist and Bergquist[13] have pointed out, can often best be accomplished through an existing organization. However, when an existing organization is not sufficient and when the goals are sufficiently large, a more effective strategy is often that of building a resource network. NORCHE, for example, encourages effective teaching and learning, certainly a broad aim. The means employed to reach these ends are diverse. The use of specific consultants assigned to the member institutions, the promoting of exchange of services and people, and the development of a computerized listing of resources represent some of the programs undertaken by the Consortium. Workshops and meetings of the Consortium have multiple purposes and serve multiple audiences:

Table 2: Percentages of NORCHE Schools Engaging in Selected Consortium Activities, 1978-81.

	Activity	Yr. 1 N=15	Yr. 2 N=22	Yr. 3 N=24
A.	School paid annual dues	100%	100%	100%
B.	Representatives attended Fall conference	93%	81%	92%
C.	Representative on Board of Directors	40%	38%	33%
D.	Representatives attended Spring Conference	33%	76%	79%
E.	Institutional plan developed or revised	53%	57%	75%
F.	Consortium sponsored event attended by faculty	33%	90%	92%
G.	Consultant visit to/from institution	87%	57%	92%
H.	Exchange/demonstration visits	47%	52%	63%
I.	Faculty Projects funded	33%	57%	70%
J.	Product, program, process completed	33%	86%	92%
K.	An ID/Faculty Development agency has been established	73%	81%	75%
L.	An Institutional Representative has been appointed	60%	95%	100%
M.	The Institutional Representative has time committed to ID	53%	62%	67%
N.	Planning for ID beyond consortium funding has been addressed	N/A	95%	100%

Source: Year 1, Evaluator's Report (M. DeBloois); Year 2, Evaluator's Report (Julie Landeen), Year 3 (Project Records)

from faculty members with interest in teaching improvement to the administrator overseeing such activity to the professional instructional developer assigned to that task. What is important is that enough diversity of types of people exists, that uncommon ideas can be generated, and that members can select the best from a number of alternatives.

There are times, however, when a regional program to deal with that diversity becomes unmanageable. In the experience of NORCHE, at those points it is advantageous to return to the needs of the member institutions as the basis for any planning or programming. For example, at the 1979 Fall workshop, a program of statewide workshops seemed to be the logical next step for the group, as specified in the FIPSE proposal. On the contrary, it turned out that the needs of the supposed audience were too great for the proposed workshop mechanism and that instead, a program of individual workshops for different campuses was a more effective direction to proceed. Representatives expressed much more interest in each institution coming up with its own plan and then designing a workshop or conference, drawing upon the resources of the consortium.

A major challenge beyond the Consortium's first year was to spread benefits and responsibility to new schools which joined and to recognize talent as it emerged. The successful conference held in the spring of the second year at Eastern Montana College was an instance where a new member school with initiative assumed a major leadership role. In the

upcoming series of conferences, a similar pattern of spreading benefits

Comparing the consortium envisioned in the first year with what has actually occurred, progress has been considerably slower than was originally anticipated. The original proposal envisioned 25 schools, we now have 24. As the organization has evolved, the proposers over-estimated the potential for training workshops for Institutional Representatives and under-estimated the ability of these people to field their own topics and locate experts from among their own ranks. The possibility for member-proposed conferences was not anticipated, but has been one of the strong features of the Consortium in its final year.

Reception of the basic Consortium program has been excellent. Campuses with little previous effort in teaching improvement have begun programs. External funds from NORCHE have been matched or used as leverage at home institutions. Wilson[14] has noted the power of a consortium in the diffusion and utilization of information. Justice[15], a Program Officer for FIPSE, has noted that "a certain audience readiness (can support) dissemination," and "our experience ... is that user centered approaches, those whose first aim is to help other institutions solve their own problems with aid but not too rigid direction from existing models, are approaches which do increase the likelihood of use." Wide acceptance of NORCHE has come in part from a perceived current need for teaching improvement programs and from the user-centered nature of these programs.

In relation to the change agentry model of Ronald Havelock[16],

internal and external agents have been balanced in Consortium work. For example, the Institutional Representative by definition is an internal faculty member or administrator in the institution and is thus aware of the particular political pressures and intimate details of why things can and cannot be done. This person typically has a plan, a vision for what can be accomplished, but it is often through the help of an external exchange agent, in this case the Contract Consultant assigned to the school, that changes can in fact occur. It appears that an expert from the outside can give considerable credibility to the instructional development enterprise and can also provide leverage for the internal change agent to work.

It is probable that our original proposal overstated the potential of developing a nucleus of "highly trained faculty" or a "critical mass of dedicated people." A more accurate statement is that the attention of a number of faculty and administrators has been caught and their creativity harnessed to improve instruction on their own campuses.

The utility of the institutional plan has varied from campus to campus. In some cases (e.g. at Weber State College, Utah State University or Carroll College) these were entensive documents with objectives and timelines while in others (e.g. Western Wyoming College or Sheridan College) a 3-5 page document was sufficient. The mid-project evaluation noted that in some instances this plan was more of a Committee exercise than it was something with actual benefit for their campus[17]. In part this finding may be due to changing financial conditions within the

region. Major funding cutbacks in both Utah and Idaho have left people scrambling to protect resources rather than put them out on the table through planning. The Consortium may at times provide a small pocket to protect some of these resources. Where this protectionist climate is prevalent, one would expect that a concrete plan would have less appeal and be less useful than in places where the climate is more stable.

Budget difficulties in the wake of Proposition 13 and Reagan economics mentality certainly were not anticipated in the original proposal. We have yet to see how the Consortium itself will weather this storm. While roughly two-thirds of institutional represtntatives have some time committed to instructional or faculty development, the requirement for a half-time institutional representative has been overlooked or circumvented in some schools. For the smaller schools particularly, this requirement was probably unrealistic, particularly in the time of tight budgets.

Two unanticipated consequences are worthy of note. One of these has been the expansion of Resource Schools in the Consortium from the original four to include four more: Eastern Montana College, Montana State University, the University of Utah and in some cases Brigham Young University (not presently an official member of NORCHE). In each of these cases a viable instructional development program has been made accessible to other Consortium schools. While increasing the number of Resource Schools was discussed in early stages of NORCHE it was not

written into the proposal.

The second related development is a "miniconsortium" which has sprung up in the LDS Church Education System, which was not anticipated. A major impetus for this group of schools has come from Ricks College, an active participant in NORCHE, encouraging Brigham Young University with its elaborate Instructional Development Center, the David O. McKay Institute, to provide assistance at Ricks, LDS Business College, and to Brigham Young University Hawaii Campus. The outcome of that involvement is not yet totally apparent, but an immediate consequence has been a workshop to be sponsored at the Ricks College Campus during summer 1981, hosting representatives from the other three LDS Church Education System campuses.

A final spinoff has been the success of the Consortium in encouraging other funded projects from FIPSE in our region. The change has been fairly dramatic. In the 1980 fiscal year, eight proposals were submitted and three were funded: A Telecommunications Project at Eastern Montana College; a Competency Base Legal Education at the University of Montana and a Videodisc Spanish Language Project at Brigham Young University. Results for the final year are not yet in but a number of projects are in the running. FIPSE should be happy with the results of the Consortium at least in spreading the word about its possibilities as an agency in our region.

Two difficulties have emerged which bear recording. The first has been an internal difficulty in convincing members of Utah State University's faculty and administration of the value of NORCHE. To

some extent this may be due to an inadequate job of selling it politically or on campus sentiment that the resources should lean more in Utah State's favor. To date, the Consortium has paid its way, and has given a viability to the on-campus Instructional Development program which certainly would not have been otherwise the case. Frankly, the Consortium has been the driving force to maintain an instructional development program on USU campus in the wake of the budget cuts discussed in the next section.

In conclusion, the operational philosophy of the Northern Rockies Consortium, as with the USU model for instructional development, has been one of incrementalism and gradual change. In view of the level of funding and the perceived role of the Director, work has been delegated to consultants and initiative left to the individual schools to identify needs and carry out their own projects. Close monitoring or tight supervision have been minimal.

The conservative strategy requires some assumptions. One assumption is that these people know what they are doing, i.e. that they are most qualified to prescribe programs which will benefit their institution. Another is that given moderate encouragement and some resources, institutional representatives will initiate and accomplish good things. For the most part this strategy has borne fruit. Table 2 summarizes three years' findings. Of the 26 institutions, 18 have developed institutional plans and received funding for minigrant projects ($500). Six conferences have been conducted on topics of interest and the responses for the most part have been positive.

Other indicators lend credibility to NORCHE's operation. Three members of the Board of Directors are top administrators in their respective schools. Their attendance and participation are more than perfunctory and as the evaluator to the project noted, a tremendous amount of stretching of resources due to the ingenuity of the people involved has occurred.[17] Visitors from the Consortium have had access to high ranking people on member campuses. At a time when budgets are contracting, when funds for higher education have declined in the region, NORCHE has provided some leverage to maintain visibility and support for teaching improvement programs.

What the future holds for NORCHE remains to be seen. A Board of Directors meeting two weeks ago approved a new financial plan providing for funding starting January 1982 from four different funding sources. The plan puts a substantial portion of the fund-raising responsibility on members of the Board of Directors and member institutions. Time will tell.

WEATHERING BUDGET CUTS

Describing Consortium activities and instructional development as an ever-widening circle of influence is enjoyable. It sounds optimistic, warm and respectable. Cycles have troughs as well as peaks, however, and our center at USU faced the same kinds of budget cuts that have been rampant through our region. It has now probably weathered the worst of those. These budget cuts have been sobering, causing times of reflection, regrouping, and retrenchment.

In the wake of the Proposition 13 vote taken in California, Utah's Democratic Governor, Scott Matheson, proposed a voluntary cut in a number of state programs including all of higher education, trimming 4% of overall budget. The mandate came to the administration that, if possible, entire programs were to be cut to strengthen remaining programs through a weeding-out process. On the USU campus this was to be accomplished by two committees, mainly made of senior faculty members, researchers, deans and department heads, representing a fairly powerful establishment. The final review committee was chaired by our Provost with each major program on campus requested to submit program budget information to the committee for consideration. Thus the stage was set for budget cutting to occur.

My first inkling that our program would face difficulty came in a telephone conversation with our Provost on March 27, 1980, initiated by myself over another matter. As recorded in my personal journal, he stated "Nick, you should be aware that your program (Instructional Development) is under fire. We are having difficulty in finding people who will stand up to be counted in its favor." He spoke of his own commitment to the program and said he was doing what he could, sometimes overstepping his role as a non-voting chairperson. He noted the intensity of the sessions: "things are bloody in there" and noted that 4 or 5 academic departments were being considered for removal from the University, emphasizing the gravity of the situation. I listed people that I thought were favorably disposed to our activities, particularly

those on the I.D. Advisory Committee. He at that time cautioned me against contacting people to plead a case for our program. I pointed out to him the irony of having been selected as the lead school for a 22-member Consortium and of having an extensive set of evaluation reports since the programs' beginnings ten years ago. I then asked him if opposition from the Learning Resources Program Director, our immediate supervisor, was the central problem. He responded that it was not, but that it was "a question of user satisfaction," but not to panic, as the fight wasn't over.

After that brief announcement my adrelin level was much higher. I worked with my own staff, advising them of the difficulties we were facing and together we contacted certain key individuals. We did not try to mount a counteroffensive or protest campaign. We surveyed 10 comparable institutions to learn what was happening in their instructional development centers and met with key people who had been advisors to the program at one time or another -- Doug Alder, Michael DeBloois and others. These people did approach the administration to suggest what could be done. The outcome finally was to have the Learning Resources Program Director come to my office and announce that no funds had been allocated for our program for the next fiscal year.

Feelings at that point were dismal. Upon reflecting, our survival strategy was quite simple. Each professional member of the staff had a split appointment and was able to pick up a larger portion of salary through the other portion of their assignment, typically teaching or managing of a particular program. We lost a secretary, four interns

and a one-half time unfilled professional position, although these did not occur until the end of the fiscal year. I remained as Instructional Development Director working from available funds on hand and trying to stretch out fee-for-service activities on our own campus. The name of the game for the past year has been survival and maintenance.

Over that time I personally have promoted the Northern Rockies Consortium and have invested most of my efforts in teaching a College Teaching Seminar and in teaching two new classes for the Instructional Technology Department. It has been a busy sometimes very creative year, sometimes intense and always with the sentiment that our administration was favorable to our program and that new plans were afoot, that a committee was studying the problem and that there was a silver lining to that ever-present cloud.

What I came to realize over time was that things had not been quite as simple as I had thought. On the committee that decided on the future of our program were 16 people, four of whom had had direct experience with our program. We simply had not appealed to the clientele of established professors. I'm not sure if a program such as ours could appeal to these people, at least given our present approach. The reason we were singled out for some scrutiny was that our immediate boss, the Learning Resources Program Director, had opened the door. When asked for his recommendation of which program to cut, ours was given as one of four choices, all of which were cut. The program was left somewhat flapping on a limb which the committee promptly sawed off. In view of the prevailing assumptions that academic programs would have to go, it was not irrational to say that this support entity would have to be first.

In retrospect, the animus between Instructional Development and the remainder of the Learning Resources Program -- including Instructional Television, Audiovisual Services, and various media production services -- had built over time. While the entire program had been envisioned to function under the "integrated media concept," forging print and non-print information on campus, in fact the programs had remained as diverse as ever, cooperating occasionally but preferring to pursue independent courses of action. From the point of view of the Learning Resource Program Director, the administration gave lip service to the integrated concept but had never given the financial backing or the budgetary power necessary to bring it about. Thus, our office, with its separate funding from the Provost, represented the visible tip of an iceberg of frustration over a lack of coordinated effort.

Politically there were probably some things I could have done to strengthen our case, although in the final analysis I suspect that these making any difference is unlikely. The central administration had always been philosophically favorable to the program and has remained so. The option of getting outside pressure either from Consortium members or from FIPSE seemed unwise at the time. Campus budgetting was a matter that had to be dealt with internally. I believed then and still do that if our services are not wanted on this campus, it is time to move on. I also suspect that in a time of budget cuts the creative and new programs are often the ones to take the flack, where older, more established traditional programs weather the storm easier.

PROMISE OF THE FUTURE

Over the last year through a series of many meetings, several different reorganization plans have been proposed. As is the case perennially in higher education, a new structure has emerged. As of this writing it appears that the new administrative plan will go into effect within a month. The plan will see a combination of an existing Instructional Technology program and the overall Learning Resources Program which up to this point has functioned in a somewhat fragmented manner. Heading the program will be the department head of Instructional Technology under the overall supervision of the Learning Resources Program Director and the Provost. The new program appears to have the blessing of the administration and may prove to be a solid program if handled correctly. Three new divisions will emerge in the Learning Resources Program: one devoted to traditional library services, another to instructional development to include professional development, a technology research project (videodisc) and apparently the telecommunications portion of our service. A third division will be devoted to instructional services and will include graphics, printing, editorial services and similar programs. The program is meant to operate along the lines of a University Medical Center, functioning under the direction of an academic department. In this case the school is the Department of Instructional Technology. A new series of roles will emerge for all of us. As I paint the future broadly, I see us becoming more involved with professional development of faculty members, viewing faculty members in their overall

careers, enhancing the stages of professional development and the overall rewards of university careers.

In conclusion I have considerable hope for the future, but see that the enterprise, both in the Northern Rockies Consortium and in the on-campus instructional development effort will take a new thrust for the decade of the 'eighties. The office will be a leaner and hopefully more persuasive voice on campus. It will function under the umbrella of the existing structure and the climate from the administration will be increasingly supportive. The philosophy of "small is beautiful"[18] and of gradual progress based upon faculty initiative will remain viable in the challenging decade to come.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The existence and maintenance of an Instructional Development program at Utah State University has been a small-scale tentative enterprise for twelve years spanning the 70's decade. It has represented a source of change for one campus with later influence upon 24 other institutions through the Northern Rockies Consortium for Higher Education (NORCHE).

The approach has been one of gradualism and modest expectations. A conscious decision was made early on to limit the expansion of staff and to rely upon faculty commitment to initiate and energize projects. A similar decision was made in the early stages of NORCHE to keep central staff to a minimum and to rely upon a network of consultants and institutional representatives to carry the load. Emphasis has necessarily been placed upon encouraging initiative from participants, supporting

emerging activities with limited resources, and upon maintaining a relatively low-profile program.

Evidence from faculty who have participated in these activities suggests enthusiasm for this approach. Over eighty percent of USU faculty who participated in minigrant or released time grants report that the experience was positive. Consortium representatives at member schools respond positively to a program focussing upon their needs and their initiative.

Leadership styles have varied considerably over the twelve years from the academic, faculty development approach of Alder to the directive, professional instructional development approach of DeBloois, to the egalitarian, more eclectic approach of Eastmond. In retrospect, periodic change of leadership has probably been valuable, allowing for new energy and a change of vision.

Each program director's style has either been or has become well suited for that particular phase of the program. Alder built awareness among faculty in ways that DeBloois or Eastmond could not. DeBloois by temperament and experience, was well suited for the exapnsion into departmental level activities. My "share the benefits" approach has been well suited for the modestly funded consortium, and I have learned at first hand the tactics of weathering a year long on-campus budget crisis.

The level of outside funding for USU instructional development has varied from practically nil in the founding years to nearly half in

the middle expansion years (57% in 1976) to about one third during the latter years of the Consortium. During the budget cuts, quite unexpectedly, five major instructional improvement projects were funded at USU by external, mainly federal, sources to faculty members individually rather than centrally. Four of the five were originally funded under the I.D. release time grants program. One can argue that over the twelve years outside funds have been useful for internal leverage and that, in some cases, they have been a sustaining source through periods of financial drought.

From another standpoint, however, these grants can divert program efforts from the central mission of campus-based instructional development, unless their direction is carefully controlled. Some sentiment exists, for example, that despite the enriching aspects of the relationship, overinvolvement with the Consortium (externally focused) may have contributed to the intensity of budget cuts on the home campus, USU. I heartily disagree, but often debate colleagues on this issue. A useful rule seems to be "select the desired activity for the office, refine the essential idea and then pursue outside funding." The alternative of writing proposals to hit funding agency priorities seems considerably more likely to detract from a central mission and program focus. In the case of both FIPSE grants this strategy of program intent followed by proposal submission was employed successfully. While budget cuts are still too recent to allow overly directive advice in this area, the rule of letting internal program needs dictate external funding requests seems solid. The final results of this twelve year experiment may be seen as a series of networks put into place, some ephemeral and some long lasting,

some on-campus and many through the Consortium, all providing an impetus for change in institutions and people. The type of change is gradual and mainly self-initiated; the gains are modest and ever-tenuous. Twelve years of experience with instructional development at Utah State University and more recently through the Northern Rockies Consortium argues that an incremental approach is presently feasible and is likely to remain useful at least through the decade of the eighties.

Footnotes

1. Jerry G. Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1976.

2. Roger Kaufman, Educational System Planning. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1979.

3. Robert Gagne and Leslie Briggs, Principles of Instructional Design. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

4. Jack Lindquist, (Ed.), William H. Bergquist, Claude Mathis, Chester H. Case, Thomas Clark, Lance C. Buhl, Designing Teaching Improvement Programs. Berkeley, California: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.

5. Michael L. DeBloois and Douglas D. Alder, Stimulating Faculty Readiness for Instructional Development: A Conservative Approach to Improving College Teaching. Educational Technology. 13:7, July 1973, pp. 16-19.

6. Douglas MacGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.

7. DeBloois and Alder, Stimulating Faculty Readiness for Instructional Improvement: pp. 18-19.

8. J. N. Eastmond, Jr., Instructional Development Under the Microscope: Perceptions of Faculty Members. Utah State University, Division of Instructional Development, Logan, Utah. 1975 (ERIC ED 112882).

9. Douglas D. Alder and J. Nicholls Eastmond, Jr. Candid Comments on an ID Center's Beginnings. Logan, Utah: Utah State University, Division of Instructional Development, 1975 (ERIC ED 112881).

10. Eastmond, Instructional Development Under the Microscope: 1975.

11. J. N. Eastmond, Jr., and Kathleen Van Horn, So What's Different? Student Achievement and Attitude Results from Instructional Development Projects. Logan, Utah; Division of Instructional Development, 1976. (ERIC ED 135402).

12. Everett Rodgers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach, 2nd Ed. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

13. William Berquist and Jack Lindquist, Dissemination through Networking, in Lindquist (Ed.) Increasing the Impact of Social Innovations Funded by Grantmaking Organizations. Battle Creek, Michigan, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1979.

14. John R. Wilson, Consortium-Based Diffusion of Faculty Development, in Lindquist (Ed.) Increasing the Impact of Social Innovations Funded by Grantmaking Organizations. Battle Creek, Michigan, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1979.

15. David Justice, Emerging Dissemination Strategies Within a Federal Granting Agency, in Lindquist (Ed.) Increasing the Impact of Social Innovations Funded by Grantmaking Organizations. Battle Creek, Michigan, W. K. Kellogg Foundations, 1979.

16. Ronald G. Havelock, A Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Educational Technology Publications, Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1973.

17. Julie J. Landeen, Mid-Year Evaluation of the Northern Rockies Consortium for Higher Education, Year 2 Activities, Logan, Utah 1980. p. 14.

18. E. F. Schumaker, Small Is Beautiful: Technology as if People Mattered, New York: Printice Hall, 1973.

References

Alder, Douglas D. and J. Nicholls Eastmond, Jr. Candid Comments on an ID Center's Beginnings, Logan, Utah: Utah State University, Division of Instructional Development, 1975. (ERIC ED 112881).

DeBloois, Michael L. and Douglas D. Alder. Stimulating Faculty Readiness for Instructional Development: A Conservative Approach to Improving College Teaching. Educational Technology. July, 1973, pp. 16-19.

Eastmond, J. Nicholls, Jr. ID Under the Microscope: Perceptions of Faculty Members. Logan, Utah: Division of Instructional Development, Utah State University, 1975. (ERIC ED 112882).

Eastmond, J. Nicholls Jr., and Kathleen L. Van Horn. So What's Different? Student Achievement and Attitude Results from Instructional Development Projects. Logan, Utah: Division of Instructional Development, 1976. (ERIC ED 135402).

Eastmond, J. Nicholls, Jr. and John A. Kadlec. Undergraduate Educational Needs in Wildlife Science. The Wildlife Society Bulletin, Vol. 5, No. 2, Summer 1977, pp. 61-66.

Gaff, Jerry G. Toward Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1976.

Gagne, Robert and Leslie Briggs. Principles of Instructional Design. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Grant, Gerald and David Riesman. The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978, p. 393.

Havelock, Ronald G. A Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education. Educational Technology Publications, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1973.

Kaufman, Roger. Educational System Planning. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Landeen, Julie J. Mid-Year Evaluation of the Northern Rockies Consortium for Higher Education, Year 2 Activities, Logan, Utah, 1980.

Lindquist, Jack (Ed.) William H. Bergquist, Claude Mathis, Chester H. Case, Thomas Clark, Lance C. Buhl, Designing Teaching Improvement Programs. Berkeley, California: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.

Lindquist, Jack (Ed.) Increasing the Impact of Social Innovations Funded by Grantmaking Organizations, Battle Creek, Michigan. W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1979.

MacGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.

Newman, John Henry. On the Idea of A University, Oxford English Texts, Oxford University Press. 1976 (ISBN 0-19-811896-1)

Rogers, Everett M. and F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach, 2nd Ed., New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Schumaker, E. F. Small Is Beautiful: Technology as if People Mattered. New York: Prentice Hall, 1973.