

Effective Approaches to New Faculty Development

Mary Deane Sorcinelli

The author provides research-based and practical advice on how to foster the career development of new and junior faculty. She first reviews who the new and junior faculty are and highlights research findings on the work and career experiences of these faculty members. She then describes model programs and successful strategies to support the newest members of the professoriat, including exemplary programs for orientation, mentoring, research, and teaching development.

During the early years of a faculty appointment, the potential for both rewards and pressures is great. New faculty must unravel the organizational structures and values, expectations for performance and advancement, and the history and traditions of their new campus setting. At the same time, they must balance complex and sometimes conflicting roles and responsibilities. The ability of new faculty to navigate these early years is critical to their success in and satisfaction with an academic career.

Added to the demands on newly hired employees, educational leaders face growing problems in recruiting and retaining new faculty. Some experts on higher education are anticipating a shortage of potential new and junior faculty (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Thus, the willingness of colleagues and administrators to learn about these early years and to provide support to new faculty may be critical to the future success and viability of our institutions.

Over the past few years, many studies have focused on the work experiences, satisfactions, and concerns of new and junior faculty (Boice, 1991a, 1991b, 1992b; Fink, 1984; Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992; Reynolds, 1988; Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992a; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991). Most studies have defined the term *new faculty* broadly (e.g., faculty who have just received their PhD, faculty new to a campus but with experience in other institutions, individuals making a career change into academe), although few data sources delimit the sample of new faculty to those who have recently completed their terminal degree and are beginning their first academic position (Fink, 1984).

Moreover, the design of new faculty studies are various. For example, as Finkelstein and LaCelle-Peterson (1992) observed, investigations of new faculty include single institution studies that consider the experiences of new faculty from many departments in a single university, single discipline studies that consider the experiences of new faculty in one discipline (e.g., geography), and multiinstitutional studies that compare the experiences of new and junior faculty across several campuses (almost always, research-oriented universities have provided the setting for research).

Most investigators chronicle new faculty experiences at a single point in time, although there are a few longitudinal studies (Boice, 1992b; Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992). Finally, most research on new faculty can be characterized as qualitative, although several studies have used a combination of interviews and questionnaires (Boice, 1992b; Fink, 1984; Olsen, 1990; Sorcinelli, 1988; Sorcinelli, 1992a).

Despite the variety in data sources, however, there seems to be remarkable overall agreement about the work experiences of new faculty. The goals of this article are three-fold: to identify what we've learned about the key factors that contribute to new faculty satisfaction and stress, to track changes in those factors during the pretenure years,

and to identify important resources available to those who wish to learn more about new and junior faculty.

WORK SATISFACTION

Nearly all newcomers report high levels of satisfaction with their careers. Satisfaction with the *intrinsic* rewards of the career (i.e., factors intrinsic to academic work itself and not dependent on external circumstance) is especially strong and consistent. Thus, for example, new faculty report high levels of satisfaction with the nature of academic work and the relative autonomy with which it is pursued, the opportunities for intellectual discovery and growth, the opportunity to have an impact on others, and the sense of accomplishment (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992a; Turner & Boice, 1987).

New faculty also cite aspects of the work environment as important sources of satisfaction. The quality of individual colleagues and the intellectual and collegial ethos of their home department are paramount. More tangible aspects of campus life such as internal funds for research and teaching activities, reasonable course loads, opportunities to work with undergraduate honor's students or graduate students, and substantial library and research facilities also enhance morale (Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992a).

New faculty, however, may not sustain such satisfaction and enthusiasm over time. For example, our 5-year study of one cohort of new faculty found that the level of commitment to the personal and intellectual rewards of the profession was remarkable, even in the face of tenure and rigorous review. At the same time, findings indicated a downward turn in faculty work satisfaction over time, particularly with *extrinsic* rewards such as job security, salary, and benefits (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992).

WORK STRESS

Despite expressions of satisfaction with their careers, new faculty are not impervious to stress. Descriptors like "tension," "pressure," "anxiety," and "worry" crop up in an even cursory reading of the literature (Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991). Unfortunately, the tensions of the first year do not seem to be offset by experience. Our longitudinal study found that the proportion of newcomers reporting their work life as very stressful rose dramatically—from 33% in year 1, to 49% in year 3, to 71% in year 5. In exploring factors perceived by new faculty as most stressful, the following themes and concerns arise: time constraints in research and teaching; lack of collegial relations; inadequate feedback, recognition, and reward; unrealistic expectations; insufficient resources; and lack of balance between work and personal life.

Time Constraints

A predominant source of stress reported in nearly all studies of new faculty stems primarily from the press of finding enough time to get everything done (Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991). "Not enough time to do my work" emanates as one of the major contributors to stress among new faculty who describe their semesters as fragmented by too many tasks and too little time to complete them.

Difficulties in balancing new research and teaching responsibilities nearly always head the list of complaints. Fink (1984) interviewed new faculty and reported that they had difficulty juggling pressures for publication with heavy teaching loads. Similarly, Sorcinelli (1988) and Turner and Boice (1987) described stresses related to the demand to meet longer term goals for research (e.g., writing several articles, finishing a book, getting a lab up and running, finding colleagues with similar research interests, securing outside funding) versus the immediate and unpostponable demands of teaching. Newcomers indicated difficulties in preparing too many different classes, teaching large lecture classes, dealing with poorly prepared or unmotivated students, and compensating for their own inadequate preparation for teaching.

For some new faculty, the effects of such daily tension are debilitating. In interviews with beginning faculty, Reynolds (1988) found ill health to be a problem for more than half of her respondents. Sorcinelli (1988) found that despite their remarkable capacity for sustaining grueling schedules, new faculty described bouts of fatigue, feelings of failure, marital tensions, or frequent illnesses. Turner and Boice (1987) documented similar effects. Most of their sample of new faculty (83%) described a level of "busyness" during the first year that resulted in physical and emotional symptoms (e.g., fatigue, insomnia, anxiety attacks).

In addition, the concern of new faculty about lack of time and balance is the most consistent source of stress over time. Our study found that by the fifth year, junior faculty members described an increased personal comfort with their teaching and research. At the same time, satisfaction with their ability to find enough time to do their work and to balance the conflicting demands of research, teaching, and service continued to decline. Nearly half also reported a concomitant deterioration of their health (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992).

Lack of Collegial Relations

Few areas are more important to academic life than the intellectual and social dimensions of collegiality. Studies reveal that some of the most salient first-year concerns include feelings of loneliness, isolation, lack of social and intellectual stimulation, and insufficient support from senior faculty members (Boice, 1991a; Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991).

Fink (1984) first documented the need for more support by peers of new college teachers. When first-year faculty were asked for recommendations for their own institutions, two thirds said that they would have appreciated more assistance from fellow faculty members. Types of assistance most desired included support for teaching and more discussion of criteria used in salary and personnel decisions.

Sorcinelli (1988, 1992a), Turner and Boice (1987), and Whitt (1991) found similar concerns. New faculty reported a lack of collegial relations as the most surprising and disappointing aspect of their first year. On the one hand, many new faculty found their colleagues to be eminent and thoughtful scholars who had much to offer them. On the other hand, although new faculty may have reported general encouragement from colleagues, they were much less likely to have received concrete help

with scholarship (e.g., offering to collaborate on a research project or to review a manuscript or grant proposal) or with teaching (e.g., sharing syllabi, suggesting ways to deal with difficult students, visiting a classroom).

Moreover, although mentoring of new faculty did occur in a few departments, it was not widespread. In several studies, women and minorities, in particular, described acute feelings of personal isolation and desired to meet someone who could help them (Boice, 1992a; Sorcinelli, 1992a).

New faculty do report one element of satisfaction among the stresses of collegiality—the supportive role often played by department chairs. Sorcinelli (1988, 1992a) and Turner and Boice (1987) found that new faculty identified their chairperson as a crucial advocate and, in some cases, the most important individual during their first year. Chairs who were cited as particularly helpful seemed to take time to assign courses that fit interests and priorities, to negotiate minimal preps or a reduced load, to secure internal funds for resources or travel, and to provide guidance for annual reviews. Tellingly, chairs who assigned excessive workloads and provided little mentoring to new faculty were a dominant source of stress.

Investigators have posited several explanations for new faculty members' dissatisfaction with collegiality. Over the last decade, departments have become more diverse in sex, race, life-style, age, training, sense of mission, priorities, and compensation. Such diversity may exacerbate the sense of separateness that new faculty feel from senior colleagues (Reynolds, 1988; Sorcinelli, 1989; Whitt, 1991). In addition, Turner and Boice (1987) and Whitt (1991) found that new faculty were surprisingly passive about taking the initiative in interacting with colleagues. They rarely sought help, advice, or mentoring.

There is evidence that changes occur in new faculty's sense of collegiality over time. Two longitudinal studies provide different takes on the problem yet drew similar conclusions. Both Boice (1991a, 1992b) and Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992) reported that over 4 and 5 years, respectively, junior faculty seemed to have taken some initiative in seeking out senior faculty who could be helpful. At the same time, however, junior faculty seemed to have let go of the ideal of a work environment characterized by collaboration and intellectual stimulation, and simply lowered their expectations for collegial support. Both our findings and those of Boice suggest that over time, new faculty would benefit significantly from a more collegial, intellectually supportive environment.

Inadequate Feedback, Recognition, and Reward

Other factors that produce considerable stress among new and junior faculty are inadequate feedback, recognition, and reward. Under this rubric, new faculty express considerable tension about such issues as unclear criteria for evaluating research, teaching, and service, inadequate university recognition for their contributions, and insufficient financial rewards.

Several studies of first-year faculty conclude that early formal evaluations are significant contributors to faculty stress (Boice, 1991b; Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992a; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1989). In our studies, first-year faculty members described the reappointment process as daunting. They reported both exhaustion and stress as they cast about collecting evaluations (e.g., on grant efforts, manuscripts, teaching) and contemplated facing year after year of rigorous review. One new faculty member explained, "In this blur, one is arrested twice each year by the need to document and defend one's performance. One cycle, set of forms, and instructions for the purposes of conferring merit salary and another for reappointment."

Respondents also addressed what was described as a need for recognition. By the end of their first year, new faculty who had worked hard for achievement often complained that they then heard nothing or received an "antiseptic review" locally, despite disciplinary or national recognition. Such newcomers, who felt "totally invisible" to the people making decisions about them, expressed a simple desire for acknowledgement. New faculty recommended that departments consider more supportive, informal reviews for the first year (Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992a).

The particular stress of teaching evaluations is worth special mention. In a 2-year study of new faculty as teachers, Boice (1991b) found that new faculty taught cautiously and defensively, to avoid public failures at teaching. He reported that new faculty "routinely worried aloud about criticisms of their teaching, especially the sort that would earn repeated listings in reports of tenure committees" (p. 171). Boice recommended that departments should consider safeguarding new faculty from all formal evaluations of classroom performance for 1 or 2 years.

Anxiety about insufficient or inadequate feedback, recognition, and reward does not diminish. During the 5 years of our study, we were able to take a careful look at faculty concerns about evaluation over time. By the tenure year, junior faculty had often undergone several departmental reviews, and the department and university had taken on a more complex role in that they provided both support and evaluation (Olsen, 1990). It was not entirely surprising to find that from year 1 to year 5 our cohort reported a steadily eroding level of satisfaction with feedback on how well they were doing, recognition of their work by the university, and support they received from the administration (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992).

Unrealistic Expectations

New faculty members have been well schooled in the ethos of academic success. For many, an emphasis on conducting research, getting published, securing grants, and presenting papers is seen as highly important, even essential to advancement, rewards, and recognition. A sense of failure in this arena, then, can set a foundation for faculty stress.

Studies of first-year faculty conclude that newcomers feel a great deal of self-imposed pressure to perform well on every front. In our study, virtually all new faculty had set extremely high goals for their first year, in both teaching and research, and then described feelings of doubt when they did not measure up (Sorcinelli, 1988).

Whitt (1991) found that not only did new faculty set excessively high self-expectations but that deans and chairs shared and reinforced such goals. Both department chairs and deans expected new faculty to settle in, learn their way around, focus on their goals, and manage a multiplicity of tasks in a short amount of time. In her interviews, Whitt heard one phrase so often from both new faculty and administrators that it became tantamount to a slogan: "Hit the ground running."

Even over time, new faculty are not immune to their own and others' expectations that they not only hit the ground running but also that they keep on running. In two different longitudinal studies of new faculty, researchers noted that after 4 or 5 years in their positions, junior faculty still worried about the quantity and quality of their research, even though many had met or exceeded departmental and institutional demands for productivity. They also expressed continued concern about their departmental colleagues' evaluation of their work and about keeping up with standards set by colleagues both inside and outside of the university (Boice, 1991a, 1991b; Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992).

Insufficient Resources

New faculty point to real difficulties in securing resources essential to conducting research and optimizing the environment for teaching (Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992a; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991). Perhaps most striking in our studies was the disparity of resources available to young faculty in different disciplines. For example, new faculty in some schools and departments were provided new and fairly spacious offices, personal computers, paid summers for research, a semester's release time before tenure, adequate clerical staff, photocopying monies, and the like. Other new faculty, particularly those in the humanities, worked in run-down buildings with obsolete equipment. Microcomputers, secretarial help, travel allowances, support for release time, or lower teaching loads were curtailed or nonexistent (Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992a).

Over time, new faculty members continue to report that better physical resources (e.g., library, lab, studio, classroom facilities) are important. Of special note is a call for more travel funds for professional meetings. By their third and fifth years, junior faculty, who most need to attend professional conferences, present papers, and establish a reputation, strongly recommend that universities increase travel allowances, with more generous reimbursement packages being made available to untenured faculty (Olsen, 1990; Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992).

Balancing Work and Life Outside of Work

As noted earlier, the conflicting demands of professional tasks such as teaching, writing, staying current in one's field, advising, applying for and administering grants, and providing service to the university and profession are a source of stress for new faculty. Research also suggests that efforts to balance the demands of professional work with such aspects of personal life as being a spouse, a parent, a child of aging parents, and an involved citizen may compound new faculty stress (Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992a; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989).

In previous work with a sample of untenured and tenured faculty, we found that junior faculty reported significantly more of what we called "negative spillover" (their work life negatively "spilled over" into their personal life) than did associate or full professors. In our longitudinal study, we decided to look at the occurrence of spillover over time. During the first year, new faculty described negative spillover between time and energy for work and for spouses, children, dual careers, and commuter relationships. They also cited conflicts between work and leisure activities. Lack of time and energy for exercise, reading, hobbies, and social and civic activities were common concerns (Sorcinelli & Near, 1989).

Intuitively, one would assume that new faculty would find ways to resolve tensions and to better balance work and life away from work over time. Our longitudinal data, however, provide somewhat mixed findings regarding this prediction. Encouragingly, by year 3 we found that junior faculty were actively working on negotiating conflicts between work and life outside of work (Olsen & Stage, 1990). This finding was reinforced by Boice's (1991a) study of four successively hired cohorts of new faculty. By year 4, he found that new faculty had taken concrete steps to reduce negative spillover and had detailed specific plans for community- or family-based activities.

At the same time, our data also indicate that faculty were less satisfied with the balance between their work and nonwork life after being a faculty member for several years. In particular, there was an increase in the percentage of junior faculty indicating that their work life exercised a great deal of negative impact on their nonwork lives. Junior faculty indicated that the conflict stemmed largely from "an

erosion of leisure time and social relations under the press of institutional and self-imposed work commitments" (Olsen, 1990, p. 8.). Moreover, there is some evidence that pretenure women meet some additional obstacles as they attempt to balance work, marital, and family life (Sorcinelli, 1992a).

The aforementioned findings suggest that new faculty continue to experience stresses and strains because of the demands of work and nonwork roles throughout the years before tenure. For many newcomers, striking a balance between the two significant domains of their life may take considerable time to achieve.

SUMMARY

In general terms, this review indicates several important points about the experiences of new and junior faculty members. First, new faculty arrive on campuses with enthusiasm and optimism about opportunities for growth in their careers. Over time, however, new faculty report a lower level of work satisfaction and a higher level of work-related stress.

Second, chair and colleague relations contribute significantly to new faculty members' sense of commitment and loyalty to their campuses. Department chairs are a critical source of socialization for new faculty. Senior colleagues, too, are important to creating a positive professional environment. New faculty desire more assistance than they are getting from senior colleagues in adjusting to their new setting and in establishing themselves as researchers and teachers.

Third, new faculty seek support for both research and teaching. Campuses have a responsibility to nurture and aid the scholarship and teaching of its developing faculty. For research, resources such as internal grants, materials for libraries, labs and computers, funds for professional meetings, and staff support are of paramount importance. Formal support for teaching through internal grants is important. New faculty also desire informal support such as more frequent discussions about teaching performance with chairs and senior faculty mentors.

Fourth, new faculty report that vague, ambiguous, changing, or unrealistic expectations are primary sources of concern. New faculty want up-to-date, clear, and constructive feedback on research and teaching from chairs and senior colleagues. They recommend more supportive reviews of the first year, oriented to development rather than to evaluation.

Last, there is some evidence that pretenure women and minority faculty meet some additional obstacles as they adjust to university life. They experience less contact with and sponsorship from colleagues. Women report a different kind of experience than men do in balancing work, marital, and family life.

Studies on the early experiences of new faculty make it clear that a great deal can be done in the area of new and junior faculty development. Fortunately, research on new faculty not only has investigated satisfactions and stresses but also has pointed to recommendations for enhancing their professional development (Boice, 1992b; Fink, 1984; Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1988, 1992a). When asked what kinds of programs they believe would best facilitate their professional development and offset some of the factors viewed as liabilities to their careers, new faculty give their endorsement to programs that will contribute to their development as scholars and teachers (e.g., released time, funding, training). Not surprisingly, new faculty also believe that improved facilities and resources (e.g., libraries, labs, classrooms), funds for professional meetings, and staff support will contribute greatly to their work. Finally, new faculty also endorse programs that introduce them to campus colleagues and resources (e.g., mentoring programs, orientation activities, and workshops on teaching and writing grants).

MODEL PROGRAMS FOR NEW FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Listed here are key resources that address the needs of new and junior faculty. New and junior faculty development programs that several institutions have started to improve the environment for newcomers are identified. They include exemplary programs for orientation, mentoring, and research and teaching development. (For the addresses and telephone numbers of these programs, see Appendix A).

Programs for New Faculty Orientation

New faculty desire information about their college or university as they start their appointments. An orientation program can shorten the time newcomers take to become integrated into their departments and campus. The program should include opportunities to build relationships among new and established faculty, as well as information about teaching, research, and campus programs. Five model programs provide a range of ideas for developing new faculty orientations. For a more detailed discussion and evaluation of these programs, see Fink (1992).

Southeast Missouri State University holds a mandatory, week-long teaching effectiveness program for all newly hired, full-time faculty. Participants identify preferences among a variety of topics (e.g., designing syllabi, improving lectures, leading discussion, and testing and grading) and choose optional activities (e.g., library tour, resources for students).

The University of Maryland offers a one-evening, 3-hour orientation program for part-time, adjunct faculty. The program provides information about support services for faculty and students, and activities (e.g., small-group discussion, role play, and brainstorming) that serve as good practices in both teaching and learning.

The University of Illinois offers two to six 90-minute Dean's Seminars for new faculty in individual colleges. These seminars are sponsored by a dean of a college and are developed and implemented by a college-level committee and the staff of the Division of Instructional Development. Sessions cover both general and discipline-specific features of good teaching.

The University of Oklahoma has organized a voluntary, semester-long Professional Development Seminar for all newcomers. New faculty members meet weekly for lunch, followed by a 75-minute program. Seminar topics are wide ranging and include sessions on securing funding, starting a research program, improving and evaluating teaching, finding resources, and understanding the organization of the university.

The University of Texas at Austin offers a 3-day, voluntary, campus-wide orientation program for new faculty prior to registration for the fall semester. The program includes sessions on orienting new faculty to the campus, to Austin, and to Texas, and introduces new faculty to support services for teaching and research.

Programs for New and Junior Faculty Mentoring

Many new faculty emphasize social and intellectual isolation as a problem. New faculty see benefits in working with senior faculty in formal mentor programs. Informal support from chairs and senior faculty also helps. Three successful mentoring programs described next encourage collaboration in teaching and scholarship among faculty across such variables as sex, age, rank, discipline, and, in one case, campus.

California State University at Long Beach, funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), has developed and evaluated a mentoring program for junior faculty. The project

directors first surveyed the occurrence of mentoring on campus and found that although mentoring was infrequent, new faculty who experienced it fared better than did those who did not. The directors then developed a systematic program of mentoring, which included establishing 25 mentoring pairs to meet on a weekly basis for at least an academic year. The mentors and mentees meet as a group once a month to share ideas, and the project directors visited mentors and mentees on a regular basis, both to nudge pairs to meet and to study the mentoring relationship in depth.

The Great Lakes Colleges Association, a consortium of 12 liberal arts colleges, sponsors an interinstitutional mentoring program that pairs junior faculty members with senior colleagues from outside of the newcomers' institutions. Junior faculty apply and senior faculty volunteer for the program by filling out a brief Faculty Mentoring Questionnaire. Participants are reimbursed for expenses incurred during their mentoring meetings. Mentoring pairs arrange their own meeting time and place, complete an evaluation of their first meeting, and then decide about the continuation of their meeting. Participants receive guidelines outlining approaches to mentoring as well as confidentiality in the relationship.

At *Temple University* in Philadelphia, the Senior Mentoring Service was established in 1990 and is supported by a grant from the federal Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education (FIPSE). The program offers every full-time junior faculty member in Temple University's College of Arts and Sciences the opportunity to work privately on teaching skills with a senior professor recently retired from the college faculty—professors recognized for their teaching effectiveness, their demonstrated willingness to help younger colleagues, and their broad knowledge of the academic culture. The mentors and their clients determine their own mentoring goals and schedules, meeting approximately 90 minutes every 2 weeks during the academic year. In addition to modest stipends for mentors, the program provides competitive Grants in Aid of Teaching Effectiveness (\$300 to \$1500 per award), for which all junior faculty participants are eligible.

Programs for Development in Teaching and Research

Institutions need to nurture and aid the scholarship of its developing faculty. At the same time, new faculty spend a great deal of time on teaching and worry about what to teach, how best to teach, and how to motivate students. Although the aforementioned new-faculty orientation and mentoring programs all provide opportunities for development in teaching and research, the following two programs are expressly designed to provide formal support for research and scholarly work, and for teaching, particularly at the undergraduate level.

Outstanding Young Faculty Award. Indiana University, Bloomington, conducted a longitudinal study of new faculty socialization and found that the many demands on young faculty member's time and energy can leave inadequate time for development of a strong research record, despite the best intentions. In response, the campus developed a program to support junior faculty members' development as scholars. Outstanding Young Faculty Awards support five faculty each year to further their scholarship or creative activity. The awards include a Summer Faculty Fellowship in the amount of \$4,500, a Faculty Grant-In-Aid in the amount of \$2000, and a \$4000 released time or grant-in-aid for the academic year. The campus also has developed other award programs that junior faculty are encouraged to apply for including Multidisciplinary Seminars Program, Instructional Development Summer Fellowships, and Departmental Faculty Development Grants.

The Lilly Teaching Fellows Program, sponsored by the Lilly Endowment, provides a means through which junior faculty members can

develop their expertise as teachers as they also establish themselves as researchers. A Teaching Fellows program typically involves 6 to 10 tenure-track junior faculty members who are appointed as fellows for 1 year. Although each university receiving Lilly support develops its own program, virtually all programs include several basic elements: regular group meetings of the fellows, individual teaching-related projects, release time from teaching, senior faculty mentors, and retreats and conferences. All public and private major research universities east of the Mississippi are eligible to apply.

Reader Note. The citations listed in the References section and in the Additional Resources section are all either about or for new and junior faculty members. They include research studies of new faculty, descriptions of campus programs developed for new faculty, and handbooks written for new faculty members themselves. Readers can use these resources to provide an introduction and considerable breadth and depth of coverage on the topic of new and junior faculty development in higher education.

REFERENCES

- Boice, R. (1991a). New faculty as colleagues. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies In Education*, 4(1), 29–44.
- Boice, R. (1991b). New faculty as teachers. *Journal of Higher Education*, 62(2), 150–173.
- Boice, R. (1992a). Lessons learned about mentoring. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Boice, R. (1992b). *The new faculty member*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Bowen, J. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fink, L. D. (1984). *The first year of college teaching* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Fink, L. D. (1992). Orientation programs for new faculty. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Finkelstein, M. J., & LaCelle-Peterson, M. W. (1992). New and junior faculty: A review of the literature. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Olsen, D. (1990, November). *Work satisfaction and stress in the first three years of an academic appointment*. Paper presented at Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.
- Olsen, D., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). The pretenure years: A longitudinal perspective. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Olsen, D., & Stage, F. (1990, November). *Work satisfaction and stress in the first three years of an academic appointment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.
- Reynolds, A. (1988). *Making and giving the grade: Experiences of beginning professors at a research university*. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1988). Satisfactions and concerns of new university teachers. *To Improve the Academy*, 7, 121–133.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1989). Chairs and the development of new faculty. *The Department Advisor*, 5(2), 1–5.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992a). *The career development of pretenure faculty: An institutional study*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, Center For Teaching.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Near, J. (1989, Jan-Feb). Relations between work and life away from work among university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 60(1), 59–81.
- Turner, J. L., & Boice, R. (1987). Starting at the beginning: Concerns and needs of new faculty. *To Improve the Academy*, 6, 41–55.

APPENDIX A

Whitt, E. (1991). Hit the ground running: Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. *Review of Higher Education*, 14(2), 177-197.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- Austin, A. E. (1992). Supporting junior faculty through a teaching fellows program. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boice, R. (1990). Mentoring new faculty: A program for implementation. *Journal of Staff, Program and Organization Development*, 8(3), 143-160.
- Deneef, A. L., Goodwin, C. D., & McCrate, E. S. (Eds.). (1988). *The academic's handbook*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Eimers, M. (1990). Background and experiences of new faculty. *Instructional Development*, 1(3), 12-15.
- Eison, J. A. (1989). Mandatory teaching effectiveness workshops for new faculty: What a difference three years make. *Journal of Staff, Program and Organization Development*, 7(2), 59-66.
- Eison, J. A., & Hill, H. H. (1990). Creating workshops for new faculty. *Journal of Staff, Program and Organization Development*, 8(4), 223-234.
- Fink, L. D. (1990). New faculty members: The professoriate of tomorrow. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 8(4), 235-245.
- Jarvis, D. K. (1991). *Junior faculty development: A handbook*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Jarvis, D. K. (1992). Improving junior faculty scholarship. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lavery, P. T., Boice, R., Thompson, R. W., & Turner, J. L. (1989). An annotated bibliography of mentoring for new faculty. *Journal of Staff, Program and Organization Development*, 7, 39-46.
- Lewis, K. G., Svinicki, M. D., & Stice, J. E. (1985). Filling the gap: Introducing new faculty to the basics of teaching. *Journal of Staff, Program and Organization Development*, 3(1), 16-31.
- Noonan, J. F. (1980). An institute on teaching and learning for new faculty. In W. C. Nelson & M. E. Siegel (Eds.), *Effective approaches to faculty development*. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Renegar, S., Summary, B., Bonwell, C., & Eison, J. (1987). Mandatory teaching effectiveness workshops for new faculty: Lessons learned the hard way. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 5(3), 114-118.
- Schwen, T., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (1983). A profile of a postdoctoral teaching program. In P. Lacey (Ed.), *Revitalizing teaching through faculty development* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992b). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (Eds.). (1992). *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Gregory, M. W. (1987). Faculty stress: The tension between career demands and having it all. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Coping with faculty stress* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 29). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wheeler, D. W. (1992). Chairs and the development of new faculty. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wylie, N. R. (1986). *Helping new faculty adjust to careers at liberal arts colleges* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 843).
- Zanna, M. P., & Darley, J. M. (1987). *The complete academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist*. New York: Random.

New and Junior Faculty Development Programs

New Faculty Orientation Programs

Southeast Missouri State University. For further information contact Charles Bonwell, Director, Center for Teaching and Learning, Southeast Missouri State University, Cape Girardeau, MO 63701. Phone: 314-651-2298.

The University of Maryland. For more information contact Barbara Millis, Assistant Dean, University of Maryland University College, University Boulevard at Adelphi Road, College Park, MD 20742-1660. Phone: 301-985-7770.

The University of Illinois. For more information contact Marne Helgesen, Head, Division of Instructional Development, 307 Engineering Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801. Phone: 217-333-3370.

The University of Oklahoma. For further information contact Dee Fink, Instructional Development Program, Carnegie 116, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019. Phone: 405-325-3521.

The University of Texas at Austin. Further information is available from Karron Lewis, Center for Teaching Effectiveness, Main Building 2200, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712-1111. Phone: 512-471-1488.

New and Junior Faculty Mentoring Programs

California State University at Long Beach. For more information contact Bob Boice, Director, Faculty Instructional Support Office, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3700. Phone: 516-632-8356.

The Great Lakes College Association. For additional information contact the association at Suite 207, 2929 Plymouth Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48105-3206. Phone: 313-761-4833.

Temple University. For further information contact Donald Rackin, Director, Senior Mentoring Service, Department of English, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122. Phone: 215-787-1807 or 215-843-3799.

Programs for Development in Teaching and Research

Outstanding Young Faculty Award. For more information contact Deborah Olsen, Director of Faculty Development, Office of Academic Affairs, Bryan Hall, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405. Phone: 812-885-2809.

The Lilly Teaching Fellows Program. For more information contact the Lilly Endowment, Inc., North Meridian Street, P.O. Box 88068, Indianapolis, IN 46208-0068.

Mary Deane Sorcinelli is the director of the Center for Teaching and is an associate adjunct professor in the Division of Educational and Policy Administration at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Center for Teaching, Whitmore 239, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003.