Rowan University
Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-13-2003

An exploratory investigation of the value selected academics place on faculty internship programs

James M. Summers
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd

 Part of the Higher Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Summers, James M., "An exploratory investigation of the value selected academics place on faculty internship programs" (2003). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1381.
https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1381

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF THE VALUE SELECTED ACADEMICS PLACE ON FACULTY INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

by
James M. Summers

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
May 1, 2003

Approved By _____
Professor

Date Approved 5/13/03

ABSTRACT

James M. Summers
AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF THE VALUE SELECTED ACADEMICS PLACE ON FACULTY INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS
2002/03
Dr. Burton Sisco
Master of Arts in Higher Education

The purposes of this exploratory investigation were to (a) ascertain the level of importance or value Rowan University Engineering and Business faculty members (n = 51) place on faculty internships and (b) determine the preference these faculty members have toward faculty internships or traditional sabbaticals. A t-test for Equal Means indicated the two groups held similar views with respect to the perceived value faculty internships have on professional growth and improved scholarship and teaching. One exception was the effect faculty internships have on career requirements. While both groups generally understood the value of faculty internships, participants would opt for a traditional sabbatical. Some participants suggested, as a reason, universities reward research and publication. Research and publication are the perceived goals of a traditional sabbatical but not necessarily that of a faculty internship. Implications for planning a faculty internship program are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To, Dr. Thomas Monahan, you were the first person I met when I applied for the program. You helped me through my initial matriculation and became my advisor. We also found out we had more in common than first appeared, as maturing children of the sixties and having served our country at the same time. Welcome home Tom.

To, Dr. Burton Sisco, I came to know you last year as an instructor, mentor, and finally my advisor. I have enjoyed our discussions in class and in private. Thanks for supporting me and not allowing me to cut corners and take the easy road. We are fellow travelers and I have enjoyed the journey. I know there are more miles ahead!

To, Dr. Steven Chin, thank you for your support and guidance through my internship. You can count on me as I look forward to our continued future collaboration.

To my mother, I know there had to be times when I was younger that you and dad wondered what would become of me. Well, just in case you still wonder, you and dad did a very good job. You gave me the solid foundation I needed from which to grow.

I cannot forget my children and grandchildren. In turn, I hope I have given you the solid foundation from which to grow. I want you all to know you mean everything to me and I only hope for the best for you. Always remember, you are never too old to learn.

Finally, I have to thank my best friend, my partner, and my wife. You have always been right at my side providing the encouragement that only you knew I needed. You have sacrificed much for me. I would not be where I am today but for you. I owe you more than you can ever imagine. As it was in 1974 it is the same today in 2003, you share equally in this moment. I thank God every day for our love and companionship. Now, it's your turn!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of Problem	2
	Significance of the Problem	3
	Purpose of the Study	3
	Assumptions and Limitations	4
	Operational Definitions	5
	Research Questions	6
	Summary	6
2.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
	Types of Partnerships	10
	Faculty Internships	12
	Faculty Internship Examples	13
	Traditional Sabbaticals	16
	Expected Faculty Internship Outcomes	17
3.	METHODOLOGY	18
	Subjects	18
	Instrument	19
	Procedure	20
	Data Analysis	21
4.	FINDINGS	22
	Profiles of the Sample	22
	Research Questions	23
5.	SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	39
	Summary of the Study	39
	Purpose of the Study	39
	Methodology	40
	Data Analysis	41
	Findings	41
	Discussion and Conclusion	45
	Implications	47
	Recommendations for Future Research	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
REFERENCES	49
APPENDIX A: Institutional Review Board Disposition Form	51
APPENDIX B: Letter of Introduction	58
APPENDIX C: Informed Consent Form	60
APPENDIX D: Perceived Value of Faculty Internships Survey	62

TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Years in Education	22
2.	Sabbatical History	23
3.	Confidence in Abilities and Sense of Professionalism	24
4.	Professional Development	25
5.	Professional Advancement	25
6.	Credibility Among Peers	26
7.	Influence Among Peers	27
8.	Credibility With Department Administrators	28
9.	Influence With Department Administrators	29
10.	Knowledge of Career Requirements	30
11.	Maintain Industry Contacts	31
12.	Commitment to Teaching	32
13.	Teaching Strategies	32
14.	Course Content	33
15.	Sabbatical versus Faculty Internship Outcomes	34
16.	Sabbatical Preference	35
17.	Reasons for Sabbatical Preference	36
18.	Years in Education * Preference * Major Field of Instruction Cross Tabulation	38

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study explored the value selected academics place on faculty internship programs. Faculty internships can have an effect on faculty leadership, classroom preparation, and instructional techniques. The literature suggests internships, as a subset of education-business partnerships, can have a positive effect in faculty professional development either at the onset of ones career or at mid-career. In turn, this development may have a direct affect on the way faculty teach and interact with other faculty.

Internships are designed to expose faculty to real world business problems, potential solutions, and opportunities to interact with business professionals. The suggestion is authentic teamwork experienced by the faculty member will become an important part of the classroom setting. Faculty exposed to the teaming concepts prevalent in most businesses today will place new value on collegiality and teamwork in the academic workplace.

The effects of faculty internships can be measured on at least three levels. The first level is the effect the internship experience has on the faculty member and his/her teaching strategy. The second level effects arise from the translation of the work experience to the classroom and thus to the students. The third level effects are on the college and community as faculty leaders begin to act as change agents within the educational system. In other words, an expected outcome of faculty internships is a more experienced and professional instructor capable of translating the work experience to the

classroom, thus providing an enriched learning experience for faculty and student alike. The internship experience is expected to grow faculty leaders who become change agents within the educational system.

Statement of Problem

Kubota (1993) states some work experience programs in the math and science fields at the secondary and community college levels are tied directly to programs that prepare teacher leaders. However, she points out there is virtually no information on the success of classroom transformation or faculty members becoming change agents as a result of internships. Rosengard (2000) found little available internship information during her study of mid-career interning in the broadcast journalism field. She found that most information was more than fifteen years old. Since most of the literature involves education-business partnerships in K-12 public education system, there is a plethora of articles and reports on the varying degrees of education-business partnership success. However, there appears to be little relevant information supporting the potential importance placed on faculty internships at the collegiate level. The internship is a contractual relationship between business and higher education. There are costs and risks experienced by both parties. Business and higher education institutions require relevant information in order to guide and make business decisions. Faculty internships cost universities in terms of budget and workload shedding. Businesses experience a cost to bring on faculty and the unknown effect the faculty member will have on the team and project. There is an information gap about the importance of faculty internships. Closing this gap will help businesses and higher education institutions better determine the value of faculty internships and help make decisions to either enter new internships or continue

current relations. This study sought to ascertain the level of importance or value faculty members place on these types of internships.

Significance of the Problem

Partnerships are fragile entities and depend on the good will and trust between the involved parties. Businesses seek to assist in the improvement of educational systems while receiving some benefit from the influence and knowledge of the assigned faculty member. Higher education institutions seek the improvement of their educational systems and the quality of their faculty and instructional techniques. Faculty members seek professional growth and renewal that internships may be able to provide. There is much to gain but there is a cost associated with this program. Wise business decisions are made on relevant information. In a world of diminishing resources and increasing costs, organizations can ill afford to expend scarce resources on programs with seemingly great potential but little to actually prove they can be successful. Closing the information gap with respect to the potential success of faculty internships will help businesses and higher education to decide whether such programs warrant further support. There must be mutual support for these programs. Business, educational institutions, and faculty members must have an understanding of the value associated with internships and believe there will be mutual benefit for all involved parties.

Purpose of the Study

Faculty internships may be viable alternatives to traditional sabbaticals. For the most part, faculty internships have been associated with elementary and secondary science and mathematics teachers. More recently community college and some four-year colleges and universities have offered faculty internships as alternatives to traditional sabbaticals.

There is a cost and significant effort to successfully implement faculty internships. A college or university initiating a faculty internship planning effort should identify faculty knowledge of and value placed on these types of sabbaticals as a significant planning assumption. Faculty closely associated with industry and business would benefit the most from an internship. The purpose of this study was to ascertain the level of importance or value Rowan University engineering and business faculty members placed on these types of internships.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study took place at Rowan University and involved the College of Engineering and College of Business faculty. Findings of this study represent the thoughts and opinions of these faculty members only. It was assumed these faculty members represented a population closely associated with industry and business who would most benefit from a faculty internship. No attempt was made to ascertain the thoughts and opinions of college administrators. The study does not imply the thoughts and opinions of other Rowan University faculty or faculty of other colleges and universities.

In order to gather relevant information the survey instrument for this research project used other existing surveys as a guide. However, the focus of this research was narrow, looking at professional development, when compared to the model. The model survey included professional development as well as faculty job satisfaction, near and long term career plans, retirement plans, and critiques of internships and business partners. Only general agreement with national trends could be made in the narrow category of professional development.

Operational Definitions

The following definitions apply to the terms used:

Traditional Sabbatical—A time away from the normal routine of campus life for introspection or a time to renew skills or learn new ones. Traditional sabbaticals follow a more open-ended approach to renewal and are generally the outcome of individual planning of the sabbatical taker.

Faculty Internship—A time away from the normal routine of campus life to expose faculty to real world business problems and solutions through specific projects located within the business setting and initiated through a contractual agreement between the university and business.

College of Engineering Faculty—Full time faculty members from the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Department of Chemical Engineering, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, and the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Rowan University.

College of Business: Full time faculty members from the Department of Marketing, Department of Management and MIS, and Department of Accounting and Finance at Rowan University.

Overall: A term used in this study to describe the full time faculty members of the College of Engineering and College of Business taken together.

Professional self-concept: A term to describe confidence in teaching and a sense of professionalism.

Commitment to teaching: A term to describe enthusiasm as an instructor and the importance this enthusiasm plays energizing students.

Professional development: A term used to describe the level of commitment to learn more about subject areas, to be more inclined to attend workshops or courses, and learn more about new technology.

Access and use of community resources: To maintain contact with business and industry mentors for own continued growth or as classroom resources.

Research Questions

The purpose of this research was to explore faculty thoughts and expectations on internships.

Research Question 1: Do faculty members believe internships could have a positive effect on career development as measured by a sense of professional self-concept, individual professional development, professional advancement, improvement of credibility and influence with peers and administrators, and an increase in knowledge of career requirements?

Research Question 2: Do faculty members believe internships have a positive influence on commitment to teaching, course content and teaching strategies?

Research Question 3: Do faculty members believe they have the time to devote to an internship or traditional sabbatical?

Research Question 4: Given the choice which would faculty choose a faculty internship or a traditional sabbatical?

Summary

Business and higher education partnerships provide vehicles for advancement of business and education. A partnership subset is faculty internships. Such programs are intended to expose faculty to real world problems and solutions while being a member of

a business team. Improvements are expected in faculty instructional techniques. Faculty members are expected to embrace the experience to the point of becoming leaders and change agents in their higher educational community. As desirable as this appears, there is little information to support the belief internships are a necessary investment and will have a significant return on this investment.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Educational partnerships come about as a desire to improve school-community relationships, provide incentives for students and faculty, improve curriculum and obtain equipment. Business and educational community relationships have been in existence since the late 1800s. By the 1970s these relationships became more formal in the form of partnerships. In 1983, the U.S. Department of Education's National Commission on Excellence in Education issued *A Nation At Risk.* This report described an urgent need to transform American public education based on actual test scores in math and science compared to other countries (U. S. Department of Education, 1983). The commission called for the establishment of higher standards for graduates and educators. The report also had the effect of stimulating increased interest in education-business partnerships. As a result, partnerships accelerated in growth throughout the 1980s and 1990s. To illustrate this growth-rate, the decade of the 1980s witnessed the number of partnerships growing from 42,200 to 140,800 (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 1993).

As the 21st century approached, higher education and the corporate world faced new challenges demanding fresh and creative solutions. Wirasinghe (2000) posited the 21st Century would be a time of intense globalization strengthened by an information society. The key to prosperity would be innovation in technology through engineering and global commercialization. America experienced a transformation from an industrial to a knowledge-based, technological society. This transformation called for an educated and

highly skilled workforce. During this same period of time colleges and universities experienced challenges from increased costs and decreased funding. It is the combination of these pressures that generally brought together higher education and industry in formal relationships or partnerships. The obvious goals are the increased vitality of the college or university and the future success of industry. Partnerships flourish because both parties find the alliance to be mutually beneficial (Nimtz, Coscarelli, & Blair, 1996). Instructors can be invigorated and stimulated as they come into contact with various professionals. Professional encounters may lead faculty to develop improved curriculum based on their work experience leading to greater opportunities for student learning (Hall, Castrale, & Zimmerman, 1993). Education organizations also realize increased access to new technology and facilities (Lankard, 1995). Higher education also gains from increased admissions and retention, better-prepared students, and decreased remediation costs (USDOE, 1993).

Businesses approach the partnership looking for benefits that affect their operation, productivity, and profit line (Lankard, 1995). Of course businesses are always on the look out for those opportunities where their corporate image can be enhanced and partnerships provide an appropriate means. A successful venture provides greater business visibility in the community. Beyond improved public relations, businesses can derive some sense of satisfaction they played a role in stimulating improvements in the educational system (Hall, et al., 1993)

Types of Partnerships

Hall, et al. (1993) presented six education-business partnership classifications or levels. Partnerships ranged from policy making to business employees participating in the classroom. Classifications are:

- Policy Partners
- Systemic Educational Improvement
- Partners in Management
- Partners in Teacher Training and Development
- Partners in the Classroom
- Partners in Special Services

The first three are inclined toward policy making. The last three partnerships are where these associations "put rubber to the road" and businesses and the educational system tend to benefit the most (Hall, et al., 1993).

Policy partnerships are collaborative efforts that shape the public or political debate to bring about transformations favorable to the education-business association in federal or state legislation. Benefits from policy partnerships arise from the large numbers of stakeholders addressing significant issues causing change within the system. The goal is to change federal and state policy in ways beneficial to the students (USDOE, 1993).

Systemic educational improvement partnerships have a focus on educational systematic improvements. Teams of business, educational, and other community leaders perform studies and identify areas for improvement in the educational system. The benefit of this approach is the positive impact systemic improvements have on the overall educational system. However, progress toward systemic change may be measured in tens

of years and the educational community must have realistic expectations for these long-range goals (USDOE, 1993).

The last of the policy related associations are partners in management. Here, businesses provide the educational system with management support services and business expertise. The educational system can benefit from the expertise businesses have in labor management, incentive programs, information systems and strategic planning. Businesses and private foundations are increasingly investing in partnerships focused on management in school systems (USDOE, 1993).

Special services partnerships provide resources to meet specific needs. Projects are usually short-term and may only involve one school, teacher or class (Hall, et al., 1993). These partnerships usually focus on primary and secondary school systems and are of limited value due to the time-limited nature of the services provided. However, it is also pointed out that because these partnerships and activities are simple in nature they are easy to measure and usually have a high success rate thus promoting follow on partnerships.

Classroom partnerships provide an opportunity for business experts to enter the classroom. The expectation is the classroom will benefit from the expertise provided by the business professional. Like special services, classroom partnerships are generally focused on primary and secondary school systems. The benefit is the ability to directly and positively impact a small group of young people. They are fairly easy to measure in terms of academic achievement. However, they warn there are limitations most notably programs of this nature benefit only a few students and teachers.

Partners in teacher training and development are focused on the association between the educational system and business. Hall (1993) presents the notion that business provides opportunities for school personnel and faculty to maintain and upgrade their skills. In the process educational personnel are exposed to and learn more about the current labor market, workplace needs and emerging technology. Primary, secondary, and higher education personnel and faculty benefit from these partnerships. The faculty internship is an excellent example of this type of partnership. The education system benefits from these partnerships in that faculty are energized with new concepts and ideas that translate real world experience to improvement in the classroom presentation (USDOE, 1993). There is an expectation on the part of the involved educational system training partnerships or faculty internships will foster faculty leadership and create faculty change agents.

Faculty Internships

Faculty internships are designed to enhance the service to industry of the teaching, research, and service of faculty. These special partnerships involve part- and full-time faculty in an external business or organization for a semester or other defined period of time. The arrangement provides an opportunity for a faculty member to share his/her expertise with an organization. The faculty member also performs a clearly defined function that may be of benefit to the business. As a result of this association, the faculty member maintains or improves his/her knowledge of current business operations and technology deployment. These experiences, in turn, are presumably shared with students in the classroom.

Faculty internships are of benefit to all disciplines. Kubota (1993) presented a case where industry and education acknowledged the need for a skilled workforce in mathematics, science, and other technological fields. A partnership consisting of a consortium of San Francisco Bay companies and the Lawrence Hall of Science at the University of California at Berkeley decided to focus on teachers as the primary change agents to transform mathematics and science education. Rosengard (1999) developed an argument for faculty internships as a method of updating faculty skills and knowledge in the broadcast journalism field. She argued mid-career faculty members find themselves outdated because of rapidly expanding technology. The university teacher needs to be involved in various broadcasting activities including working at a station. While developing an argument for a transformation in engineering education in the 21st century, Wirasinghe (2000) established a need for faculty internships to compliment student internships.

Faculty internships may also address mid-career faculty crisis and morale problems (West, 1980). In general, internships may renew lost enthusiasm for their education profession (Kelly, 1990). An internship may also help faculty make a decision to change careers (West, 1980). Another benefit of internships is the notion of increased faculty collaboration enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching (Austin & Baldwin, 1992).

Faculty Internship Examples

Kubota (1993) discussed a partnership between the Lawrence Hall of Science at USC Berkely and a consortium of San Francisco Bay Area companies. The consortium established a program called the Industry Initiatives for Science and Math Education

(IISME). Teachers from K-14 were eligible for the program. From 1985 through the summer of 2000, IISME provided 731 K-14 teachers at least one summer work experience with one of the 114 corporate sponsors (Weisbaum & Huang, 2001). The partners recognized a need for a skilled workforce in mathematics, science, and other technological fields. Kubota (1993) presented the notion faculty internships focused on teachers being the primary agents for affecting meaningful change in mathematics and science (Kubota, 1993). Nimtz, Coscarelli, and Blair (1996) echoed this by acknowledging the workforce beyond 2000 will be highly educated and skilled in response to the transformation from an industrial to a knowledge-based, technological society. They suggest higher education and the corporate world faced with these challenges will have to provide fresh and creative solutions. IISME appears to be a response to this call. In general the program appears to provide a highly valued product but there remained deficiencies and drawbacks. Weisbaum and Huang (2001) reported the following internship results in their fifteen-year study:

- Teachers reported the internship experience relevant to their classroom content, professional development, and created an improved sense of professional self-concept.
- The program provided teachers with encouragement through a professional support network.
- Many teachers reported a positive impact on their commitment to teaching.
- Most teachers did not view the program as a mechanism for facilitating their professional advancement along the school ladder.

- Teachers did not report much impact on problem solving strategies in the classroom or on connecting students with industrial resources.
- Teachers reported the experience had little impact in helping with new teaching strategies.
- Teachers claimed an increased use of computers in the classroom and they sought ways to increase collaboration with other faculty and maintained their connections with their business sponsor.

With respect to faculty collaboration, Austin and Baldwin (1992) suggested the idea that increased faculty collaboration is a result of business teaming experiments. Having been exposed to successful teaming concepts during a work experience, faculty would be expected to champion this cause back in school or on campus.

In 1999, the Knight Foundation awarded $950,000 to the Radio Television News Directors Foundation for mid-career journalism training. Rosengard (2000) presents the initiative as one designed to enhance broadcast journalism education and to strengthened the caliber of the future broadcast workforce. The initiative sent broadcast journalism educators back to work in newsrooms during the summer months. Fifteen educators participated in the program in 2000, twenty educators in 2001, and twenty-five in 2002. Rosengard points out that prior to this internship program many broadcast journalism educators sought work experiences on their own because of their belief in renewing content knowledge. While this initiative is generally directed to mid-career educators entry level educators and those in between will benefit from the exposure.

Rosengard (2000) and Kubota (1993) each shared the same conclusion that faculty internships provide a valuable service to both faculty and students. Faculty members

maintain key skills and students are beneficiaries of improved curriculum and teaching techniques. West (1980) supported this claim by stating faculty internships in private industry have been effective in renewing morale and improving teaching techniques. West also pointed out that in many cases, 50% at the time of his research in 1980, faculty members had not returned to campus rather they remained in industry. Key here is that universities can utilize faculty internships to thin the ranks during times of tight budgets and downsizing. Kelly (1990) supported skill improvement and pointed out that faculty internships can also help in career change decisions. She specifically spoke of the benefit of administrative internships to faculty desiring administrative positions.

Traditional Sabbaticals

The most common form of individual professional development in higher education is the sabbatical. The usual time duration of a sabbatical varies from one semester to a full year. Kelly (1990) pointed out that sabbaticals are one of the "perks" of academe. She suggested that they are experiences designed to challenge and invigorate participants. Sabbaticals can be a time for introspection or a time to renew skills and update disciplinary knowledge. While the faculty internship has a specific project in mind keyed to the faculty members' discipline and fixed by a contractual mechanism, traditional sabbaticals, on the other hand, follow a more open-ended approach. Traditional sabbatical activities engage personal improvement through a plan developed by the sabbatical taker. However, the goal of the sabbatical, like that of faculty internships, is individual improvement with the expectation the sabbatical taker will return to the classroom renewed. In this study faculty internships were treated as a form of sabbatical.

Expected Faculty Internship Outcomes

Wirasinghe (2000) argued that the engineering profession and educational process must respond to new realities to be successful in the 21st Century. These realities include but are not limited to globalization of commerce, information revolution, innovation in technology, and lifelong learning. Similarly, Nimtz, Coscarelli, and Blair (1996) proposed that higher education and the corporate world are faced with challenges that demand fresh and creative solutions. Wirasinghe (2000) posited that students must be imbued with greater responsibility to society during the educational process. Importance is placed_on students being exposed to "experimental learning" through internship programs. Engineers must learn the concepts of teamwork, collaboration, and open communication. Faculty cannot be expected to imbue students with this sense of greater societal responsibility if they are lacking in societal responsibility themselves. Likewise, faculty cannot foster teamwork and collaboration as experienced in the industrial world if they_do not have a first hand knowledge. Wirasinghe posited students graduating with internship experience are expected to have significant leadership roles in industry in the future. It is appropriate to have similar expectations of faculty in leadership roles on campus and in industry. If student internships facilitate student leadership formation, should faculty internships have similar results with faculty?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The participants in the study consisted of 77 selected academics from the Rowan University College of Engineering and College of Business. Rowan University is located in southern New Jersey and is a regional public university that offers undergraduate through doctoral programs. Weisbaum and Huang (2001) suggested teachers whose discipline is closely associated with industry and business would be more inclined to favorably view faculty internships than teachers of non-industry related courses. The Colleges of Engineering and Business are closely associated with industrial and business organizations by the nature of course content, through existing joint venture projects, or faculty consultative activities. Thus the Colleges of Engineering and Business provided faculty with the potential to provide meaningful data concerning faculty internships. In order to obtain as much information as possible from a relatively small population of 77 potential participants it was decided to survey the entire population. Of the 77 faculty members 35 were from the College of Engineering and 42 were from the College of Business.

In order to safeguard the rights and welfare of the faculty participants an Institutional Review Board (IRB) application (APPENDIX A) was completed on January 27, 2003 and submitted to the Rowan University IRB for approval. The application included a copy of a participant informed consent form and survey. The application was approved

by the IRB on March 3, 2003. Participants were asked to read and sign the consent form prior to completing the survey.

Instrument

The data was gathered by a cross-sectional survey titled Perceived Value of Faculty Internships Survey (Appendix D). In order to obtain relevant information corresponding to the existing literature the survey design was based on the Industry Initiatives for Science and Math Education (IISME) survey given to teachers from 1985 to 2000 (Weisbaum & Huang, 2001). The original survey design was broken into three sections: background, professional development, and sabbatical preference. During February 2003 the survey was piloted. Non-participant faculty members and administrators completed the prototype survey and provided a critique of the design and made recommendations for improvement. Based upon pilot feedback the survey was improved by adding an introductory paragraph that clarified the differences between traditional sabbaticals and faculty internships. Background questions concerning faculty job satisfaction and future plans were removed since this information was believed not relevant to this particular study. Improvement to the Likert scale consisted of simplified scale modifiers and corrected 4-point Likert scale that created an unintended built-in bias toward "agreement" on professional development questions. The new Likert scale was based on a 5-point scale as follows: 1 – strongly disagree; 2 – disagree; 3 – undecided; 4 – agree; and 5 – strongly agree.

The final cross-sectional survey consisted of three sections. The first section obtained basic background information with respect to number of years in education, major field of instruction, and a sabbatical history. The second section consisted of a series of

statements designed to obtain the degree to which the participant agreed faculty internships could effect overall professional development. The first four statements addressed the effect faculty internships have on confidence in abilities, commitment to teaching, individual professional development, and professional advancement. The next four statements addressed peer and administration credibility and influence as a function of faculty internships. The balance of the statements addressed use of community resources, increase in knowledge of career requirements, improved teaching strategies and course content. The third section asked the participant if they had sufficient time in their professional schedules to take either a traditional sabbatical or faculty internship and then, if they had the choice, which one would they chose, traditional or faculty internship and then to indicate why they would make this choice.

Procedure

On March 3, 2003, seventy-seven survey packages were distributed to the selected academics in the Colleges of Engineering and Business. The package included a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey (APPENDIX B), a participant consent form (APPENDIX C), the survey (APPENDIX D), and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to return the completed survey. A New Jersey instant lottery ticket was included in the package as a token of appreciation for the faculty member's participation. The initial due date for responses was March 14, 2003. The Associate Dean of the College of Engineering and the Dean of the College of Business issued a letter to their faculty members asking them to support the study. In order to insure progress, participants received periodic reminders from the researcher via electronic mail. The survey collection period closed March 14, 2003 and data analysis began.

Data Analysis

Data were primarily analyzed using the SPSS software system. SPSS Group statistics provided means, percent, and standard deviation (SD) for each category. The Independent Samples T Test with a .05 level of significance compared the means of the engineering and business participants in a search for significant differences between the two groups. A cross tabulation analysis was conducted on number of years in education, field of instruction and sabbatical preference.

The data were organized to provide information regarding the number of years in education, sabbatical and faculty internship history, and the levels of agreement on faculty internship impact on professional development and peer and administration acceptance. The final series of questions determined faculty sabbatical preference. The final question, "why the participant chose one type of sabbatical over the other" provided qualitative data. This data was not entered into the database but was grouped separately using an affinity process to put the comments into like categories in a search for significance and commonality. A minor flaw in the survey form became evident during the data entry. In section three the participants were asked to only choose one type of sabbatical, traditional or faculty internship. However, some participants stated they could not decide between the two. A third category "undecided" was added to the database to accommodate these entries and not lose this data.

Of the 77 surveys issued, a total of 51 surveys were returned for an overall return rate of 66.2%. The College of Engineering returned 22 surveys, or a rate of 62.9%, and the College of Business returned 29 surveys, or a return rate of 69%. The overall return rate of 66.2% provided sufficient data to proceed with analysis.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Profile of the Sample

The overall participant mean number of years in education was 13.8 years (SD 11.02). Table 1 depicts this distribution. One participant from the College of Engineering did not provide data on years of experience. The overall standard deviation indicated a wide variation in the number of years of experience and in fact the range for the overall group was from one to forty-nine years. The mean number of years in education for the College of Engineering participants was 8.0 years (SD 5.06) and ranged from two to twenty years. The mean number of years in education for the College of Business participants was 18.07 years (SD 12.25) and ranged from one to forty-nine years.

Table 1
Years in Education

	Mean	SD	Range
Overall	13.84	11.02	1 to 49
Engineering	8	5.06	2 to 20
Business	18.07	12.25	1 to 49

Overall, fourteen participants reported taking a traditional sabbatical (Table 2). Of the fourteen traditional sabbatical takers three were from engineering and eleven were from business. Overall, twelve of the fourteen reported the sabbatical fulfilled their needs and met their expectations. Of these, two were from engineering and ten from business. Three

participants reported taking a faculty internship, one from engineering and two from business. All three participants reported the faculty internship fulfilled their needs and met their expectations. Overall, 17 participants, or 33.4%, reported taking a form of sabbatical. Fifteen, or 29.4%, reported the sabbatical fulfilled their needs.

Table 2
Sabbatical History

	Overall (17)		Engineering (4)		Business (13)	
	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Taken traditional Sabbatical	14	27.5	3	5.9	11	21.6
Sabbatical Fulfilled Needs	12	23.5	2	3.9	10	19.6
Taken Faculty Internship	3	5.9	1	1.9	2	3.9
Faculty Internship Fulfilled Needs	3	5.9	1	1.9	2	3.9

Research Questions

Research Question 1: do faculty members believe internships could have a positive effect on career development as measured by a sense of professional self-concept, individual professional development, professional advancement, improvement of credibility and influence with peers and administrators, and an increase in knowledge of career requirements?

Tables 3 through 10 provide information regarding research question 1. Table 3 provides data on the impact faculty internships may have improving faculty confidence in teaching ability and a sense of professionalism. Overall thirty-eight participants, or 74.5%, indicated they agreed or strongly agreed faculty internships could have a positive

impact on faculty confidence and a sense of professionalism. Three were undecided while ten, or 19.6%, did not agree. The overall mean was 3.69 (SD 0.94). Nineteen engineering participants, or 86.4%, of the engineering total agreed with the statement; three, or

Table 3
Confidence in Abilities and Sense of Professionalism

	Overall n=51, M=3.69, SD=0.94		Engineering n=22, M=3.91, SD=0.87		Business n=29, M=3.52, SD=1.35	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	4	7.8	0	0	4	13.8
Disagree	6	11.8	3	13.6	3	10.3
Undecided	3	5.9	0	0	3	10.3
Agree	27	52.9	15	68.2	12	41.4
Strongly Agree	11	21.6	4	18.2	7	24.1

13.6%, disagreed. The engineering mean was 3.91 (SD 0.94). Of the business participants nineteen, or 65.5% of the business participants, agreed or strongly agreed; three, or 10.3%, were undecided while seven, or 24.1%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 3.52 (SD 1.35). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 1.256$, $df = 47.85$, $p < .05$).

When asked to classify the impact faculty internships may have on the improvement of their professional development thirty-nine participants, 76.5% overall, either agreed or strongly agreed that internships would have a positive impact (Table 4). Six others were undecided while eight, or 25.7% of the total, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The overall mean was 3.86 (SD 1.1). Eighteen engineering participants, or 81.9% of the engineering total, agreed with the statement. One participant was undecided while three, or 13.6% disagreed. The engineering mean was 4.05 (SD 1.0). Twenty-one business participants, or

72.4% of the business total, agreed. Three, or 10.3%, were undecided while five, or 17.2%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 3.72 (SD 1.16). No

Table 4
Professional Development

	Overall n=51, M=3.86, SD=1.1		Engineering n=22, M=4.04, SD=1.0		Business n=29, M=3.72, SD=1.16	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	2	3.9	0	0	2	6.9
Disagree	6	11.8	3	13.6	3	10.3
Undecided	4	7.8	1	4.5	3	10.3
Agree	24	47.1	10	45.5	14	48.3
Strongly Agree	15	29.4	8	36.4	7	24.1

significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 1.038$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 5 provides information concerning the participant's thoughts on the potential, positive impact faculty internships may have on professional advancement. Overall

Table 5
Professional Advancement

	Overall n=51, M=2.94, SD=1.1		Engineering n=22, M=3.0, SD=0.98		Business n=29, M=2.9, SD=1.21	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	5	9.8	0	0	5	17.2
Disagree	14	27.5	8	36.4	6	20.7
Undecided	14	27.5	8	36.4	6	20.7
Agree	15	29.4	4	18.2	11	37.9
Strongly Agree	3	5.9	2	9.1	1	3.4

eighteen participants, or 35.3%, agreed. Fourteen, or 27.5% were undecided, while nineteen, or 37.3%, either disagreed or strongly disagreed internships would facilitate professional advancement. The overall mean was 2.94 (SD 1.1). Six engineering participants, or 27.3% of the engineering total, agreed. Eight, or 36.4%, were undecided while eight others disagreed. The engineering mean was 3.0 (SD 0.98). Twelve business participants, or 41.3% of the business total, agreed while six were undecided. However, eleven, or 37.9%, either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The business mean was 2.9 (SD 1.21). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 0.329$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

When asked if faculty internships may have a positive impact on peer credibility twenty participants, or 39.2%, overall either agreed or strongly agreed (Table 6). Eighteen, or 35.3%, were undecided while thirteen, or 25.4%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The overall mean was 3.2 (SD 1.13). Nine engineering participants, or 40.9% of the engineering total, agreed or strongly agreed. Another nine, or 40.9%, were undecided. Four, or 18.1%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The engineering mean was

Table 6
Credibility Among Peers

	Overall n=51, M=3.2, SD=1.13		Engineering n=22, M=3.36, SD=1.09		Business n=29, M=3.07, SD=1.16	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	4	7.8	1	4.5	3	10.3
Disagree	9	17.6	3	13.6	6	20.7
Undecided	18	35.3	9	40.9	9	31
Agree	13	25.5	5	22.7	8	27.6
Strongly Agree	7	13.7	4	18.2	3	10.3

3.36 (SD 1.09). Eleven business participants, or 37.9% of the business total, agreed or strongly agreed. Nine, or 31%, were undecided. Another nine disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 3.07 (SD 1.16). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 0.92$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 7 provides participant thoughts on the improvement to peer influence faculty internships may have. Overall, fifteen participants, or 29.5%, agreed there would be improvement to their influence with other faculty as a result of an internship. Thirteen, or 37.3%, were undecided while seventeen, or 33.3%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The overall mean was 2.9 (SD 0.96). Eight engineering participants, or 36.2% of the engineering total, agreed while seven, or 31.8% were undecided. Seven, or 31.8%, either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The engineering mean was 3.05 (SD 1.0). Seven business participants, or 24.1%, agreed while twelve, or 41.4%, were undecided. Ten participants, or 34.4%, either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 2.79 (SD 0.94). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 0.924$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 7
Influence Among Peers

	Overall n=51, M=2.9, SD=0.96		Engineering n=22, M=3.05, SD=1.0		Business n=29, M=2.79, SD=0.94	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	4	7.8	1	4.5	3	10.3
Disagree	13	25.5	6	27.3	7	24.1
Undecided	19	37.3	7	31.8	12	41.4
Agree	14	27.5	7	31.7	7	24.1
Strongly Agree	1	2	1	4.5	0	0

Table 8 reflects opinion concerning the impact faculty internships may have on faculty credibility with department administrators. Overall, eleven participants, or 19.8%, agreed faculty internships could improve faculty credibility with administration. Twenty, or 39.2%, were undecided. Another twenty participants disagreed or strongly disagreed. The overall mean was 2.73 (SD 0.98). Of the engineering participants, four, or 18.2% agreed while nine, or 40.9%, were undecided. Nine others either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The engineering mean was 2.68 (SD 0.89). Of the business participants, seven, or 24.1% agreed while eleven, or 37.9%, were undecided. Another eleven business participants disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 2.76 (SD 1.06). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = -0.274$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 8
Credibility With Department Administrators

	Overall n=51, M=2.73, SD=0.98		Engineering n=22, M=2.68, SD=0.89		Business n=29, M=2.76, SD=1.06	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	6	11.8	2	9.1	4	13.8
Disagree	14	27.5	7	31.8	7	24.1
Undecided	20	39.2	9	40.9	11	37.9
Agree	10	19.6	4	18.2	6	20.7
Strongly Agree	1	2	0	0	1	3.4

Table 9 presents participant opinion concerning the level of influence faculty may have with department administrators resulting from a faculty internship. Overall, nine, or 17.6%, agreed influence with department administrators would improve as a result of a faculty internship. Twenty, or 39.2%, were undecided. Twenty-two, or 43.1%, either disagreed or strongly disagreed influence would improve with department administrators.

The overall mean was 2.61 (SD 0.94). Five engineering participants, or 22.7% of the engineering total, agreed while seven, or 31.8%, were undecided. Ten, or 45.5%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The engineering mean was 2.68 (SD 0.95). Of the business participants, four, or 13.8% of the business total, agreed. Thirteen, or 44.8%, were undecided. Twelve, or 41.3%, either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 2.55 (SD 0.95). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 0.486$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 9
Influence With Department Administrators

	Overall n=51, M=2.61, SD=0.94		Engineering n=22, M=2.68, SD=0.95		Business n=29, M=2.55, SD=0.95	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	7	13.7	2	9.1	5	17.2
Disagree	15	29.4	8	36.4	7	24.1
Undecided	20	39.2	7	31.8	13	44.8
Agree	9	17.6	5	22.7	4	13.8
Strongly Agree	0	0	0	0	0	0

Information concerning agreement that faculty internships can improve the knowledge of career requirements and help faculty determine future career decisions is found in Table 10. Overall, 33 participants, or 64.7%, agreed or strongly agreed that faculty internships can provide knowledge of career opportunities and requirements that could be used to make decisions about future career moves. Six, or 11.8%, were undecided while 12, or 23.5%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The overall mean was 3.53 (SD 1.21). Seventeen engineering participants, or 77.2% of the engineering total, agreed or strongly agreed. Three, or 13.6%, were undecided while two participants, or 9.1%, disagreed. The

engineering mean was 3.91 (SD 0.87). Sixteen business participants, or 55.1% of the business total, agreed or strongly agreed. Three participants, or 10.3%, were undecided while ten, or 34.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 3.24 (SD 1.35). Significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 2.139$, $df = 47.837$, $p < .05$). The majority of the engineering participants (77.2%) agreed with the statement while the business participants were nearly split with just a little over 50% agreeing.

Table 10
Knowledge of Career Requirements

	Overall n=51, M=3.53, SD=1.21		Engineering n=22, M=3.91, SD=0.87		Business n=29, M=3.24, SD=1.35	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	4	7.8	0	0	4	13.8
Disagree	8	15.7	2	9.1	6	20.7
Undecided	6	11.8	3	13.6	3	10.3
Agree	23	45.1	12	54.5	11	37.9
Strongly Agree	10	19.6	5	22.7	5	17.2

Research Question 2: Do faculty members believe internships have a positive influence on commitment to teaching, course content and teaching strategies?

Table 11 provides information regarding participant opinion on the continued use of industry contacts established during a faculty internship. Overall thirty-seven participants, or 72.5% of the total, agreed or strongly agreed they would continue to utilize industry contacts as a classroom resource or mentor after a faculty internship. Nine, or 17.6%, were undecided while five, or 9.8%, disagreed. The overall mean was 3.84 (SD 0.95). Seventeen engineering participants, or 77.2% of the engineering total,

agreed or strongly agreed. Three participants, or 13.6%, were undecided while two, or 9.1%, disagreed. The engineering mean was 3.91 (SD 0.87). Twenty business participants, or 68.9% of the business total, agreed. Six, or 20.7%, were undecided while three, or 10.3%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 3.79 (SD 1.01). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 0.43$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 11
Maintain Industry Contacts

	Overall n=51, M=3.84, SD=0.95		Engineering n=22, M=3.91, SD=0.87		Business n=29. M=3.79, SD=1.01	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	1	2	0	0	1	3.4
Disagree	4	7.8	2	9.1	2	6.9
Undecided	9	17.6	3	13.6	6	20.7
Agree	25	49	12	54.5	13	44.8
Strongly Agree	12	23.5	5	22.7	7	24.1

Table 12 provides a discussion concerning the increase to commitment to teaching as a result of a faculty internship. Overall, twenty-nine participants, or 56.9%, indicated there would be an increase to the commitment toward teaching as a result of a faculty internship. Eleven, or 21.6%, were undecided while an additional eleven disagreed or strongly disagreed. The overall mean was 3.37 (SD 1.09). Of the Engineering participants, fifteen, or 68.2% of the engineering total, agreed or strongly agreed. Four, or 18.2%, were undecided while three, or 13.6%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The engineering mean was 3.59 (SD 0.96). Of the business participants, fourteen, or 48.2% of the business total, agreed or strongly agreed. Seven, or 24.1%, were undecided while

Table 12
Commitment to Teaching

	Overall n=51, M=3.37, SD=1.09		Engineering n=22, M=3.59, SD=0.96		Business n=29, M=3.21, SD=1.18	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	4	7.8	1	4.5	3	10.3
Disagree	7	13.7	2	9.1	5	17.2
Undecided	11	21.6	4	18.2	7	24.1
Agree	24	47.1	13	59.1	11	37.9
Strongly Agree	5	9.8	2	9.1	3	10.3

eight, or 27.5%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 3.21 (SD 1.18). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 1.248$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 13 provides information concerning the impact faculty internships may have on teaching strategies. Overall, 31 participants, or 60.8%, agreed or strongly agreed faculty internships could have a positive affect on teaching strategies. Ten others, or 19.6%, were undecided with another ten disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. The overall mean was

Table 13
Teaching Strategies

	Overall n=51, M=3.45, SD=1.1		Engineering n=22, M=3.5, SD=0.96		Business n=29, M=3.41, SD=1.21	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	4	7.8	1	4.5	3	10.3
Disagree	6	11.8	2	9.1	4	13.8
Undecided	10	19.6	6	27.3	4	13.8
Agree	25	49	11	50	14	48.3
Strongly Agree	6	11.8	2	9.1	4	13.8

3.45 (SD 1.1). Of the engineering participants, thirteen, or 59.1% of the engineering total, agreed or strongly disagreed. Six, or 27.3%, were undecided while three, or 13.6%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The engineering mean was 3.5 (SD 0.96). Of the business participants, eighteen, or 62.1% of the business total, agreed or strongly agreed. Four, or 13.8%, were undecided while seven, or 24.1%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 3.41 (SD 1.21). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 0.274$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 14 provides information concerning the impact faculty internships may have on course content improvement. Overall thirty-eight, or 80.8% of the total, agreed or strongly agreed that a faculty internship would have a positive impact on course content improvement. Seven, or 13.7%, were undecided while six, or 11.7%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The overall mean was 3.8 (SD 1.0). Of the engineering participants seventeen, or 77.3% of the engineering total, agreed or strongly agreed. Three, or 13.6%, were undecided while two, or 9.1%, disagreed. The engineering mean was 3.86 (SD 0.83). Of the business participants eleven, or 72.4% of the business total, agreed or

Table 14
Course Content

	Overall n=51, M=3.8, SD=1.0		Engineering n=22, M=3.86, SD=0.83		Business n=29, M=3.76, SD=1.12	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	2	3.9	0	0	2	6.9
Disagree	4	7.8	2	9.1	2	6.9
Undecided	7	13.7	3	13.6	4	13.8
Agree	27	52.9	13	59.1	14	48.3
Strongly Agree	11	21.6	4	18.2	7	24.1

strongly agreed. Four, or 13.8%, were undecided while four others disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 3.76 (SD 1.12). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = 0.368$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 15 provides information regarding participant's thoughts whether traditional sabbaticals and faculty internships have similar outcomes. Overall, nine, or 17.6% of the total, agreed or strongly agreed there could be similar outcomes between the two types of sabbaticals. Seventeen, or 33.3%, were undecided. Twenty-five, or 49%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The overall mean was 2.61 (SD 1.11). Of the engineering participants three, or 13.6% of the engineering total, agreed. Ten, or 45.5%, were undecided while nine, or 40.9%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The engineering mean was 2.59 (SD 0.91). Of the business participants six, or 20.7% of the business total, agreed or strongly agreed. Seven, or 24.1%, were undecided. Sixteen, or 55.1%, disagreed or strongly disagreed. The business mean was 2.62 (SD 1.27). No significant difference was found between the two participant groups ($t = -0.094$, $df = 49$, $p < .05$).

Table 15
Sabbatical versus Faculty Internship Outcomes

	Overall n=51, M=2.61, SD=1.11		Engineering n=22, M=2.59, SD=0.91		Business n=29, M=2.62, SD=1.27	
Level of Agreement	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Strongly Disagree	8	15.7	3	13.6	5	17.2
Disagree	17	33.3	6	27.3	11	37.9
Undecided	17	33.3	10	45.5	7	24.1
Agree	5	9.8	3	13.6	2	6.9
Strongly Agree	4	7.8	0	0	4	13.8

Research Question 3: Do faculty members believe they have the time to devote to an internship or traditional sabbatical?

Research Question 4: Given the choice would faculty choose a faculty internship or a traditional sabbatical?

The final series of questions determined faculty thoughts on available time to invest in a sabbatical, research Question 3, and their preference between traditional sabbaticals or faculty internships and the reason for their preference, Research Question 4. When asked if the participants had sufficient time in their professional schedule to take either a traditional sabbatical or a faculty internship thirty-five participants, or 71.4% of the total, said "yes" while fourteen or 28.6% said "no" (Table 16). Approximately equal numbers of engineering (18) and business (17) participants indicate they have sufficient time in their schedules to take a sabbatical. More business participants (10) said they do not have the time. Four engineering participants indicated no time in their schedule. When asked their preference, ten participants or 20.4% elected the faculty internship while thirty-one or 63.3% elected the traditional sabbatical. Eight participants or 16.3% were undecided.

Table 16
Sabbatical Preference

Future Sabbatical Plans	Overall (49)		Engineering (22)		Business (27)	
	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Sufficient Time						
yes	35	71.4	18	81.8	17	63
no	14	28.6	4	18.2	10	37
Preference						
Faculty Internship	10	20.4	6	27.3	4	14.8
Traditional Sabbatical	31	63.3	10	45.4	21	77.8
Undecided	8	16.3	6	27.3	2	7.4

Slightly more engineering participants (6) over business (4) would elect a faculty internship. However, business participants (21) had a two to one ratio over engineering (10) in favor of traditional sabbaticals. More engineers (6) were undecided. Two business participants were undecided.

Table 17 provides participant's reasons for sabbatical preference. Common groupings of responses were found using an affinity tool. Pareto analysis developed significance for these groupings. The reader is cautioned to note that some participants provided more than one comment with differing themes with at least one theme supporting the sabbatical preference. Another caution is not all participants provided a reason to support their preference. The groupings, therefore, are a collection of thoughts generally supporting one sabbatical over the other but also providing the reader with other opinions concerning sabbaticals.

Table 17

Reasons For Sabbatical Preference

	Overall Freq	College of Engineering	College of Business
Sabbaticals are for research and publishing	15	4	11
Classroom can benefit from current industry/business issues	11	8	3
Advancement tied to research and publication by top schools	8	1	7
Faculty internships situation dependent with right organization	4	3	1
Faculty internship value is unclear	3	1	2
Clinics and consulting provide outlet to industry	2	1	1
Sabbatical is a time for rest and rejuvenation	2	0	2
Business environment is bad at this time	1	0	1
Both have different virtues	1	0	1
Traditional sabbatical is excuse for long vacation	1	0	1
Faculty internship insufficient time in industry	1	1	0
Rewards go to schmoozers not technically competent	1	1	0

Note: Categories determined by applying an affinity process to general answers

The most significant response, with 15 similar comments, was sabbaticals are a time for research and publication. The next significant grouping, with 11 similar comments, was the idea the classroom would benefit from current industry and business issues and faculty internships are better suited to gather together these issues. The third significant grouping, with 8 similar comments, reflected the idea that professional advancement found in top universities and colleges is directly tied to research and publication. A fourth less-significant category, with 4 comments, expressed the idea that faculty internships are situational and only of value if the correct organization is involved. The rest of the statements were of reduced significance and are presented for the reader to review Table 17 for these replies.

Table 16 provided information regarding sabbatical preference. Table 17 provided an insight into the rationale for these preferences. In order to determine if educational experience had an influence on these preferences a cross tabulation analysis was conducted on educational experience, field of instruction and preference was conducted. Table 18 summarizes the cross tabulation outcome. No participant with more than 15 years in education selected faculty internships. Of those who selected faculty internships, 8 out of 10, or 80%, had less than 10 years experience. However, traditional sabbaticals were selected by a fairly even distribution of participants across the range of years of educational experience. The mean number of years in education for the engineering group was 8; the business group mean was 18.07 years (Table 1). Both groups have an equal split about their respective means. No significant grouping for traditional sabbaticals in terms of years of experience appeared to exist.

Table 18

Years in Education * Preference * Major Field of Instruction Cross Tabulation

Major Field of Instruction	Years in Education	Faculty Internship	Traditional Sabbatical
Engineering (n=15)	3		1
	4		1
	5	1	1
	6	1	
M=8 yrs	7	2	2
	9	1	
	12		2
	14		1
	15	1	
	20		1
Business (n=25)	1	1	1
	5	1	
	6		2
	8		1
	9	1	1
	10		1
	14	1	1
	16		1
M=18 yrs	18		2
	20		3
	25		2
	26		1
	30		1
	33		2
	35		1
	49		1

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

Internships are designed to expose faculty to real world business problems, potential solutions, and opportunities to interact with business professionals. The internship experience is expected to become an important part of the classroom setting. Faculty exposed to the teaming concepts prevalent in most businesses today will place new value on collegiality and teamwork in the academic workplace. The expected outcomes of faculty internships are improved professional development, improved classroom practices and course content, and the rise of internship takers as leaders and change agents within the educational community.

Purpose of the Study

Faculty internships may be viable alternatives to traditional sabbaticals. However, there are associated investment costs and risks to be borne by the university or college and the business community. In order to minimize these risks and maximize the return on investment a comprehensive internship plan should be developed within the framework of a partnership. A significant planning assumption to this plan should be the level of knowledge of and value placed on internships by faculty, administrators, and the business community. Faculty closely associated with industry and business would benefit the most from an internship. The purpose of this study was to ascertain the level of importance or

value selected academics placed on these types of internships. Value was measured by the impact an internship could have on professional development and advancement, course content improvement, and improved teaching strategies. No attempt was made to ascertain similar information from administrators or the business community.

Methodology

The participants in the study consisted of 77 selected academics from the Rowan University College of Engineering and College of Business. The Colleges of Engineering and Business are closely associated with industrial and business organizations by the nature of course content, through existing joint venture projects, or faculty consultative activities. In order to safeguard the rights and welfare of the faculty participants an Institutional Review Board (IRB) application (Appendix A) was completed on January 27, 2003 and submitted to the Rowan University IRB for approval and was approved by the IRB on March 3, 2003. Participants were asked to read and sign the consent form (Appendix C) prior to completing the survey.

Data were gathered by a cross-sectional survey titled Perceived Value of Faculty Internships Survey (Appendix D). A short demographic section determined participant discipline, number of years in education, and if the participant had experience with either traditional sabbaticals or faculty internships. A five-point Likert scale was utilized to address the level of participant agreement to statements regarding professional improvement and advancement, course content improvement, and improvement in teaching skills. The final part of the survey determined participant preference regarding sabbaticals and internships and the reasons for the preference.

On March 3, 2003, seventy-seven survey packages were distributed to the selected academics in the Colleges of Engineering and Business. The package included a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey, a participant consent form, the survey, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to return the completed survey. A New Jersey instant lottery ticket was included in the package as a token of appreciation for the faculty member's participation. The survey collection period closed March 14, 2003 and data analysis began.

Data Analysis

The Likert scale data were primarily analyzed using the SPSS software system. SPSS Group statistics provided means, percent, and standard deviation (SD) for each category. The Independent Samples T Test with a .05 level of significance compared the means of the Engineering and Business participants in a search for significant differences between the two groups. A cross tabulation analysis was conducted on number of years in education, field of instruction and sabbatical preference to determine if educational experience had an effect on sabbatical preference. The sabbatical preference responses provided qualitative data and were not entered into the database but were grouped separately using an affinity process to put the comments into like categories in a search for significance in commonality.

Findings

Research Question 1: Do faculty members believe internships could have a positive effect on career development as measured by a sense of professional self-concept, individual professional development, professional advancement, improvement of

credibility and influence with peers and administrators, and an increase in knowledge of career requirements?

Kubota (1993) presented a case where industry and education acknowledged the need for a skilled workforce in mathematics, science, and other technological fields. Rosengard (1999) developed an argument for faculty internships as a method of updating faculty skills and knowledge. Weisbaum and Huang (2001) in the IISME Teacher Retention and Program Impact Study 1985-2000 concluded such programs have had benefit with respect to personal and professional improvement. Overall, 74.5% of the participants agreed faculty internships could have a positive effect improving skills and abilities and increasing a sense of professionalism, while 76.5% of the participants agreed faculty internships could improve their professional development.

While developing an argument for a transformation in engineering education in the 21st century, Wirasinghe (2000) established a need for faculty internships to compliment student internships and discussed the potential for faculty internships to create faculty leaders and change agents. Leaders and change agents are recognized by both peers and other leaders for their credibility and influence to affect change for the better. However, Weisbaum and Huang (2001) concluded most teachers do not view internships as a means to facilitate their professional advancement. Overall, only 35.3% of the participants agreed advancement could be positively affected. With respect to improvement of credibility and influence among peers, 39.2% overall agreed an internship could have a positive affect on peer credibility while 29.5% agreed an internship could improve influence. With respect to improvement of credibility and

influence among administrators, 19.8% agreed credibility with administrators could be enhanced while 17.6% agreed influence could be improved.

Regarding career requirements and change, West (1980) suggested faculty internships could address a mid-career crisis, morale problems, or help faculty determine future career decisions. Overall, 64.7% of the participants agreed internships could provide knowledge of career opportunities and requirements to be used to make decisions concerning future career moves. However, there was a significant difference between the two groups with 77.2% of the engineering group in agreement and 55.1% of the business group in agreement.

Research Question 2: Do faculty members believe internships have a positive influence on commitment to teaching, course content and teaching strategies?

Kelly (1990) suggested faculty internships might revive lost enthusiasm for education. Weisbaum and Huang (2201) reflected that a third of the teachers in their study indicated a professional support network encouraged them to remain in education. Overall, 56.9% of the participants agreed commitment to teaching could improve as a result of an internship.

Austin and Baldwin (1992) suggested another benefit of internships could be enhanced quality of scholarship and teaching. However, Weisbaum and Huang (2001) found internships did not have much impact on increasing problem-solving strategies in the classroom or provided teachers with new classroom strategies. Overall, 60.8% of the

participants agreed improvement in teaching strategies could occur as a result of an internship.

Weisbaum and Huang (2201) concluded teachers found the internship experience more relevant to their classroom content. Overall, 80.8% of the participants agreed course content could improve as a result of an internship. Additionally, 72.5% of the participants agreed they would most likely maintain contact with business and industry mentors as a classroom resource.

Research Question 3: Do faculty members believe they have the time to devote to an internship or traditional sabbatical?

Overall, 71.4% of the total participants indicated they had time in their schedule to take either a traditional sabbatical or a faculty internship. Approximately equal numbers of engineering (18) and business (17) participants indicate they have sufficient time in their schedules to take a sabbatical. Ten business participants said they do not have the time, while 4 engineering participants indicated they had no time for a sabbatical.

Research Question 4: Given the choice would faculty choose a faculty internship or a traditional sabbatical?

Kelly (1990) argued faculty internships could be effective in renewing morale or providing helpful information regarding career change decisions. She also argued traditional sabbaticals, like internships, are experiences that should challenge and

invigorate, and provide time for introspection or to renew skills or update disciplinary knowledge. The possibility could be argued that traditional sabbaticals and faculty internships could have similar outcomes. When asked if they thought there were similarities between traditional sabbaticals and faculty internships, 49% of the participants disagreed. However, 33.3% were undecided while only 17.6% agreed there could be similarities in outcomes. When asked which type of sabbatical the participants would choose, given the choice, 63.3% overall indicated they would select a traditional sabbatical, 20.4% a faculty internship, and 16.3% were undecided. Business participants favored traditional sabbaticals by a ratio of two to one over the engineering group. In support of the traditional sabbatical preference 15 participants stated traditional sabbaticals provide time to do research and publish while 8 others indicated top universities advance faculty as a result of research and publications. In support of faculty internships 11 participants indicated the industry or business experience could be helpful in the classroom.

An analysis of the effect the number of years in education may have on sabbatical preference, determined those participants with a preference for internships had 15 or fewer years in education. Regarding traditional sabbaticals, no significant experience group seemed to exist. Participants with a preference for traditional sabbaticals were uniform across the range of years of experience.

Discussion and Conclusions

The majority of the Rowan University participants agreed faculty internships could have a positive effect on their professional development. The participants also believe an internship could provide valuable information regarding future career moves. Conversely,

the majority of the participants agreed internships would not have a positive effect on their professional advancement. Internships would not increase or improve credibility or influence with peers or administrators. The participants reflected the thought that internships could improve their personal, professional lives but would not have a similar effect on leadership and career advancement.

The participants indicated faculty internships could have a positive impact on the quality of scholarship and teaching. The majority stated they would continue to maintain contact with industry and business associations and utilize these associations wherever possible to benefit the classroom. Participants also indicated they believe course content would improve as a result of an internship. Commitment to teaching and improved teaching strategies could result from of an internship.

The majority of the participants indicated they had time in their schedules for either a traditional sabbatical or faculty internship. However, given the choice, a majority would select a traditional sabbatical over a faculty internship. The business group clearly indicated the traditional sabbatical would be their choice. The engineering group split with approximately half in favor of a traditional sabbatical, and the others split over an internship or undecided. There seemed to be some linkage between years experience and discipline regarding preference for internships. Of the 10 participants preferring internships the majority were in the engineering group and 8 participants, or 80%, had less than 10 years experience. There didn't appear to be any link between experience and preference for traditional sabbaticals.

The preference for traditional sabbaticals seemed rooted in the perception that top universities reward faculty on research and publication. Traditional sabbaticals are

perceived as a time to perform research and publish. Traditional sabbaticals also provide some faculty with much needed time to relax and rejuvenate. Faculty internships, while accepted as having value to professional improvement, are not as clearly linked as traditional sabbaticals are to professional advancement and reward. Advancement and reward seemed to be the driver toward selection of traditional sabbaticals over faculty internships.

Implications

A college or university planning to initiate a faculty internship effort through an industry or business partnership should first identify the value faculty place on these types of sabbaticals. The Rowan University College of Engineering and College of Business faculty members placed more importance on traditional sabbaticals than faculty internships. Traditional sabbaticals were perceived to provide the time to do research of ones own choosing and the opportunity to publish this research. Reward and advancement is closely linked research and publications. Faculty internships appeared to be linked to personal professional improvement and improvement in the classroom, but not advancement. For a faculty internship program to be successful administrators should consider the way the college or university rewards and advances faculty. If internships do not have the potential to reward, advance, or increase faculty credibility or influence then faculty would most likely opt to take a traditional sabbatical over an internship. Lacking reward and advancement potential, there would be little incentive for faculty members to invest their time or energy in an internship.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study focused on faculty beliefs and thoughts concerning faculty internships. Questions raised and unanswered or issues discussed but not fully explored in this study could provide areas for future research.

- What are the attitudes of university administrators and business executives toward faculty internships?
- To what extent do universities and colleges reward independent research and publication? Can this reward system be altered to include faculty internship experiences as an end unto themselves while not necessarily leading to publication?
- Do faculty members who have internship experience exhibit improved leadership qualities and are they recognized by administration as leaders and or change agents?
- Have universities actually benefited in terms of improved resident scholastic knowledge, improved student knowledge, and increased sources of funding as a result of a business partnership with faculty internships?
- Are there unique demographic influences that would bias a faculty member toward a faculty internship or sabbatical? Some demographic influences could be:
    - gender based
    - academic rank
    - faculty tenure status
    - department / discipline affiliation

REFERENCES

Austin, A.E., & Baldwin, R.G. (1992). *Faculty collaboration: enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching.* Washington, DC: The George Washington University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347 958).

Hall, R.F., Castrale, G.E., & Zimmerman, S. (1993). *Business-education partnerships: developing a collaborative relationship with business and community.* Macomb, Il: Western Illinois University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED 369 169).

Kelly, D.K. (1990). *Reviving the "deadwood": how to create an institutional climate to encourage the professional growth and revitalization of mid-career faculty in the community colleges.* Claremont, CA: Claremont College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318 518).

Kubota, C. (1993). *Education-business partnerships: work experience programs.* Columbus, OH: ERIC/CSMEE. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 045).

Lankard, B.A. (1995). *Business/education partnerships.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 383 856).

Nimtz, L.E. & Coscarelli, W.C. & Blair, D. (1996). *University-industry partnerships: meeting the challenge with a high tech partner.* Minneapolis, MN: academy of human resource development 1996 conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 403 491).

Rosengard, D. (2000). *Mid-career interning: faculty going from classroom to newsroom.* Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED No. 444 207).

U. S. Department of Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: the imperative for education reform.* Retrieved November 2, 2002, from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/

U. S. Department of Education. (1993). *Synthesis of existing knowledge and practice in the field of educational partnerships* (OERI Publication Winter 1992 – 1993). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

West, D.A. (1980). *Faculty morale and career choice in the 1980's.* Columbia, MI: University of Missouri. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192 703).

Weisbaum, K.S. & Huang, D. (2001). *IISME teacher retention and program impact evaluation 1985-2000.* Cupertino, CA: industry initiatives for science and math education. Retrieved October 10, 2002 from http://iisme.org.

Wirasinghe, C. (2000). *Engineering education for leadership in the 21st century.* Calgary, Alberta, CA: University of Calgary.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 446 281).

APPENDIX A

Institutional Review Board Disposition Form

RECEIVED
FEB 1 2
Government Grants and Sponsored Projects

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD DISPOSITION FORM

JAMES M. SUMMERS
Principal Investigator

Co-Principal Investigator (if applicable)

102 N. GIRARD AVE.
Address of Principal Investigator

Address of Co-Principal Investigator

NATIONAL PARK N.J. 08063
City, State, and Zip Code

City, State, and Zip Code

856-845-5629
BUTCHSUMM@COMCAST.NET
Telephone # Fax # e-mail address

Telephone # Fax # e-mail address

TITLE OF RESEARCH AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF THE VALUE FACULTY PLACE ON FACULTY INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

ADMINISTRATIVE DISPOSITION - DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

Your claim for exemption for the research study identified above has been reviewed. The action taken is indicated below:

_____ **APPROVED FOR EXEMPTION AS CLAIMED: CATEGORY #** _____
Note: Anything that materially changes the exempt status of this study must be presented to the IRB for approval before the changes are implemented. Such modifications should be sent to the IRB Office at the address above.

_____ **APPROVED FOR EXEMPTION - BUT NOT AS CLAIMED. Your claim for exemption does not fit the criteria for exemption designated in your proposal. However, the study does meet the criteria for exemption under CATEGORY #** _____

_____ **A determination regarding the exempt status of this study cannot be made at this time. Additional information is required.**

_____ **Your proposal does not meet the criteria for exemption, and a full review will be provided by the IRB.**

EXPEDITED REVIEW: ✓ **Approved** _____ **Denied**

FULL REVIEW : _____ **Approved** _____ **Approved with modifications** _____ **Denied**

DENIED: _____

See attached Committee Action Letter for additional comments.

Chair, IRB

Date 2/24/03

Co-Chair, IRB

Date 2/25/03

Appendix C

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
DISPOSITION FORM

JAMES M. SUMMERS
Principal Investigator

Co-Principal Investigator (if applicable)

102 N. GIRARD AVE
Address of Principal Investigator

Address of Co-Principal Investigator

NATIONAL PARK, N.J. 08063
City, State, and Zip Code

City, State, and Zip Code

856-848-5699
BUTCHSUMM@COMCAST.NET
Telephone # Fax # e-mail address

Telephone # Fax # e-mail address

TITLE OF RESEARCH AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF THE VALUE FACULTY PLACE ON FACULTY INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

ADMINISTRATIVE DISPOSITION - DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

Your claim for exemption for the research study identified above has been reviewed. The action taken is indicated below:

_____ **APPROVED FOR EXEMPTION AS CLAIMED: CATEGORY #** _____
Note: Anything that materially changes the exempt status of this study must be presented to the IRB for approval before the changes are implemented. Such modifications should be sent to the IRB Office at the address above.

_____ **APPROVED FOR EXEMPTION - BUT NOT AS CLAIMED. Your claim for exemption does not fit the criteria for exemption designated in your proposal. However, the study does meet the criteria for exemption under CATEGORY #** _____.

_____ **A determination regarding the exempt status of this study cannot be made at this time. Additional information is required.**

_____ **Your proposal does not meet the criteria for exemption, and a full review will be provided by the IRB.**

EXPEDITED REVIEW: _____**Approved** _____**Denied**

FULL REVIEW : _____**Approved** _____**Approved with modifications** _____ **Denied**

DENIED: _____

See attached Committee Action Letter for additional comments.

_____ _____
Chair, IRB **Co-Chair, IRB**

Date _____ **Date** _____

Appendix D

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH

1. Type of approval review requested (check one): Full Review ____ Expedited Review X Review Exemption ____

2. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: JAMES M. SUMMERS

3. DEPARTMENT: EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP DEPARTMENT

TITLE OF RESEARCH: AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF THE VALUE FACULTY PLACE ON FACULTY INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS.

CO-INVESTIGATORS: N/A

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH (INDEPENDENT PROJECT, MASTER'S THESIS, ETC.): MASTER'S THESIS

4. IF YOU ARE A STUDENT RESEARCHER PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING:

MAILING ADDRESS: 102 N. GIRARD AVE., NATIONAL PARK, N.J. 08063

EMAIL: BUTCHSUMM@COMCAST.NET TELEPHONE NO. 856-848-5699

FACULTY SPONSOR NAME: DR. BURTON SISCO

DEPARTMENT OF SPONSORING FACULTY: EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP DEPARTMENT

PHONE NO. 856-256-4500 x3717 FAX NO. ____ EMAIL: SISCO@ROWAN.EDU

FACULTY SPONSOR SIGNATURE: [signature]

DATE: 2/3/03

5. HAS THIS RESEARCH PROJECT BEEN CONSIDERED PREVIOUSLY BY THE IRB? YES ____ NO X

IF YES, GIVE DATE OF LAST REVIEW: ____

6. SOURCE OF FUNDING (IF APPLICABLE): N/A

____ SBR GRANT

____ UNIVERSITY GRANTS (INCLUDING FOUNDATION)

____ CAREER DEVELOPMENT GRANT

____ EXTRAMURAL FUNDS
PLEASE INDICATE AGENCY NAME: ____

7. ARE YOU WORKING WITH A RESEARCHER FROM ANOTHER INSTITUTION? IF SO, BE AWARE THAT YOUR CO-INVESTIGATOR MUST ALSO SUBMIT YOUR JOINT PROPOSAL TO THE IRB AT THE INSTITUTION THAT EMPLOYS HIM/HER. _____YES _X_NO

8. DOES YOUR RESEARCH INVOLVE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)?

___ minors _____ prisoners _____ pregnant women _____
___ use of the investigators current students as subjects
___ drugs or other controlled substances
___ psychological or physiological stress above the level of normal everyday activities
___ misleading or deceiving subjects about any aspect or purpose of the research
___ collection of information which deals with sensitive aspects of the behavior (e.g., illegal activity, drug or alcohol use, sexual behavior)
___ collection of information which would place subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability if it became known
___ collection of information which could affect subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation if it became known.
___ examination of existing data, documents, or specimens that are not part of the public record
___ children involved in your research without sensitive information about themselves or their families.
___ collecting or studying existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens or diagnostic specimens, which are publicly available and from which participants cannot be identified by anyone other than the investigator(s).

9. WHAT IS THE OBJECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH?

THIS STUDY WILL EXPLORE THE VALUE FACULTY PLACE ON FACULTY INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS. THE RESEARCH WILL ATTEMPT TO ANSWER THE QUESTION WHETHER FACULTY MEMBERS BELIEVE THESE PROGRAMS IMPROVE A SENSE OF PROFESSIONALISM, COMMITMENT TO TEACHING, AND PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT.

10. DESCRIBE THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH INCLUDING WHAT WILL BE REQUIRED OF SUBJECTS (ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEET IF NECESSARY):

FACULTY MEMBERS FROM VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS WILL BE ASKED TO COMPLETE AN ANONYMOUS SURVEY TITLED "PERCEIVED VALUE OF FACULTY INTERNSHIPS SURVEY." COPY OF SURVEY IS ATTACHED. A CONSENT FORM (COPY ATTACHED) WILL BE COMPLETED BY EACH PARTICIPANT.

11. UNDER WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES ARE YOU APPLYING FOR EXEMPTION?

___ 1. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices such as, (i) research on regular and special educational instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

_____ 2. Research involving the use of social sciences or educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior where (i) information is not obtained in such away that the participants can be identified directly or indirectly or (ii) the participants' responses, if they became known, could not place the participant at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the participants' financial standing, reputation, or employability. (All research involving survey and interview procedures is exempt when the participants are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office. However, confidentiality must be maintained when required by federal statute).

_____ 3. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that participants cannot be identified.

_____ 4. Research and demonstration projects which are funded by a federal agency and determined to be exempt by the agency head and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

_____ 5. Exemption for collection or study of existing data: research involving collection or study of existing data, documents, records, if these data are non-identifiable and publicly available or information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified directly through identifiers linked to the subject (codes linking names to data are considered indirect identifiers).

_____ 6. Exemption for study of the department of health and human services: unless specifically required by the statute, research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of the Department of Health and Human Services, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine:

_____ (a) programs under the Social Security Act or other public benefit or service programs
_____ (b) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs;
_____ (c) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures;
_____ (d) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

IF YOUR RESEARCH IS GIVEN EXEMPTION STATUS, THE FOLLOWING MUST BE STATED ON A COVER LETTER (ON DEPARTMENTAL LETTERHEAD) ACCOMPANYING ANY SURVEY OR QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. A statement that all participation is voluntary
2. A statement that you are conducting research and the reason for it (e.g., master's thesis, publication, etc.)
3. Purpose of the research - what you are investigating
4. A statement that all responses will be kept anonymous and confidential
5. A statement that participants need not respond to all questions
6. If participants are your own students, a statement that class standing will not be affected in any way based on participation
7. The name and telephone number of the Principal Investigator (PI) and faculty sponsor (if applicable)

CLAIMS FOR EXEMPTION MAY NOT BE MADE FOR (A) RESEARCH INVOLVING CHILDREN, (B) AIDS-RELATED RESEARCH, (C) RESEARCH INVOLVING SUBSTANCE OR CHILD ABUSE OR (D) RESEARCH TO BE CONDUCTED AT THE V.A. (RESEARCH UNDER THESE CATEGORIES IS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL FEDERAL GUIDELINES.)

COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR A FULL IRB REVIEW

12. DESCRIBE THE SUBJECTS WHO WILL BE PARTICIPATING (NUMBER, AGE, GENDER, ETC):

13. HOW WILL SUBJECTS BE RECRUITED? IF STUDENTS, WILL THEY BE SOLICITED FROM CLASS?

14. WHAT RISKS TO SUBJECTS (PHYSIOLOGICAL AND/OR PSYCHOLOGICAL) ARE INVOLVED IN THE RESEARCH?

15. IS DECEPTION INVOLVED IN THE RESEARCH? IF SO, WHAT IS IT AND WHY WILL IT BE USED?

16. WHAT INFORMATION WILL BE GIVEN TO THE SUBJECTS AFTER THEIR PARTICIPATION? IF DECEPTION IS USED, IT MUST BE DISCLOSED AFTER PARTICIPATION.

17. HOW WILL CONFIDENTIALITY BE MAINTAINED? WHO WILL KNOW THE IDENTITY OF THE SUBJECTS? IF A PRE-AND POSTTEST DESIGN IS USED, HOW WILL THE SUBJECTS BE IDENTIFIED?

18. HOW WILL THE DATA BE RECORDED AND STORED? WHO WILL HAVE ACCESS TO THE DATA? ALL DATA MUST BE KEPT BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR FOR A MINIMUM OF THREE YEARS.

APPENDIX B

Letter of Introduction

February 28, 2003

To: Survey Participant

From: James M. Summers

Re: Perceived Value of Faculty Internships Survey

I am pursuing a Masters in Higher Education at Rowan University. My thesis project is a study of the perceived value faculty members may place on a form of sabbatical called a faculty internship. The attached survey instrument defines faculty internship and is designed to obtain values you may place on this type of sabbatical.

I also have completed the IRB application and have received approval by the IRB to gather data using the survey form. I can assure you your responses will be kept in strict confidence and in no way will individuals be recognized by their answers to the survey questions. However, as part of the IRB process I need ask you to read and sign the attached Informed Consent Form. I have already signed this form and ask you to complete it and return it with the completed survey.

I have enclosed a self-addressed stamped envelop for your use. Please place the signed consent form and survey in the envelope and return back to me. Please return as soon as you can. I need all responses by March 14, 2003. I really do appreciate your attention to this matter.

I can be reached by phone during the day at 215-XXX-XXXX or by cell phone 215-XXX-XXXX. My home phone is 856-XXX-XXXX. My e-mail address is summersjm@xxxxx.com (work) and butchsumm@xxxxx.net (home).

As a token of my appreciation for your assistance I have enclosed a N.J. lottery ticket. Hopefully you will be a big winner and then be able to go on sabbatical to, say, the Bahamas! Regardless, good luck and thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

James M. Summers

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF THE VALUE FACULTY PLACE ON FACULTY INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

I agree to participate in a study entitled "An Exploratory Investigation of the Value Faculty Place on Faculty Internships Programs", which is being conducted by Mr. James M. Summers of the Educational Leadership Department, Rowan University. The purpose of this study is to determine the value faculty members place on faculty internship programs. The data collected will be included in Mr. Summers' Master's Thesis and submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Arts Degree of the Graduate School at Rowan University.

I understand that I will be required to complete a survey entitled "Perceived Value of Faculty Internship Survey." My participation in the study should not exceed 15 to 30 minutes or the time it may take to complete the survey.

I understand that my responses will be anonymous and that all data gathered will be confidential. I agree that any information obtained from this study may be used in any way thought best for publication or education provided that I am in no way identified and my name is not used.

I understand that there are no physical or psychological risks involved in this study, and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time without penalty.

I understand that my participation does not imply employment with the state of New Jersey, Rowan University, the principal investigator, or any other project facilitator.

If I have any questions or problems concerning my participation in this study I may contact Mr. James M. Summers at (856) 848-5699 (H) or (215) 897-7665 (W).

_____ _____

(Signature of Participant) (Date)

_____ _____

(Signature of Investigator) (Date)

APPENDIX D

Perceived Value of Faculty Internships Survey

Perceived Value of Faculty Internships Survey

Sabbaticals are a time for introspection or a time to renew skills or learn new ones. Faculty internships are a form of sabbatical. A faculty internship is keyed to the faculty's discipline and is generally the outcome of a partnership between the university and business or industry. Traditional sabbaticals seem to follow a more open ended approach to renewal. The approach to a traditional sabbatical is generally through the individual planning of the sabbatical taker. Both types have similar expected outcomes of renewal, skill enhancement, improved classroom techniques, or new career ventures.

Faculty Internships are designed to expose faculty to real world business problems and solutions. These internships remove the faculty member from the campus environment for an established period of time and place him or her in the business environment much like student internships. These internships provide an opportunity for faculty to interact with business professionals. The suggestion is authentic teamwork in the business setting will become an important part of the classroom setting. Faculty exposed to the business concepts prevalent in most businesses today will place new value on collegiality and teamwork in the academic workplace. The intent of this survey is to understand the value you may place on the effect a faculty internship program may have on your professional career.

Please read each sentence carefully and respond to it as accurately as possible. Thank you.

Part 1: Background Information

1. How many years have you been in the field of education? _____

2. What is your major field of instruction? _____

_____

3. Have you ever taken a traditional sabbatical? ____Yes ____No.

4. If you answered "yes" to No.3 did the sabbatical meet your expectations? ____Yes ____No.

5. Have you ever taken a faculty internship as a result of a partnership agreement between an institution and a business? ____Yes ____No.

6. If you answered "yes" to No.5 did the internship meet your expectations? ____Yes ____No.

Part 2: Perceived Value of Faculty Internships

In Part 2 there are statements, each followed by a graduated scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." Read each statement and circle the corresponding number that best depicts the degree to which you agree with the statement.

---

1. A faculty internship will improve my professional self-concept (confidence in abilities and sense of professionalism).

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

2. A faculty internship will increase my commitment to teaching (enthusiasm, importance of my role as an instructor, reinvigorate and energize).

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

3. A faculty internship will improve my professional development (learn more about subject area, be more inclined to attend workshops or courses, or learn more about new technology).

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

4. Successful completion of one or more faculty internships will facilitate professional advancement and promotions.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

5. A faculty internship will improve my credibility among my peers.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

6. A faculty internship will improve my influence among my peers.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

7. A faculty internship will improve my credibility with my department administrators.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

8. A faculty internship will improve my influence with my department administrators.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

9. A faculty internship would make me more inclined to access and use community resources (maintain contact with business/industry mentor for own or classroom resources; access to industry or community personnel and resources).

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

10. A faculty internship would increase my knowledge of career requirements and help influence my decision to change careers if I so desire.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

11. My classroom teaching strategy would improve from a faculty internship.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

12. My classroom course content would improve from a faculty internship.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

---

13. A traditional sabbatical will provide the same personal outcomes as those of a faculty internship.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

Part 3:

1. Do you believe you can find sufficient time in your schedule to engage in a traditional sabbatical or faculty internship? ____Yes ____No

2. Given the choice which would you prefer (please check one)?
   Faculty Internship ____
   Traditional Sabbatical ____

Why?_____