DEMONSTRATING PROFESSIONALISM AS A UNIVERSITY FACULTY MEMBER IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION: A DELPHI STUDY

Hundreds of university faculty members seek promotion and tenure each year. While all universities require excellence in teaching, research, and service, some universities add a fourth criterion (professionalism or collegiality) as a consideration for promotion and tenure. However, university promotion and tenure guidelines are vague as to how professionalism or collegiality is defined. The purpose of this study was to describe what university faculty members in agricultural education consider to be professional and unprofessional behavior within the profession. A panel of 23 university faculty members in agricultural education completed a three round Delphi procedure to identify what they considered to be professional and unprofessional behaviors of agricultural education faculty members. The panel reached consensus on 66 professional behaviors and 42 unprofessional behaviors. In general, university faculty members in agricultural education should be knowledgeable in their field, be a lifelong learner, and keep up-to-date on the latest in their field. They should be dedicated to their program, putting students first and demanding quality work from their students. Faculty members in agricultural education should not plagiarize or publish work that is not their own. Furthermore, faculty members should not engage in inappropriate relationships and make comments that would offend others.

Introduction

New faculty members at a major university face a preliminary tenure review. They prepare their materials for the promotion and tenure committee to review to see if they are on track. After the materials are reviewed, they receive a letter from the committee, indicating that for the most part they are on track to be promoted and tenured. However, there are some statements in the letter indicating that they do not spend enough quality time on campus and that they need to become more visible and spend more time with colleagues (Phelps, 2004). Faculty members are stunned because their student evaluations are impeccable and their research agenda is on track. What is meant by spending more time on campus and with colleagues?

Hundreds of faculty members face this situation each year as they prepare to become promoted and tenured at their university. The process can seem political as individuals with seemingly mediocre credentials get tenured and promoted and those with outstanding credential get denied promotion and tenure. What criteria are documented in promotion and tenure guidelines at universities that define how faculty members should be evaluated for promotion and tenure? At almost all institutions, faculty members are evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, and service, which encompass the primary activities faculty members at a university (Hartle, 2004; Lewin, 2002; AAUP, 1999).

A review of promotion and tenure documents at universities offering agricultural education generally indicate that the three criteria to be used for promotion and tenure are teaching, research, and service (University of Florida, n.d.; The Ohio State University, 2006; University of Missouri, 2006; Virginia Tech, 2006; Oregon State University, 2006). However, at some institutions (Oregon State, 2006; Virginia Tech, 2006), a fourth criterion is also openly considered when deciding whether or not to promote and grant tenure to faculty members: professionalism (or collegiality). Specifically, at Oregon State University, all faculty members are expected to be collegial members of their units. Furthermore, while tenure decisions are based primarily on the candidate's performance

of assigned duties and achievement in scholarship, it is also appropriate to consider collegiality, professional integrity, and willingness to accept and cooperate in assignments as a criterion for tenure.

The American Association for Agricultural Education (AAAE) embraces and promotes the concept of professionalism through its mission and values. As a professional organization, AAAE values colleagues interacting with others, professional renewal, and taking an active role in contributing to formal and non-formal educational systems (AAAE, 2005).

So what constitutes professionalism? Some universities consider professionalism as working productively with others, treating colleagues as equals, respecting the ideas and ideals of others, and taking an active and constructive role in the shared stewardship of one's academic unit or university (Di Leo, 2006). Other universities look to see how respected candidates are at the university and within the profession, look to see if the candidate is a team player, and see if they are well-liked overall (McKinney, 2005).

While some universities may not specifically state that collegiality is a specific criterion for promotion and tenure, they have statements within promotion and tenure documents in the traditional areas of teaching, research, and service that imply participating in collegial activities within those areas (Connell & Savage, 2001). It is generally expected that faculty members cooperate with their colleagues at their respective institutions, making group decisions on curriculum, teaching schedules, student advising, and allocation of resources (Connell & Savage, 2001). Thinking along the same lines, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (1999) approved the statement that:

> "few, if any responsible, faculty members would deny that collegiality, in the sense of collaboration and constructive cooperation, identifies important aspects of a faculty member's overall performance. A faculty member may legitimately be called upon to participate in the development of curricula and standards for the evaluation of teaching, as well as peer review of the teaching of colleagues. Much research, depending on the nature of the particular discipline, is by its nature collaborative and requires teamwork as well as the ability to engage in independent investigation."

While there is a dearth of information about what constitutes professionalism at the university level, what constitutes unprofessional behavior at the university level is well documented. Gossiping, whining, dressing inappropriately, cursing, breaching confidentiality, getting angry too often, and even talking too much in meetings with colleagues has cost faculty members promotion and tenure at their university (McKinney, 2005). On the other hand, doing those things that are expected of a professional (particularly a young professional) like walking the walk, seeking advice from colleagues, seeking a mentor, and attending key social events have put some faculty members over the hump and as a result, they were promoted and tenured at their university (McKinney, 2005).

Some organizations have advocated against using collegiality as a criterion for promotion and tenure. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has continually addressed the increasing tendency on the part of universities to add professionalism or collegiality as the fourth criterion for tenure (Hartle, 2004), taking the stand that adding collegiality is both redundant and dangerous to consider as a criterion for tenure. It is redundant because "collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of scholarship, teaching, and service. It is rather a quality whose value is expressed in the successful execution of these three functions" (Hartle, 2004, par. 3). Collegiality is considered as dangerous because "it may be

confused with a ‘constructive attitude’ or with displays of deference to administrative or faculty major decisions” (Hartle, 2004, par. 4).

The AAUP has also stated that "Historically, collegiality is not infrequently been associated with ensuring homogeneity, and hence with practices that exclude persons on the basis of their difference from the perceived norm. An absence of collegiality ought never, by itself, to constitute basis for nonreappointment, denial of tenure, or dismissal for cause” (Lewin, 2002). Collegiality is not a direct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional areas of teaching, research, and service. Rather, evaluations in these three areas should always consider collegiality as part of the successful execution of the three areas considered in promotion and tenure.

If professionalism is to be considered when evaluating who should be promoted and tenured in higher education, what behaviors should be considered as professional behaviors and what behaviors should be considered unprofessional behaviors? When reviewing promotion and tenure guidelines, no clear guidelines or criteria were found within these documents to define professionalism (collegiality). This study sought to help define what faculty members in agricultural education consider to be professional and unprofessional behaviors that will help make more concrete decisions regarding professionalism (collegiality).

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to describe what university faculty members in agricultural education consider to be professional and unprofessional behavior within the profession. Specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Develop a consensus listing of professional behaviors to be exhibited by university faculty members in agricultural education.
2. Develop a consensus listing of critical unprofessional behaviors of university faculty members in agricultural education.

Methods and Procedures

The Delphi technique was used to accomplish the purpose of the study. The Delphi technique uses a group communication process utilizing a panel of experts to deal with a complex problem (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). The Delphi technique also utilizes a series of questionnaires that initially asks for responses to a broad question or series of questions that focus upon problems, objectives, solutions, or forecasts (Delbecq, Van de Van, & Gustafson, 1986). The process stops when consensus has been reached among participants, or when sufficient information exchange has been obtained through additional rounds of questions (Dalkey, 1969). Because the Delphi technique does not require face-to-face contact, it is particularly useful for involving experts, users, resource controllers, or administrators who cannot come together physically (Delbecq et al, 1986).

The expert panel for this study consisted of faculty members in agricultural education. Using the 2005 AAAE Directory, 30 faculty members were randomly selected to be included on the panel. Each faculty member was contacted via e-mail, given an explanation of the purpose of the study, and asked if they would be willing to serve on the panel. Twenty-three faculty members agreed to serve on the panel of experts.

Three rounds of data collection were conducted. The first round questionnaire consisted of three open-ended questions, which were:

(1) How would you define collegiality/professionalism in agricultural education (includes agricultural education, extension education, agricultural leadership, and agricultural communications) at the university level?

(2) List positive, professional behaviors that you feel a university professional in agricultural education should exhibit when doing his/her job.

(3) List what you would consider to be unprofessional behaviors of university professionals.

Data from round one were analyzed using the constant-comparative method to categorize responses into characteristics (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). All panel members responded (100 percent) and identified 67 professional behaviors and 61 unprofessional behaviors.

The round two questionnaire consisted of two parts: one dealing with professional behaviors of faculty members in agricultural education and the other dealing with unprofessional behaviors of faculty members in agricultural education. For each part, panel members were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each behavior listed by using a five point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Data from this round was treated as interval data and analyzed using means (Clason & Dormody, 1994). It was decided *a priori* that behaviors with a mean of 3.5 or higher and having at least 50 percent agreement (rating of either a 4 or 5) would be retained for round three. Twenty-two panel members responded (96 percent) to the round two questionnaire and agreed with 66 professional behaviors and 51 unprofessional behaviors.

The round three questionnaire again consisted of two parts: one for professional behaviors of faculty members in agricultural education and one for unprofessional behaviors of faculty members in agricultural education. For the part on professional behaviors, panel members were asked to: 1) provide a dichotomous indication (agree/disagree) for each characteristic and 2) indicate how important it was for a university professional in agricultural education to exhibit this behavior (1 = unimportant to 5 = very important). For the part on unprofessional behaviors, panel members were asked to: 1) provide a dichotomous indication (agree/disagree) for each characteristic and 2) indicate how critical should this unprofessional behavior be viewed in the agricultural education profession (1 = not critical to 4 = very critical). It was decided *a priori* that those characteristics with 80 percent agreement would be retained. Again 22 members of the panel responded (96 percent) to the round three questionnaire and reached consensus on 66 professional behaviors and 44 unprofessional behaviors.

After collecting data in round three, researchers calculated the arithmetic mean and standard deviation for each response (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002). Mean scores from round three were used to determine either the importance of professional behaviors to be exhibited by university faculty members in agricultural education or how critical unprofessional behaviors should be viewed in the profession. For professional behaviors, responses were categorized as “Very Important” (4.50 – 5.00), “Important” (3.50 – 4.49), “Moderately Important” (2.50 – 3.49), “Of Little Importance” (1.50 – 2.49), and “Unimportant” (1.00 – 1.49). For unprofessional behaviors, responses were categorized as “Very Critical” (3.50 – 4.00), “Critical” (2.50 – 3.49), “Somewhat Critical” (1.50 – 2.49), and “Not Critical” (1.00 – 1.49).

Results

Professional Behaviors of University Faculty

Round one sought to identify a list of professional behaviors that should be exhibited by faculty members in agricultural education. The opened ended question used in round one was "List positive, professional behaviors that you feel a university professional in agricultural education should exhibit when doing his/her job". Panel members initially identified 67 professional behaviors that university faculty members in agricultural education should exhibit in the profession.

In round two, panel members were asked to rate their level of agreement with each of the 67 professional behaviors identified in round one. Using this methodology, 66 professional behaviors were retained for round two. A full list of professional behaviors and their level of agreement is listed in Table 1. The only professional behavior that was dropped was "works regular hours."

In round three, panel members were asked for a dichotomous (agree/disagree) response for each professional behavior listed. Panel members were also asked to indicate via a 5 point Likert-type scale (1 = not important to 5 = very important) how important it was for university faculty in agricultural education to exhibit that professional behavior. All 66 professional behaviors were retained. Eight professional behaviors were classified as very important. Fifty-five professional behaviors were rated as important while only three were considered moderately important. These behaviors are listed in Table 1 according to the level of importance.

Those behaviors which were rated by the panel of experts as very important were "is willing to learn" (M = 4.76), "is knowledgeable in their field" (M = 4.76), "is ethical" (M = 4.71), "is honest" (M = 4.71), "demands quality work from their students" (M = 4.67), "models effective teaching characteristics" (M = 4.62), "stays up to date in the field" (M = 4.57), and "has a good work ethic" (M = 4.57). Those behaviors which were rated by the panel of experts as moderately important were "respects other faculty member's turf" (M = 3.29), "is sensitive" (M = 3.33), and "is a servant leader" (M = 3.38).

Unprofessional Behaviors of University Faculty

Round one sought to identify a list of unprofessional behaviors that would be inappropriate for university faculty members in agricultural education to exhibit on the job. The opened ended question used in this round was "List what you would consider to be unprofessional behaviors of university professionals." Panel members initially identified 61 unprofessional behaviors that would be inappropriate for university faculty members in agricultural education to exhibit.

In round two, panel members were asked to rate their level of agreement with each of the 61 unprofessional behaviors identified in round 1. Using this methodology, 50 unprofessional behaviors were retained for round three. A full list of professional behaviors and their level of agreement is listed in Table 2. The following unprofessional behaviors were dropped: "does not work with secondary or state programs of agricultural education," "cancels class," "criticizes the work of others," "maintains the status quo," "swears," "awards grades for participating in student organizations," "micromanages others," "is isolated," "presents a sloppy appearance," "refuses to share ideas," and "is individually focused."

Table 1

Professional Behaviors to be Exhibited by Faculty Members in Agricultural Education

	Round 2 (N = 22)		Round 3 (N = 22)		
A university faculty member…	M[a]	% Agreement	% Agreement	M[b]	SD
is willing to learn	4.48	100	100[c]	4.76	.44
is knowledgeable in their field	4.48	95	95[c]	4.76	.54
is ethical	4.50	91	95[c]	4.71	.46
is honest	4.23	91	95[c]	4.71	.56
demands quality work from their students	4.50	95	100[c]	4.67	.48
models effective teaching characteristics	4.64	100	95[c]	4.62	.50
stays up to date in the field	4.23	95	95[c]	4.57	.60
has a good work ethic	4.45	95	91[c]	4.57	.60
has good written communication skills	4.36	90	95[c]	4.48	.81
is a lifelong learner	4.55	95	100[c]	4.48	.81
challenges the poor quality of unethical work	4.38	91	100[c]	4.43	.60
is dedicated to the program	4.45	95	100	4.43	.68
is responsible	4.59	100	100[c]	4.38	.59
is accountable	4.59	100	100[c]	4.38	.67
has high moral character	4.36	95	100[c]	4.38	.74
is trustworthy	4.55	95	100[c]	4.33	.80
Respects people	4.45	100	95[c]	4.29	.64
puts their students first	4.36	95	95[c]	4.29	.72
is productive in the field	4.33	95	95[c]	4.29	.78
Engages in self-reflection	4.23	86	100[c]	4.29	.78
uses reasoning in thinking	4.14	91	100[c]	4.29	.90
does things for the right reason	4.41	95	95[c]	4.24	.62
is a good listener	4.24	95	95[c]	4.24	.77
is a self starter	4.23	86	100[c]	4.24	.89
has a strong love of agricultural education	4.23	86	95[c]	4.23	1.04
has good oral communication skills	4.27	91	95[c]	4.19	.93
is objective	4.14	82	91[c]	4.10	.62
is open-minded	4.27	91	95[c]	4.10	.77
is a member of professional organizations	4.41	95	100[c]	4.10	.94
Respects colleagues	4.27	91	100[c]	4.10	.94
serves as a mentor	4.41	95	100[c]	4.05	.74
is fair and balanced	4.32	91	95[c]	4.05	.74
demonstrates leadership	4.23	86	95[c]	4.00	.77

table continues

Table 1 (continued)

	Round 2		Round 3		
A university faculty member…	M[a]	% Agreement	% Agreement	M[b]	SD
is willing to serve the profession	4.32	95	100[c]	4.00	.78
is supportive of colleagues to students	4.36	95	100[c]	4.00	.84
is an agent of change	3.86	68	100[c]	4.00	.86
participates in professional development	4.45	95	95[c]	3.95	.87
demonstrates followership	4.05	77	95[c]	3.90	.62
is visionary	4.41	100	100	3.90	.77
serves as a role model	4.27	95	95[c]	3.90	.83
Presents a professional appearance	4.29	90	100[c]	3.90	.89
works for the benefit of the profession	4.36	100	91[c]	3.86	.73
is caring	4.18	91	95[c]	3.86	.85
has a positive attitude	4.09	86	95[c]	3.81	.93
is respectful of others opinions	4.32	91	86[c]	3.81	1.03
is innovative	4.00	79	95[c]	3.81	1.12
demands quality work from peers	3.82	73	95[c]	3.81	1.17
is an expert in social science research	3.73	64	86[c]	3.76	.83
is willing to help others	4.23	91	95[c]	3.76	.83
is optimistic	3.95	82	95[c]	3.76	.83
is tactful	4.05	82	91[c]	3.76	1.00
is confident	3.91	66	100[c]	3.71	.72
responds to communication in a timely fashion	4.09	77	95[c]	3.71	.72
reviews research	4.14	91	100[c]	3.71	.78
is mission/goal oriented	4.14	77	95[c]	3.71	.78
is open	4.00	77	95[c]	3.71	.78
is supportive to colleagues to administrators	4.14	82	100[c]	3.71	.96
is courteous	4.09	86	95[c]	3.67	1.11
is a team player	4.14	86	86[c]	3.67	1.11
is enthusiastic	3.95	77	100[c]	3.62	.86
is cooperative with others	4.32	95	86[c]	3.62	1.02
provides moral support for colleagues	3.95	73	91[c]	3.57	.93
is punctual	4.00	77	95[c]	3.57	.93
is a servant leader	3.64	59	91[c]	3.38	1.02
is sensitive	3.77	64	81[c]	3.33	.97
Respects other faculty member's turf	3.77	64	86[c]	3.29	1.10
works regular hours	2.95	28			

Note: [a]1=strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree
[b]1 = unimportant, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = moderately important, 4 = important, 5 = very important
[c]Reached consensus in Round Three.

Table 2

Behaviors Considered Unprofessional if Exhibited by Faculty Members in Agricultural Education

	Round 2 (N = 22)		Round 3 (N = 22)		
An unprofessional faculty member..	M[a]	% Agreement	% Agreement	M[b]	SD
plagiarizes	4.91	100	100[c]	3.90	.30
takes credit for others work	4.82	100	100[c]	3.76	.44
publishes students' research as their own	4.73	100	95[c]	3.76	.63
cheats	4.64	100	100[c]	3.67	.58
lies	4.64	100	100[c]	3.57	.68
awards grades without student work	4.41	87	95[c]	3.43	.68
makes sexist comments	4.59	91	95[c]	3.42	.68
is poorly prepared for teaching in the classroom	4.05	82	95[c]	3.38	.74
engages in inappropriate relationships	4.55	91	95[c]	3.33	.91
misuses resources	4.41	87	100[c]	3.19	.68
is underhanded	4.45	95	100[c]	3.10	.89
submits false expense reports	4.86	100	100[c]	3.05	.92
shows bias toward students	4.27	81	91[c]	2.95	.87
shows favoritism toward students	4.18	77	86[c]	2.90	.83
does not fulfill assigned duties	4.27	81	100[c]	2.90	.94
does not respect others	4.41	91	95[c]	2.90	.94
has a poor work ethic	4.18	81	91[c]	2.90	.94
grants authorship on papers to individuals who are undeserving	4.18	81	100[c]	2.90	1.00
believes that students are not a top priority	3.82	66	81[c]	2.90	1.04
uses university vehicles for personal business	4.55	95	95[c]	2.86	1.01
breaches confidences	4.50	95	95[c]	2.86	1.06
prejudges student performance	4.36	90	95[c]	2.76	.70
admonishes colleagues in public settings	4.55	91	100[c]	2.76	.94
uses public occasions to forward personal agendas	4.23	77	91[c]	2.76	1.09
is apathetic	4.23	81	91[c]	2.67	.66
does not listen	4.09	77	86[c]	2.62	.87
gossips	4.23	86	91[c]	2.57	1.03
sells textbooks received from publishers	4.23	81	86[c]	2.52	1.17
is rude	4.18	86	91[c]	2.48	1.12

table continues

Table 2 (continued)

	Round 2		Round 3		
Unprofessional Behavior	M[a]	% Agreement	% Agreement	M[b]	SD
looks down upon others	4.18	81	95[c]	2.43	.87
takes advantage of being a university employee	3.64	59	86[c]	2.43	.93
always makes excuses	4.18	77	86[c]	2.42	.93
is unwilling to help others improve	3.91	73	81[c]	2.38	.81
withholds information	3.77	54	76	2.38	.92
engages in academic snobbery	3.82	68	91[c]	2.38	1.07
hires students to do personal work	3.64	59	71	2.38	1.32
misses deadlines	3.73	59	95[c]	2.33	.86
does not show up to meetings	3.95	68	81[c]	2.33	.86
interrupts people	3.95	68	100[c]	2.29	.85
is close-minded	4.09	68	91[c]	2.24	.70
does not follow the chain of command	3.68	59	91[c]	2.24	.83
overdelegates responsibilities	3.77	68	81[c]	2.19	.81
is self-centered	3.82	68	76	2.14	.96
avoids involvement in professional organizations	3.91	63	71	2.14	1.06
is selfish	3.86	65	81[c]	2.05	.92
does not participate in professional development activities	3.77	61	86[c]	2.05	1.05
doesn't trust others	3.68	63	71	1.95	.80
is cliquish	3.73	63	76	1.95	1.12
is jealous	3.82	73	76	1.90	.83
is overly competitive	3.45	55	67	1.90	1.00
is individually focused	3.55	50			
refuses to share ideas	3.55	45			
presents a sloppy appearance	3.55	45			
is isolated	3.45	45			
micromanages others	3.41	41			
awards grades for participating in student organizations	3.38	47			
swears	3.36	41			
maintains the status quo	3.36	32			
criticizes the work of others	3.27	41			
cancels class	3.27	41			
does not work with secondary or state programs of agricultural education	3.23	46			

Note: [a]1=strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree
[b]1 = not critical, 2 = somewhat critical, 3 = critical, 4 = very critical
[c]Reached consensus in Round Three.

In round three, panel members were asked for a dichotomous (agree/disagree) response for each professional behavior listed. Panel members were also asked to indicate via a 5 point Likert-type scale (1 = not critical to 4 = very critical) how critical it was for university faculty to exhibit the unprofessional behavior. Forty-two unprofessional behaviors were retained. The following unprofessional behaviors were dropped: "hiring students to do personal work," "avoids involvement in professional organizations," "withholds information," "is overly competitive," "is cliquish," "doesn't trust others," and "is jealous."

Five unprofessional behaviors were classified as very critical to view in the profession, 23 were classified as critical behaviors and 14 behaviors were somewhat critical to view in the profession. The most critical unprofessional behaviors, as viewed by the panel of experts, were "plagiarizes" (M = 3.90), "takes credit for others work" (M = 3.76), "publishes students' research as their own" (M = 3.76), "cheats" (M = 3.67), and "lies" (M = 3.57).

Conclusions/Recommendations/Implications

From the data in this study, it can be concluded that from the perspective of this panel of experts, there are 66 professional behaviors that should be exhibited by faculty members in agricultural education with 8 behaviors being very important. Faculty members in agricultural education should be willing to learn, knowledgeable in their field, ethical, honest, demand quality work from their students, model effective teaching characteristics, stay up to date in the field, and have a good work ethic.

Those behaviors which were rated by the panel of experts as very important were "is willing to learn" (M = 4.76), "is knowledgeable in their field" (M = 4.76), "is ethical" (M = 4.71), "is honest" (M = 4.71), "demands quality work from their students" (M = 4.67), "models effective teaching characteristics" (M = 4.62), "stays up to date in the field" (M = 4.57), and "has a good work ethic" (M = 4.57). Those behaviors which were rated by the panel of experts as moderately important were "respects other faculty member's turf" (M = 3.29), "is sensitive" (M = 3.33), and "is a servant leader" (M = 3.38).

Unprofessional Behaviors of University Faculty

Round one sought to identify a list of unprofessional behaviors that would be inappropriate for university faculty members in agricultural education to exhibit on the job. The opened ended question used in this round was "List what you would consider to be unprofessional behaviors of university professionals." Panel members initially identified 61 unprofessional behaviors that would be inappropriate for university faculty members in agricultural education to exhibit.

In round two, panel members were asked to rate their level of agreement with each of the 61 unprofessional behaviors identified in round 1. Using this methodology, 50 unprofessional behaviors were retained for round three. A full list of professional behaviors and their level of agreement is listed in Table 2. The following unprofessional behaviors were dropped: "does not work with secondary or state programs of agricultural education," "cancels class," "criticizes the work of others," "maintains the status quo," "swears," "awards grades for participating in student organizations," "micromanages others," "is isolated," "presents a sloppy appearance," "refuses to share ideas," and "is individually focused."

In round three, panel members were asked for a dichotomous (agree/disagree) response for each professional behavior listed. Panel members were also asked to indicate via a 5 point Likert-type scale (1 = not critical to 4 = very critical) how critical it was for university faculty to exhibit the

unprofessional behavior. Forty-two unprofessional behaviors were retained. The following unprofessional behaviors were dropped: “hiring students to do personal work,” “avoids involvement in professional organizations,” “withholds information,” “is overly competitive,” “is cliquish,” “doesn’t trust others,” and “is jealous.”

Five unprofessional behaviors were classified as very critical to view in the profession, 23 were classified as critical behaviors and 14 behaviors were somewhat critical to view in the profession. The most critical unprofessional behaviors, as viewed by the panel of experts, were “plagiarizes” (M = 3.90), “takes credit for others work” (M = 3.76), “publishes students’ research as their own” (M = 3.76), “cheats” (M = 3.67), and “lies” (M = 3.57).

Conclusions/Recommendations/Implications

From the data in this study, it can be concluded that from the perspective of this panel of experts, there are 66 professional behaviors that should be exhibited by faculty members in agricultural education with 8 behaviors being very important. Faculty members in agricultural education should be willing to learn, knowledgeable in their field, ethical, honest, demand quality work from their students, model effective teaching characteristics, stay up to date in the field, and have a good work ethic.

Upon further analysis of the professional behaviors to be exhibited by university faculty members in agricultural education, common themes exist for these behaviors. These themes are centered on the areas of lifelong learning, program mission, being a productive researcher, and maintaining a positive relationship with colleagues.

Overall, faculty members in agricultural education are professional is they engage in life long learning, helping themselves stay knowledgeable and up-to-date in their field. Also, professional faculty members are student oriented, putting their students first while expecting quality work from their students. Professional faculty members in agricultural education are also thinking about the mission and goals of the program they serve. Such faculty members are dedicated to the total agricultural education program, concentrating their efforts to the mission and goals of the program. These faculty members are visionary leaders, seeking to be an agent of change to keep the program up-to-date and relevant to meet student needs.

Being a productive researcher is also important to being a professional faculty member, though behaviors oriented toward research were not rated as important to other behaviors. Faculty members in agricultural education should become experts in social science research and take an active role in reviewing research on a regular basis not only to fulfill the requirements for promotion and tenure, but also to help achieve the goal of being knowledgeable and up-to-date in the field.

It is important that faculty members develop and maintain positive relationships with their colleagues. Many professional behaviors identified were geared towards respecting colleagues, being supportive of colleagues, serving as a role model, being respectful of opinions of others, being a team player, and providing moral support.

The panel of experts for this study agreed that there are 42 unprofessional behaviors that faculty members in agricultural education should not exhibit on the job. Faculty members in agricultural education would be considered unprofessional if they plagiarized, took credit for the works of others, published students’ research as their own, cheated, and lied. Upon further analysis

of the unprofessional behaviors, common themes that existed included those dealing with scholarly endeavors, use of university resources, and relationships with students.

Faculty members in agricultural education engage in unprofessional behavior if they plagiarize and take credit for others work when publishing their own. Furthermore, these individuals engage in unprofessional behavior if the grant authorship on papers to individuals who are undeserving of having their name on these publications.

Misuse of university resources is also another unprofessional practice faculty members should avoid. It is considered unprofessional if faculty members misuse resources, submit false expense reports, and use university vehicles for personal business.

Improper relationships with students are also unprofessional behaviors that faculty members should avoid. Improper relationships with students can include a variety of things, ranging from awarding grades without student work to making sexist comments to even hiring students to do personal work for faculty members. Other unprofessional behaviors that fit into this category includes prejudging student performance, showing favoritism toward students, engaging in inappropriate relationships with students, and showing bias toward students.

It is interesting to note some of the professional and unprofessional behaviors that were dropped for lack of consensus. "Working regular hours" was the only professional behavior in which consensus was not reached. Once could infer that it does not matter when you work, but that you take care of your professional responsibilities. This contradicts the comments of Phelps (2004) who stated that junior faculty members need to be visible on campus. Some of the unprofessional behaviors in which the panel did not reach consensus included "presents a sloppy appearance," "criticizes the work of others," and "does not work with secondary and state programs of agricultural education." Certainly the work environments in higher education are changing rapidly. Many faculty members may not wear the professional dress like faculty members did in the previous generation. Because the panel included a diverse mix of all areas of agricultural education, some panel members may not be charged with working with secondary or state programs of agricultural education, leading to that behavior not reaching consensus.

For the unprofessional behaviors that were rated as somewhat critical, panel members were able to reach consensus on two-thirds of those behaviors. Those behaviors that were somewhat critical, yet there was a lack of consensus on that being an unprofessional behavior, included faculty members withholding information, hiring students to do personal work, being self-centered, avoiding involvement in professional organizations, not trusting others, being cliquish, being jealous, and being overly competitive. It is clear that there is some disagreement as to what constitutes unprofessional behavior at the university level. The diversity of the profession will give different views given the circumstances that are presented.

While the results of this study provides a list of both professional and unprofessional behaviors groups can use when evaluating faculty who are seeking promotion and tenure, caution should be taken when using these lists for that purpose. Since these lists were generated by individuals within the profession, these lists would only be beneficial to agricultural education departments/programs when evaluating faculty members for promotion and tenure. Furthermore, these lists may not contain all of the behaviors that should be considered. Periodically, these lists should be reviewed for the inclusion and/or deletion of behaviors that should be considered for promotion and tenure.

While this study begins to develop a list of professional and unprofessional characteristics of agricultural education faculty members, one would wonder what faculty members in colleges of agriculture would think of this list? It is recommended that a similar study be conducted with faculty members in colleges of agriculture to determine what professional behaviors faculty members should exhibit and what unprofessional behaviors should be look at when evaluating faculty.

Because professionalism and collegiality is not officially considered a criterion for promotion and tenure at many universities, how will these lists be used? Department and colleges should review the list of professional behaviors to see where these behaviors would fit in the standard criteria usually considered for promotion and tenure in the three traditional areas of teaching, research, and service. Administrators and faculty members can use the list of both professional and unprofessional behaviors to mentor new faculty to make sure they get off to a got start with their university careers so they can be productive in a university setting.

References

American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (1999). On collegiality as a criterion for faculty evaluation. *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports,* Retrieved September 25, 2006 from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsresearch/policydocs/collegiality.htm

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College.

Clason, D. L., & Dormody, T. J. (1994). Analyzing data measured by individual Likert-type items. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 35*(4), 31-35.

Connell, M. A., & Savage, F. G. (2001, Nov/Dec). Does collegiality count? *Academe, 87*(6). Retrieved September 25, 2006 from http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2001/01nd/01ndcon.htm

Dalkey, N. D. (1969). *The Delphi method: An experimental study of group opinion.* Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Delbecq, A., Van de Ven, A., & Gustafson, D. (1986). *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal group and Delphi processes.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Di Leo, J. R. (2006). Uncollegiality, tenure, and the weasel clause [Electronic version]. *Symploke, 13*(1-2), 99-107.

Glasser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory.* Chicago: Aldine.

Hartle, A. (2004, December/January). Collegiality: A criterion for tenure? Why it's not all politics. *The Academic Exchange.* Retrieved September 25, 2006 from http://www.emory.edu/ACAD_EXCHANGE/2004/decjan/hartle.html

Lewin, T. (2002, July 12). 'Collegiality' as a tenure battleground. *The New York Times.* Retrieved September 25, 2006 from http://www.physics.utoronto.ca/~peet/ofinterest/CollegialityasTenureBattleground.htm

McKinney, M. (2005). Collegiality: The tenure track's pandora's box. *Inside Higher Education, 23.* Retrieved September 25, 2006 from http://insidehighered.com/workplace/2005/06/23/mckinney

Mississippi State University (2006). *Faculty handbook: Promotion and tenure policies and procedures.* Retrieved September 25, 2006 from http://msuinfo.ur.msstate.edu/handbook.fac/v.html

Oregon State University (2006). *Faculty handbook: Criteria for promotion and tenure.* Retrieved September 28, 2006 from http://oregonstate.edu/facultystaff/handbook/promocri.html

Phelps, P. (2004). Collegiality lessons [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved September 25, 2006 from http://chronicle.com/jobs/2004/07/2004072701c.htm

The Ohio State University (2006). *For faculty and staff: Promotion and tenure.* Retrieved September 28, 2006 from http://oaa.osu.edu/promotion_tenure.php

University of Florida (n.d.). *Faculty handbook.* Retrieved September 28, 2006 from http://www.aa.ufl.edu/Handbook/employment.html

University of Missouri (2006). *Connected rules and regulations: Policy and procedures for promotion and tenure.* Retrieved September 28, 2006 from http://www.umsystem/edu/ums/departments/gc/rules/personnel/320/035.shtml

Virginia Tech (2006). *Faculty handbook.* Retrieved September 28, 2006 from http://www.provost.vt.edu/documents/FHB_July_2006.pdf