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Pre-flection

• Why do we have / do faculty development?
• What is / are typical topic(s)?
• What is / are some typical format(s)?
• Which (if any) theoretical models for adult learning is/are used?
• How do we assess impact of professional development?
• These are the questions we tried to answer.

Overview

• Background + Rationale + Methodology
• Results of literature review
• Results of survey
• Summary of results + implications for practitioners
• Present a holistic framework for professional development
Background & Purpose

- Study by Welch & Saltmarsh (2013) revealed faculty development is key programming of campus centers for community engagement.
- 2015 Campus Compact membership survey revealed 75% of respondents reported conducting faculty development.
- We know little about format, theoretical foundations, topics, or impact.

Faculty Development...

- Is defined as educational activities designed to help faculty grow in their professional practice (McKee & Tew, 2013)
- Six components of effective faculty development:
  - 1) creating a climate of respect;
  - 2) encouraging active participation;
  - 3) building on experience;
  - 4) employing collaborative inquiry;
  - 5) learning for action;
  - 6) empowering the participants (Lawler, 2003)

Research Questions

1. What types of information regarding faculty development exist in the professional literature?
2. What are the current formats, topics, and practice of faculty development provided by campus centers for service-learning and community engagement?
3. To what extent do current faculty development programs incorporate theoretical frameworks for adult learning?
4. What topical skills and/or sets of skills are included in faculty development to advance service-learning and/or community engagement?
5. What new directions should the field pursue to support and enhance faculty development that advances service-learning and community engagement within higher education?
Two-Part Methodology

- **Part I - Review of the literature**
  - ERIC Database Journal articles 2000 – 2015
  - Article review worksheet developed & used

- **Part II - Survey**
  - Prototype developed and field tested: (1) Faith-based, (2) Private Liberal Arts, (3) Large public research institution
  - 22 items / Six Sections
  - Survey directors of campus centers for community engagement

Literature Review Process

- **Search terms**: “faculty development,” “faculty training,” “professional development,” “service-learning,” “community engagement,” “higher education,” “college,” or “university.”
- 50 articles identified → 20 focused on K-12 teacher education & were deleted from the review pool
- 30 remaining articles (2 unobtainable) → 28 articles reviewed
- Review worksheet developed & implemented
- Initial individual review → 59% inter-rater reliability
- Re-review → 100% consensus

Literature Review Categories

- Article type categorized
  - Descriptive, Theoretical model, experimental study
- Method and design
  - Quantitative, qualitative, experimental, case study, “none,” etc.
- Outcome measures
- Theoretical framework
Literature Review Results

• Article Type:
  – Program Descriptions = 16 (58%)
  – Technical Guides = 6 (21%)
  – Empirical/Research = 6 (21%)

Literature Review Results (cont)

• Empirical Design/Method To Answer Research Questions: Six Articles
  – One factor analysis + pre/post measure
  – Three quasi-experimental design pre/post measures
  – Two qualitative methods (focus groups, interviews, reflection entries)

Literature Review Results (cont)

• Outcome Measures – one or more measures:
  – Course development - 10
  – Participant satisfaction surveys – 10
  – Anecdotal reports/testimonials - 8
  – Pre/post measures - 5
  – Interviews/focus groups – 5
  – Two articles reported community satisfaction & goal attainment as criterion of positive outcomes
  – One article reported students & community partners achieve objectives
  – One article used syllabus review as criterion
  – No measures – 5
Literature Review Results (cont)

• Theoretical Frameworks
  – Most lacked any theoretical framework for adult learners
  – 13 (47%) explicitly articulated theoretical framework for adult learners (faculty development participants) and/or a specific learning method/approach

Learning Theory Models

• Cooks, Scharrer, and Castaneda Paredes’ (2004) Social Approach Model
• Cox’s (2004) Faculty Learning Communities
• Eccles, et al. (2005) Transformative Change Model
• Swidler’s (1986) Social and System Change Model
• Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder’s (2002) Community of Practice model

Faculty Development Models/Approach

• Two articles described using a Charrette Method (Lindsey, Todd, Hayter, & Ellis (2009)
  – *a design charrette* is a short, collaborative meeting during which members of a team quickly collaborate and sketch designs to explore and share a broad diversity of design ideas.
• Competency Based Models
SURVEY ON CURRENT TRENDS & PRACTICE

Survey Development & Distribution

- Survey tool drafted based on questions that emerged from Welch & Saltmarsh (2013) study
- Three CEPs reviewed and provided feedback
- Tool revised to include 22 items organized into six sections, including Who, What, Where, When, How Assessed, and Institutional Info
- Survey emailed to contact list curated by NERCHE
- 534 surveys delivered, one-month response window, two e-mail reminders sent, 83 complete responses (15.5% response rate)

Survey Results: Institutional Info

- 33 (40%) public, 30 (37%) private liberal arts, 16 (20%) faith-based, 2 (2%) community college, 1 (1%) HBCU
- 76% hold Carnegie CE Classification
- 89% have a center devoted to S-LCE
- 67% of centers are located in Academic Affairs
Survey Results: Who facilitates and participates

- 55% reported that S-LCE Directors are primarily responsible for faculty development (with 59% reporting added support from other S-LCE staff)
- 33% draw on faculty fellows, community partners, outside speakers, and staff from teaching and learning centers as contributors
- Faculty development COHORT programs composed almost entirely of FT tenure track, FT/PT adjunct and clinical faculty
- About half of other faculty development programs (e.g. workshops) include staff and community partners, and a quarter include undergrad, masters, and doctoral students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure/Event</th>
<th>Responses (in %)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one consultation</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop(s)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partner guest speaker(s)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative activities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning community</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members (individuals)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community teams</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book club/readings</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training videos</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing retreats</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Results: Workshop Formats

Which of these workshop formats do you use? (check all appropriate)
Survey Results: Content of FD Programs

What content/topics are covered in faculty development?

- Course development
- Critical pedagogy
- Syllabus development
- Establishing/maintaining partnerships
- Logistical coordination
- Principles of community engagement
- Cultural competency
- Theory of learning
- Reflection
- Assessment
- Publishing/dissemination
- Prep for P & T review
- Social justice and/or faith tenets related to engagement
- Community organizing
- Risk management
- Title IX
- International service experiences
- Domestic immersion experiences
- Student travel procedures
- Community-based research
- Other (please specify)

Faculty Development Topics

Most Common
- Course/syllabus development
- Principles of community engagement
- Establishing community partnerships
- Reflection
- Assessment

Least Common
- Cultural competency
- Publishing and dissemination
- Theory of learning
- Community organizing
- Title IX
- International/domestic immersion protocols

Survey Results: FD Models and Incentives

- 37% use faculty cohort/faculty fellows model for FD
- 61% of respondents do not use theoretical frameworks to shape faculty development
- Only 3 referenced Kolb’s Experiential Learning Model, Mezirow’s Transformative Learning Theory
- Incentives for participation include food (66%), intrinsic benefit of being in community (57%), access to resources and mini grants (47%), stipends (39%)
- Fellows/Cohort stipend range: $500-$3,500
- Other faculty development stipend range: $75/half day-$250/day
Survey Results: Duration of Cohort-Based Faculty Development

If you use a faculty cohort model, what is the estimated total hours of participation for each participant in the cohort experience?

- 10 hours: 45.1%
- 11-15 hours: 13.7%
- 16-20 hours: 17.6%
- Over 20 hours: 9.8%
- We do not use a cohort model: 13.7%

Survey Results: Duration of other forms of faculty development

If you do NOT use a faculty cohort model, estimate the approximate number of hours an individual faculty member spends participating in faculty development for service-learning/community engagement each year.

- 1-3 hours: 40.3%
- 4-6 hours: 25.0%
- 7-10 hours: 25.0%
- Over 10 hours: 2.8%
- We use a cohort model: 0.8%

Impact and outcomes measures:

Survey Question: Which of the following are positive aspects of the cohort/activities of faculty development? (check all that apply)

- Participant evaluation/survey: 51 respondents (98.6%)
- Teaching/individual: 27 respondents (45.49%)
- Syllabus analysis/overview: 31 respondents (58.87%)
- Faculty development and support: 29 respondents (55.89%)
- Community partner survey/feedback: 27 respondents (33.33%)
- Personal reflection: 26 respondents (52.02%)
- Professional development by discussion with group: 24 respondents (45.49%)
- Professional development of participants' knowledge: 38 respondents (73.33%)
- Course evaluations: 17 respondents (31.11%)
- Product/guidelines/professional development: 8 respondents (10.64%)
- None: 7 respondents (0.74%)
- Other (please specify): 6 respondents (1.11%)
Overall Survey Results

Trends & Strengths
- 6 core topics are covered by most respondents
- Broad faculty participation in FD offerings
- Cohort programs typically require robust time commitment
- One-on-one consulting is widely used

Trends & Challenges
- Limited/no theoretical foundations
- Limited/no assessment data collected
- Limited/no empirical research (this seems more tied to lit review)
- Faculty cohort/fellows model is still not widely used

Analysis of combined Literature Review and Survey

Limitations

- Literature Review
  - Limited to articles in refereed journals & did not include doctoral dissertations, conference presentations, or book chapters
- Survey
  - Disappointing return rate
  - Small n is not generalizable & conclusive
New & Continued Questions

- To what extent are faculty development programs impacted by center staff size & institutional location of the center?
- Is there a significant difference between Carnegie institutions and non-Carnegie institutions?
- Is there a difference between types of institutions?
- Why do faculty development programs appear to be limited in size & scope? Money? Time?
- Why don't faculty development programs use theoretical frameworks?
- Why is assessment limited or non-existent? What assessment methods should be used?

Implications & Recommendations

- Developmental & scaffolded approach is missing
  - Entry level + on-going + advanced topics & formats
- Promising competency-based approaches
- Learning Communities/Cohorts as a viable approach
  - Explore & expand faculty fellow model
- Explore robust outcome measures
  - Syllabus construction reflecting best practice
  - Pre/post measures of faculty knowledge
  - Community partner impact: attaining objectives
  - Student impact: cognitive, attitudinal measures
- Design & implement more empirical studies

Proposed Holistic Approach

- Service-learning/Community Engagement Professional serves as a professional development “Hub” serving various stakeholders in a variety of contexts
- Four stake-holder domains
  - Faculty + Student + Institution + Community
- Four contexts
  - Classroom + community + discipline + institution
- Competency-based
- Locus of change
- Multiple measures of impact/outcomes
Semantic Shift

• Given the multiple stakeholders and contexts beyond focusing exclusively on faculty...
• “Professional educational development” as advocated by the Professional and Organizational Network (POD)

EXAMPLE OF STAKEHOLDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors to Consider</th>
<th>Necessary Faculty Competencies (Adapted from Blanchard et al. 2009 and Axtell)</th>
<th>Course of Change</th>
<th>Measures of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Describe CES concepts, terms and principles (novice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar with CES theory and seminal literature (novice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply CES principles, theoretical frameworks, and pedagogical strategies when implementing CES (intermediate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify potential CES outcomes and a plan for assessing them (intermediate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectively describe CES activities for promotion and tenure review (advanced)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Scholarly Identity &amp; Community Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity</td>
<td>Cultural Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior experience</td>
<td>P &amp; T preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of faculty role (e.g. tenured, adjunct, etc.)</td>
<td>Adequate number of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of experience</td>
<td>Course syllabi that meets designation &amp; incorporate benchmarks of best practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy, Practice &amp; Perspectives</td>
<td>Awards (e.g. Lynton, Mitchell)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Identity &amp; Community Purpose</td>
<td>Written reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLE OF CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Factors to Consider</th>
<th>Necessary Faculty Competencies</th>
<th>Locus of Change</th>
<th>Measures of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class/Room</td>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>Organize the classroom space to reflect multidirectional teaching and learning (novice)</td>
<td>Increased student participation in discussions and activities</td>
<td>Student reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom layout and design</td>
<td>Invite diverse voices including community partners and residents as guest speakers (intermediate)</td>
<td>Student reflections</td>
<td>Observation of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course content and outcomes</td>
<td>Recognize and navigate inherent classroom power dynamics based on role, race, class, and other aspects of identity (intermediate)</td>
<td>Observation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use a range of techniques to facilitate group discussion and reflection (intermediate)</td>
<td>Observation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and utilize appropriate community spaces or classrooms to maximize learning, and integrate community members as course participants and co-learners (advanced)</td>
<td>Observation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student participation in discussion and reflection</td>
<td>Student participation in discussion and activities</td>
<td>Measures of impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration of diverse voices in teaching</td>
<td>Observation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

- We have a better idea of what is happening and not happening
- We have a better idea of what needs to take place and be included
- We have more questions than answers
- We need to revisit & expand our notion of professional development

Questions & Discussion
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