12-14-2011

Five Year Follow-Up Evaluation of a Faculty Development Program: A Qualitative Study

Marcia Tennill
University of Missouri-St. Louis, mmtennill@aol.com

FIVE YEAR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION

OF A FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM:

A QUALITATIVE STUDY

by

MARCIA MARIE TENNILL
B.S.Ed., Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, 1972
M.Ed., Counseling, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 1999

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI- ST. LOUIS
In partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

EDUCATION
with an emphasis in Educational Psychology

December, 2011

Advisory Committee

Margaret W. Cohen, Ph.D.
Chairperson
Michael Bahr, Ph.D.
Committee Member
Kent A. Farnsworth, Ph.D.
Committee Member
Therese H. Macan, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Abstract

This qualitative follow-up evaluation explored the long-term impact of a faculty development program on participants who were five years post program. This study focused on 12 faculty members who participated in the University of Missouri's New Faculty Teaching Scholars program. The nine month program focused on creating a culture of teaching within the university and enhancing peer networking among participants. Data was collected through the review of existing program documents, interviews with program participants, classroom observations, and the review of participants' syllabi and curriculum vitae. The primary purpose of this study was to learn how a faculty development program affected the professional lives and careers of participants. A secondary purpose of this research was to explore the effects of a faculty development program on the broader university community. The results of this research may be used to inform faculty development program planners, university administrators, and the field of faculty development.

Kirkpatrick's four level model of training evaluation was used to answer the guiding questions of this study. Data indicated that most of the 12 participants had positive feelings about the program and learned and continued to implement improved teaching strategies in their classrooms. Participants also appreciated and embraced the networking opportunities provided by the program. Overall findings suggest that program benefits were sustained over time.

I dedicate this work to my immediate family: to my husband,
who continues to support me in everything I do; to my sons and daughters-in-law
and my daughter and son-in-law, who have listened to me talk about completing this
project for way too long now.

I add a special dedication to my daughter, who has inspired,
encouraged, laughed, cried, and celebrated with me every step of the way.

I love you all and could not have done this without you.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and thank everyone who has contributed in any way to my education. I am very grateful for all the wonderful and fulfilling educational experiences I have had during my life. I know that each and every one of them has made a difference. I truly believe that everything we experience in life makes us the person we are today.

I want to thank Dr. Simon Kim, who early on in my graduate studies encouraged me to pursue my interests and continue studying for my doctorate. I am grateful to the faculty who graciously agreed to participate in this research. I want to thank my dissertation committee members for their understanding and encouragement in getting to this point. I want to offer special thanks to my advisor, Dr. Peggy Cohen, whose support and understanding has gone far beyond what anyone would expect.

I thank my friends who over the years have continued to ask about my work and inquire about my progress. It goes without saying that I am also grateful to my extended family for their encouragement.

.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

This follow-up program evaluation explored the long-term impact of faculty development in higher education and is situated in the context of a specific program: The University of Missouri's New Faculty Teaching Scholars Program (NFTS). Although this research was based on the experiences of faculty who participated in that specific program, it also broadly addressed the concept of faculty development and how it is relevant to the current environment in higher education. In higher education, faculty development programs broadly refer to those activities that focus on improving the faculty member as a teacher, a scholar, a professional, and as a person. Each of these areas is valuable and worthy of study, but exploring all of them presents a task that is too broad and extensive for the current research. Although data collection may result in responses that address all four of those topics, four of the five goals of NFTS are directed at improving the faculty member as a teacher. Therefore, this study primarily focused on the data collected that addressed faculty development as it is relevant to teaching and learning.

As I will explain in Chapter Two, one component of a competent program evaluation is the requirement to explain the process and present the results in a consumer-friendly manner. Therefore, I wrote the introduction to this research without the distraction of citations and references. I expanded upon all the information contained in this introduction in Chapters Two and Three and included all the appropriate citations and references.

The concept of providing opportunities for faculty in higher education to improve themselves is not a new one. Faculty development has been a component of the

educational system for several centuries. Most experts in the field connect the evolution of faculty development to historical shifts in societal demands and in educational practices. Although one can find different models to explain the evolution of faculty development over the years, most of them follow a similar historical timeline and can include a broad array of professional activities.

Faculty development can be beneficial at any point in one's career, but it can be critical for early career faculty. The first three years of a faculty appointment are often the most difficult, filled with the new and unfamiliar stresses of university life. Research and publication expectations, teaching obligations, and departmental requirements for university and community service all bear on the early career faculty member. New faculty members often struggle to find their way in the new environment. They sometimes feel isolated in their everyday quest to fulfill expectations and move along the road to tenure. Faculty development is a way to intervene in this process. Well-planned faculty development activities and programs can provide orientations to university life, opportunities for professional networking and socialization within the university community, and guidance in teaching and classroom instruction.

Well-planned faculty development activities also include a program evaluation component. On the financial side, funding often flows to successful programs, so some type of evaluation is necessary to document successes. On the programmatic side, evaluations inform program planning and contribute to evolving activities that meet the needs of current participants. On the professional side, evaluations of successful programs serve as guideposts and models for program planners. All of these issues suggest the importance and usefulness of evaluating faculty development programs.

One will find many documented evaluations of faculty development programs in the literature, and most outcomes are positive. Faculty members who participate in these types of programs generally find them helpful in several different areas. They appreciate the opportunities to learn and implement classroom strategies that contribute to improved teaching and relevant learning for their students. They also value the collegial relationships that often develop through these programs. However, one will also find that most evaluations are one-time activities implemented upon the completion of a program, whether it is a one-day workshop or a year-long series. There are very few documented evaluations that track the long-term impact of these programs on the participants. In fact, there is a call for long-term evaluations of faculty development programs in the current literature.

New Faculty Teaching Scholars Program

As part of its 2001 strategic plan, the University of Missouri (UM) called for the development of campus environments that directly and intentionally focus on student learning. To answer that call, UM initiated the New Faculty Teaching Scholars Program (NFTS) for the 2001-2002 academic year. NFTS continued as an annual system-wide faculty development program until the middle of the 2008-2009 academic year, when it was suspended due to the economic recession's effect on the university budget.

The UM system is comprised of four separate campuses within the state of Missouri, with locations in Columbia, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Rolla. Each location is linked as part of the university system but operates as an independent campus. When NFTS was created, the university solicited the participation of early career faculty from all four of its campuses. At first, the program was administered through the Columbia

campus, where the UM System offices are located, but each of the campuses had its own NFTS program director. Faculty members who were new to the university system, generally in their second year of appointment, were eligible for the program and could either self-nominate or be nominated by their department chair for participation. Both the participating faculty member and the department chair acknowledged in writing the time commitment necessary to participate fully in the program. Approximately 50 faculty members drawn from the four campuses participated each year.

The purpose of the program was to acclimate new faculty members to their new roles and responsibilities on their own campuses as well as across the university system. As noted in the program brochure (New Faculty Teaching Scholars, 2004), the goals of NFTS were:

1. To support individual campus activities that help new faculty members become effective teachers and scholars.
2. To promote engaged instructional strategies that support student-centered learning environments.
3. To assist in the development of campus and system-wide networks that are so essential for success in today's academic world.
4. To support increased faculty research, teaching productivity and faculty retention.
5. To support efforts to develop a “culture of teaching” on each campus and throughout the University of Missouri.

The NFTS was a nine-month program that began in the fall and ended in May. The program consisted of three system-wide retreats, one each in the fall, winter, and

spring. Each of these 2-3 day retreats was held off campus and participants from all four campuses attended. The program provided travel costs, accommodations, and meals for the participants. The fall retreat focused on the aspects of course design and offered the participants opportunities to learn about, develop, and apply active and learner-centered teaching strategies to their courses. The winter retreat took place within the context of a teaching renewal conference held on the Columbia campus. NFTS participants had the opportunity to participate in conference workshops and instructional presentations facilitated by experts in the fields of teaching and learning. The final retreat in the spring offered participants time and support to create an academic portfolio, which is a document that describes what they do as academics and can be used to document professional development and as a foundation used in promotion and tenure proceedings. In addition, monthly presentations and discussions were held on each individual campus for local program participants. These events were scheduled by the campus directors and generally reflected the topics and goals of the program, although the directors had the flexibility to tailor some events to meet the needs of their campus group. For example, events on the Rolla campus, which is a science and technology university, occasionally addressed issues related to National Science Foundation grants and the research mission of that campus.

NFTS gathered the faculty participants together multiple times during the year, both as an entire cohort and as local campus groups. University administrators and the program directors hoped to develop a culture of teaching across the university system. They were striving to foster an environment where early career faculty engaged with students and one another in a learner-centered environment. The program hoped to

provide opportunities for participants to get to know their colleagues, thus expanding their collegial networks and creating the opportunity to develop collaborative relationships on their own campuses and across the UM system. Ultimately, administrators wanted NFTS to engage, encourage, and entice early career faculty to stay at the university until they attained tenure and beyond.

Through evaluative feedback at the end of each program year, most participants indicated that NFTS changed the way they thought about teaching, revised the manner in which they taught, and contributed to an expanded professional and social network among their UM colleagues. However, a larger question remained: "How does this program impact the professional lives of participants on a long-term basis?" One means of determining long-term program impact is to follow-up with participants after a period of time has passed.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to explore any long-term impact of the UM NFTS program on participants. This was accomplished through a follow-up evaluation conducted with participants approximately five years after completing the program. This study explored how the NFTS program has affected the professional lives of those participants. For the purposes of this study, the term "professional lives" refers to the work lives of the faculty participants, which include academic, research, and service activities.

A secondary purpose of this study was to provide research-based documentation of the long-term effects of faculty development programs that are structured like NFTS. This may contribute to future program planning for UM and other institutions wishing to

establish or revise existing faculty development programs. Results from this study may also add to the current knowledge base in the field of faculty development by identifying successful elements of faculty development programs and offering best practices for the field.

Guiding Questions

This research study used a qualitative methodology to collect and analyze data. Unlike quantitative research methodologies which hypothesize outcomes, measure and quantify data, and generalize results, qualitative research methods explore in depth the details of selected issues. The purpose of this research study, then, was not to measure, compare, or quantify outcomes of the program. Rather, this research intended to explore with participants how and in what ways the program has affected them on a long-term basis. Therefore, the following guiding questions, rather than a hypothesis, were the template for this qualitative research study.

1. In what ways has NFTS influenced the professional lives of participants five years after completing the program?
2. How have participants integrated NFTS experiences into their professional lives?
3. How do the results of this study offer recommendations for best practices in the field of faculty development?

Limitations

The population for this study was limited to UM faculty members who participated in NFTS during two academic years, 2004-2005 or 2005-2006, even though the program has been offered for seven academic years. Faculty members from the two years selected for this study were at or just past the tenure timeline in their careers, which

is generally a period of five years. Since the goal of most faculty members is to be granted tenure, this follow-up point in time generally coordinated with the tenure timeline. Whether participants were granted tenure or not, this gave them an opportunity to reflect on what kinds of resources they utilized to help them reach their current professional status.

Faculty members who agreed to participate in this study were selected through purposeful random sampling, which is a method that randomly selects participants from a very specific group. However, this method allowed for participants to accept or reject an invitation to participate in the study. Thus the participants in this study may or may not be a representative sample of all NFTS participants over the history of the program.

This study is also situated within the UM environment and within the context of the NFTS program. The program experiences of the participants may or may not be similar to other faculty development program participants at different institutions. The results of this research may not be generalizable to other programs, institutions, or to the field of faculty development as a whole. However, keeping with the qualitative nature of this inquiry, this study may have the potential to suggest recommendations for best practices in the field of faculty development.

The changes and growth in the professional lives of faculty members who participated in this study may have been influenced by other factors outside the NFTS program. For example, participants may have taken part in other faculty programs or had individual experiences that enhanced their professional growth. Participants may or may not be able to identify the NFTS program as the source of their professional advancement.

These limitations are not all encompassing, but represent the types of life experiences that can affect the professional careers of faculty members. Because this is a qualitative study, the focus was on the perceptions and personal experiences of the participants and sought to suggest best practices for faculty development programs rather than offer predictions that can be generalized to other situations.

Significance of the Study

Because this study is situated in the context of the UM NFTS program, it may be most relevant to the faculty participants and administrators of that program. However, it could also be significant to the academic community on multiple levels. Among those who might benefit from this study's findings are the University itself, individual faculty members, and the broader field of faculty development.

For UM, this evaluation could supply important information regarding the long-term effects of this program. In 2006, UM conducted a study through the Office of Institutional Research and Planning Board to examine the impact of NFTS on faculty retention (University of Missouri System, 2006). That study looked at 699 early career faculty hired across all four campuses during the period of 1999-2004. The results showed that retention rates for newly hired assistant professors who participated in the NFTS program were significantly higher (87.3%) than the comparable group (76.4%) who did not participate in the program. The focus of this evaluation study was to expand on those results and explore how NFTS participants directly or indirectly connected their program experiences to their current situation. For example, the study investigated if and how the NFTS experience had been a contributing resource to issues surrounding participants' retention, promotion, or tenure. Understanding how the NFTS program may

have helped early career faculty succeed could inform future faculty development activities within the university environment.

On an individual level, the results of this study could provide potential participants with an overview of how participating in faculty development programs like this one can affect their professional lives. Programs like NFTS require a substantial commitment of time from participants, and time is a very valuable commodity for early career faculty. Therefore, this study could allow potential participants to make informed decisions about committing to faculty development programs like NFTS.

The results of this study are specific to faculty who participated in NFTS, but exploring their experiences may offer insight into how programs like NFTS do or do not have continuing impacts on the professional lives of participants. In a broader context, the results of this follow-up study could inform the field of faculty development in general by putting forward suggestions for best practices in the planning of faculty development programs.

Specifically, as I discuss in Chapter Two, there is a call in the literature for long-term follow-up evaluations of faculty development programs. This study contributed to answering that call.

Chapter Two: Review of Related Research

Introduction

The purpose of this program evaluation research was to explore the long-term impact of a faculty development program on participants. Most faculty development programs have some type of evaluation component, but most often those evaluations are administered during or immediately following the program. Through a four-level evaluation model developed by Kirkpatrick (1975), this study explored the effects of a faculty development program on participants who are four or five years post-program.

This review focuses on several areas of literature that are relevant to the study topic. The main body of literature relates to faculty development itself and will contribute to a better understanding of what this field entails, how it has evolved over the years, and why it is necessary. This review also encompasses literature related to early career faculty and the challenges they face. Varying thoughts on theoretical underpinnings of faculty development are also addressed, concluding with a brief literature review of program evaluation.

Faculty Development

Definition of Faculty Development

Faculty development has become a part of most educational systems. Broadly, the term faculty development is used to describe activities that focus on the many roles of faculty in the current educational environment. These roles can encompass teaching, research, scholarship, and service within the educational system as well as the community (Amundsen et al., 2005).

In the field of higher education, the definition of faculty development has changed little over the past several decades. Although multiple definitions of the term can be found throughout educational literature, many of them are similar and refer to the enhancement of faculty performance and the improvement of the quality of teaching in a college or university setting (Alstete, 2000; Camblin & Steger, 2000; Wallin, 2003).

A current and widely accepted definition of faculty development comes from the website of the Professional and Organizational Development Network (2007), which states that faculty development:

> . . . generally refers to those programs which focus on the individual faculty member. The most common focus for programs of this type is the faculty member as a teacher . . . . A second focus of such programs is the faculty member as a scholar and a professional . . . . A third area on which faculty development programs focus is the faculty member as a person.

Evolution of Faculty Development

Historically, institutions of higher education hired faculty to teach and serve within their organizations. Camblin and Steger (2000) traced the origins of faculty development to sabbatical leaves dating as far back as the 1800's. For many decades after that, faculty development generally focused on advancing competence and mastery in one's discipline, with the idea being that the more one knew about a subject the better one could teach it. Eventually, some institutions began to offer professional development for faculty in the form of orientations, academic leaves, course load reductions, and limited workshops on teaching effectiveness.

By the early 1900's, faculty expectations began to include expertise, visibility, and national recognition within their specific disciplines. Eventually, the opportunities and need for external funding prompted institutions to increase the emphasis on research as a large part of the faculty members' academic obligations (Leslie, 2002). It is no surprise, then, that as faculty were increasingly recruited and required to spend much of their time applying for and receiving research dollars for their institutions, the focus on teaching began to fade.

O'Meara (2006) notes that by the 1980's, the general public was becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the state of higher education. They questioned the priorities of the American faculty, which seemed more and more to revolve around the "pursuit of esoteric research" (p. 43). Research began to evolve as the standard for rewards and recognition for faculty careers at many institutions. The growing consumerist attitude of college and university students, the explosion of the computer age and a technology savvy society, and the call for some type of accountability from universities and their faculty prompted the higher education community to make a serious reassessment of their responsibilities in providing a quality education for students.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2007a), the percentage of high school graduates who enroll in college increased from 52.7% in 1972 to 66.5% in 2005. In addition, enrollment at institutions of higher education in the fall of 2007 reached 18 million, setting an all time record for admissions. NCES projects that enrollment in higher education will increase by another 14% between the fall of 2007 and 2016 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007b). College graduates expect to complete their programs fully prepared for their careers and able to find employment

positions in their respective fields. As the cost of higher education continued to rise at a rate of almost 6% per year (Baum & Ma, 2007; Tuition Inflation, 2008) and students began to enter their educational experiences with a consumerist attitude (Blumberg, 2008; Fairchild et al., 2005; Melear, 2003), the public began to demand accountability for the education provided by colleges and universities. As a result of that public accountability, colleges and universities raised the performance expectations and standards of their faculty in all three areas of their professional lives: teaching, research, and service (Rosser, 2004).

To address those elevated expectations, leaders in the field like Boyer (1990) suggested that in addition to research-related activities, there were other contributions that faculty made to their professions, namely the contributions they made to teaching, to their discipline, and to their institutional and community environments. Thus, concerned educators began to look beyond the research agendas of most institutions to formulate alternate ways to justify, document, and recognize the multiple contributions of faculty in higher education.

If institutions of higher education were going to recognize and reward behaviors other than research - like the time-honored activity of teaching - then there had to be some means of providing training and resources for faculty to earn these new rewards. As a result, the field of faculty development began to be regarded differently. The latter part of the 1990's became a pivotal time for reassessing faculty development strategies. The rising costs of higher education, shifting demographics, competition for student admissions, and a general change in professional expectations put the quality of education, and ultimately the quality of the teaching faculty, in the spotlight. University

administrations realized that the faculty development programs that were in place were no longer meeting the needs of contemporary society. From this mini-crisis came the awareness that faculty development needed to expand beyond merely enhancing an individual's expertise in a field to including personal and professional development within the discipline, within the institution, and within the community.

Necessity of Faculty Development

The changing face of the university culture and of academic environments emphasized the need for faculty development in higher education. The increasingly diverse student populations, the societal demand for measurable outcomes, the growing competition from other educational resources like alternative colleges and online education, and the explosion of technological advances in the academic community are just a few of the challenges that faculty face. Faculty development is the vehicle that can provide opportunities to address and support the continually changing landscape of higher education (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006).

Faculty development is necessary for the faculty themselves. The prevailing sense in higher education is that research is what counts and is what is rewarded. Interestingly, a recent study analyzed raw data from the 1993 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (Leslie, 2002) and found that as an undifferentiated population, these higher education faculty members agreed that "teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion" (p. 56). Leslie infers that these results point to teaching as "the principle value of the academic profession" (p. 56). One might surmise, then, that professional development that supports teaching would be supporting the interests and needs of faculty.

The goals that faculty set for their careers are influenced by several factors (Kaya, Webb, & Weber, 2005). Gender, institutional mission, discipline, and departmental emphasis all contribute to the scholarly goals of faculty, which generally relate to research, teaching, and service. Kaya et al. found that as the emphasis of departments and institutions shifted, so did the goals of the faculty. As an institution's focus on teaching goals increased, faculty members' attainment of teaching goals followed. Similar results were found in relation to research and service goals. Thus, incorporating professional development that focuses on teaching has the potential to shift faculty goals to include teaching.

Faculty development is critical for institutional stability. Several studies of faculty morale, quality of work life, satisfaction, and, ultimately, intentions to stay or leave their institutions identified multiple factors that contribute to faculty retention (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Rosser, 2004, 2005). These researchers extensively reviewed available literature and then conducted their own research on the relationships between faculty morale, quality of work life, satisfaction, and intention to leave an institution or academia in general. Although much of the prior research measured faculty quality of work life at one point in time, Rosser's 2005 study further indicated that faculty perceptions of the quality of their work life is a construct that is stable over time. These researchers discovered that the quality of faculty work life contributes both to faculty morale and satisfaction, which in turn greatly influences a faculty member's intention to leave an institution or even academia in general.

A faculty member's quality of work life can be measured in three areas (Rosser, 2004): technical and administrative support, committee and service work, and

professional development. Professional development in the form of sabbaticals, monetary and nonmonetary resource allocation, and support for attendance at professional development seminars are just a few examples of issues that continue to be important to faculty and influence their intention to remain at or leave an institution.

Institutions of higher education continue to become more and more accountable to the public for the workload and productivity of the faculty, and so it is becoming crucial for institutions to raise the standards of faculty performance in all three areas of their professional lives: teaching, research, and service (Rosser, 2004). Rosser found evidence that adequate support and funding for the professional development of faculty members contributes to their retention and noted that some researchers think that "faculty development should be the engine that drives a campus mission" (p. 287). Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) posit that it is the responsibility of institutions to “attend to those aspects of faculty work life that faculty members value” (p. 537). Research suggests, then, that professional development should be at the forefront of institutional and administrative agendas.

Faculty will focus on those activities that are expected and valued by their institution. Building on this perspective, O’Meara (2006) believes that faculty will integrate developmental areas like the scholarship of teaching into their academic lives if institutions value and reward it. Looking at institutions whose policy changes shifted to reflect a recognition and reward system for scholarship and teaching activities, O’Meara’s research indicates an increase in faculty involvement in the scholarship of teaching activities. Those institutions also saw an increase in faculty satisfaction, which also has a positive effect on faculty retention.

Arreola, Theall, and Aleamoni (2003) suggest that faculty are often evaluated on their performances in areas that are outside their content expertise. For example, a biologist may be evaluated on teaching effectiveness, when in fact that faculty member may never have had any exposure to teaching methods or strategies. In these instances, institutions must provide resources in the manner of faculty development that allow the faculty member opportunities to acquire knowledge in educational methods.

Camblin and Steger (2000) concluded that "faculty development is a significant key to the success of higher education" (p. 16). They base their conclusion on results from the institutionally sponsored professional development grant program made available to faculty at the University of Cincinnati. The surveyed faculty indicated that the institutional support for faculty development resulted in enhanced pedagogical and technical skills and an increase in course changes and collaborations with colleagues outside of their disciplines. The faculty and administration at the University of Cincinnati went one step further and recommended that the strategic vision of the university should include faculty development. Eib and Miller (2006) believe that a carefully designed faculty development program is the appropriate vehicle for creating a campus culture that supports teaching and collegiality across academic organizations. From a pragmatic point of view, Gardiner (2000) warns that non-traditional educational organizations that employ trained educators to develop and implement instruction may be able to provide a higher quality educational experience than established institutions of higher education with untrained faculty and traditional methods. Gardiner infers that competition from these non-traditional organizations necessitates professional development for every

higher education teacher in order to keep our colleges and universities viable in the years to come.

Most graduate programs do not include the pedagogy of teaching in their curriculum (Kreber, 2001). Although graduate students may complete their courses of study with expertise in their fields, many are not equipped with the skills needed to teach their own classes. Kreber suggests that teaching pedagogy be included in graduate programs. Until that happens, it follows that the responsibility then falls to the hiring institutions to provide opportunities in the form of faculty development for new faculty to be exposed to and learn how to teach.

Implementation of Faculty Development Programs

A review of the literature indicates the evolution of a variety of formats for faculty development. Amundsen et al. (2005) examined three separate literature reviews that focused on how faculty development has been implemented in the past. These earlier reviews documented the implementation of faculty development activities that were prevalent during the 1960s to the 1980s, the 1980s, and then the 1990s respectively. Broadly, Amundsen et al. note that in the 1960s, the most prevalent type of faculty development was the workshop or seminar, sometimes lasting a few hours or even a day, but generally offered on a one time basis. By the late 1980s, workshops and seminars still prevailed as the most popular faculty development activity, but individual consultations, peer review, and feedback began to emerge as valuable activities. In addition, longer workshops and seminars, sometimes with follow-up activities, began to be implemented. As the year 2000 approached, examples of faculty development activities broadened to

include professional consultations, interventions, workshops and seminars, mentoring programs, and action research.

The implementation of faculty development activities can be tracked not only on a timeline but across a variety of disciplines. The medical profession has long relied on faculty development programs as hands-on training for novice professionals. Nine monthly half-day workshops that focus on teaching skills (Knight, Cole, Kern, Barker, & Wright, 2005), two-year programs that emphasize academic productivity and encourage insitutional retention (Morzinski & Simpson, 2003), and seminars, short courses, fellowships, and mentoring (Steinert, 2000) are just a few instances that can be found in faculty development literature within the medical field. Educators in the field of engineering developed the Engineering Education Coalition to create and implement methods to enhance professors' teaching practices (Brawner, Felder, Allen, & Brent, 2002). The MESSAGE framework (Froyd, Fowler, Layne, & Simpson, 2005), which addresses the importance of improving engineering education, focuses on methods of self-regulated learning that include workshops, discussions, group interactions, reflection, and active participation. A faculty development program aimed at improving teaching, building community, and decreasing isolation was offered to the faculty in a social work department (Eib & Miller, 2006), and educational administrators experimented with one-time workshops, incentives, and extended seminars to provide developmental activites to history professors (Meacham & Ludwig, 1997). Faculty development programs that offer opportunities to faculty across disciplines abound and are too numerous to cite. The Univeristy of Missouri New Faculty Teaching Scholars Program, which is the focus of this evaluation, falls into that category.

Outcomes of Faculty Development Programs

There are many documented evaluations of faculty development programs in the literature, and most reported outcomes are positive. Faculty who participated in these types of programs generally found them helpful in several different areas. They appreciated the opportunities to learn and implement classroom strategies that contribute to improved teaching and relevant learning for their students. Participants agreed that their teaching skills improved (Camblin & Steger, 2000; Davidson-Shivers, Salazar, & Hamilton, 2005; Pittas, 2000) and they were more confident and satisfied with their teaching (Knight, Carrese, & Wright, 2007). They also valued the collegial relationships that often developed through these programs. Participants established social and professional relationships with peers and mentors (Pittas; Morzinski & Fisher, 2002), created cooperative partnerships across disciplines (Camblin & Steger), and enhanced personal communication with colleagues (Knight et al.).

Participating faculty also acknowledged that faculty development programs contributed to the forward movement of their professional careers. They noted that these development programs positively influenced their career paths by offering them perspectives on what to expect from their chosen careers and suggestions for structuring their careers for success and advancement (Knight et al., 2007) and encouraged their continual growth as faculty members (Pittas, 2000). Some faculty acquired professional recognition through national teaching or educational awards (Knight et al., 2005), and others exhibited higher incidences of retention, leadership positions, and peer-reviewed presentations and publications (Morzinski & Simpson, 2003).

Based on the Strategic Plan set forth by the University of Missouri System (Pacheco, 2001) and the goals of the New Faculty Teaching Scholars program (New Faculty Teaching Scholars, 2004), the yearly evaluations of the NFTS program generally reflect the outcomes found in the literature. At the end of each program year, participants completed a comprehensive evaluation of the activities, the content, and the perceived effect of the program on their professional development. During the seven years of the program, 395 faculty members attended and completed the program. Of those faculty participants, 74% responded to an end of program evaluative survey. Those participants agreed that NFTS had a positive impact on their teaching (average agreement 89%), their collegial relationships (average agreement 89%), and their professional development as related to promotion and tenure (average agreement 57% for the three years that issue was surveyed). These data are compiled from the annual evaluation reports from each program year (University of Missouri System, 2001-2008).

Importance of Evaluating Faculty Development Programs

Incorporating evaluation as a component in program planning sets the stage for providing data related to the creation, continuation, or improvement of the program to interested or responsible parties (Rossi, Freeman, & Lipsey, 1999). As with any program, evaluations of faculty development initiatives are critical to success. As Steinert (2000) so appropriately stated, "…the evaluation of faculty development is more than an academic exercise. Research must inform practice, and our findings must be used in the design, delivery, and marketing of our programs" (p. 49).

Importance of Follow-Up Evaluation

The majority of faculty development program evaluations are one-time assessments implemented upon the completion of a program, whether it was a one-day workshop or a year-long series. There are fewer documented evaluations that track the long-term impact of these programs on the participants. In fact, there is a call for long-term evaluations of faculty development programs in the relevant literature (Knight et al., 2007; Morzinski, & Simpson, 2003; Steinert, 2000). For the purposes of this study, the terms "follow-up evaluation" and "long-term evaluation" are used interchangeably to indicate an evaluation that takes place not immediately, but after a given amount of time has passed after program completion.

It is important and often valuable to get a "snapshot" assessment of the impact of a program at its conclusion. It is equally important to explore the long-term effects of a program on participants to see if and how they are transferring any recently acquired skills and knowledge to their current professional situation. For example, the initial effect of training may fade over time, given participants are no longer in an ideal and supportive environment. In other instances, there may be a delay in participants' implementation of newly acquired training. Some participants may not see an immediate effect from a program, but may realize significant positive outcomes at a later date. Consequently, a follow-up evaluation of a program not only explores the continuing effects of a program, but also has the potential to identify effects only experienced after the program has ended.

Early Career Faculty

Faculty development is an important aspect within the university community. Although faculty development can be beneficial at all levels of the university organization, it can be particularly helpful in serving the interests of early career faculty. Tangentially, serving the interests of early career faculty bears on the interests of university administrators as well.

Importance of Faculty Development to Early Career Faculty

Three consistent concerns of new faculty were identified by Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin (2000) in their extensive "Heeding New Voices" study: lack of a comprehensible tenure system, lack of community, and lack of an integrated professional and personal life. The expectations that face new faculty members are daunting, and early career faculty often must juggle complex and conflicting responsibilities. They are expected to understand and work within the organizational structures and values of their university communities while performing and advancing in their profession (Sorcinelli, 1994).

Faculty often describe the first three years of their academic careers as difficult and categorize those years as filled with high stress and low satisfaction. Early career faculty struggle with identifying and satisfying institutional expectations, developing and establishing collegial networks, and balancing the time demands of multiple job responsibilities (Olsen, 1993). Millis (1994) comments on the institutional demands on new faculty to carry heavy teaching responsibilities and to participate in service committees, all the while staying abreast of the current issues in their field.

There are many research studies that not only identify high stress issues for early career faculty but conclude that faculty development programs can alleviate these anxiety-provoking barriers and contribute to a sense of accomplishment, recognition, and ultimately job satisfaction for early career faculty. As Rosser (2004) explains, institutions often expect junior faculty to "hit the ground running" (p. 303). Institutions assume that new faculty members will find time to solicit external funding for research projects and teaching assistants, stay abreast of technology and instructional development in their fields, and devote time and resources to service work within their institutions and communities - all the while keeping up with teaching responsibilities and their personal lives. Olsen (1993) finds that new faculty often experienced a decreasing sense of collegiality among their superiors and peers over the first few years in their position, which is exactly the time frame in which support is most important.

On the constructive side, research by Hagedorn (2000) confirms that positive relationships with supervisors were a satisfying element of new faculty's experiences and Sorcinelli and Yun (2007) reaffirm the model of mentoring networks as a way to address many of the issues faced by early career faculty. Olsen's research (1993) produced evidence that social, intellectual, and physical resource support is critical for early career faculty and can greatly contribute to overall satisfaction with their positions. Sorcinelli's (1994) findings imply that early career faculty would benefit from a collegial and intellectually supportive academic community. These implications are based on Sorcinelli's own as well as several other studies in which new faculty suggest that programs contributing to their professional development as teachers and scholars, that

facilitate collegial relationships, and that expose them to a variety of resources would be very helpful.

Importance of Faculty Development to Institutions

From the institution's side of the table, common sense dictates that satisfied, successful new faculty members who are supported and move competently through the tenure or promotion processes are more likely to stay on at a university. Recruiting and replacing faculty members is a costly endeavor that requires a substantial amount of financial and human resources. Providing environments that support faculty retention can be beneficial for those who hire, as well as for those who are hired (Menges, 1999; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000; Sorcinelli, 1994).

As documented by Project Kaleidoscope's Core Institution Task Force (2002), an institution's fixed financial investment in the 30 year salary of a life science faculty member is approximately 3 million dollars. Non-fixed investments, such as merit awards, achievement recognition, professional development, sabbaticals, workshops, and related expenses generally total approximately 20 per cent of the fixed investment. Interestingly, institutions often allocate and spend a proportionally larger percentage of the fixed investment on faculty in their pre-tenure years, even though a return on the institutional investment doesn't really come until later in a faculty member's career, when the faculty member is retained and flourishing at the institution. Resources that support early career faculty through tenure or promotion potentially groom them to become successful academics and committed employees of the institution. This can result in continuity and strengthening of scholarly activities and university programs, effective faculty who competitively seek external support, funding, and positive visibility in the professional

community, and, ultimately, an increase in attracting and retaining other competent faculty and students.

Theoretical Foundations of Faculty Development

Faculty development is not a theoretical concept in itself. In fact, the case has been made that there is not a single clearly defined theory that supports faculty development (Alstete, 2000), nor is there a "grand or unifying theory" (Wallin, 2003, p. 319). However, educational researchers and faculty development professionals apply various theoretical foundations to their interpretations of what makes the concept of faculty development work. Examples of several theoretical propositions follow.

Motivational Theory

Faculty development has been placed within the realm of motivational theory. Wallin (2003) posits that the guiding force behind faculty members striving to improve their professional and academic lives is some type of motivation, suggesting that the motivating factors can be intrinsic or extrinsic.

Although the body of research on theories of motivation is very extensive and too broad to discuss here, Ryan and Deci (2000) state simply that "to be motivated means to be moved to do something" (p. 54). In their review of classic definitions and new directions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, Ryan and Deci reiterate the distinctions between the two types of motivators, but at the same time acknowledge the shift away from categorizing all extrinsic motivation as "pale and impoverished" (p. 55). In his seminal work on intrinsic motivation, Deci (1975) posits that intrinsically motivated behavior comes from a person's need for feeling competent and self-determining. Ryan and Deci note that intrinsic motivation has become an important part of education and

often results in quality learning and creativity. They also explain that in a classic case of extrinsic motivation, a person can feel externally propelled to perform an action, sometimes with resentment or resistance. However, one can also react to external forces with a willingness that accepts and recognizes the value of the task. Thus extrinsic motivators can also be employed as useful strategies in education.

According to Wallin's (2003) inquiry, then, effective faculty development programs are grounded in motivation theory and provide appropriate motivators, whether intrinsic or extrinsic, to ensure success for the participants.

Learner-Centered Theory

This concept is validated in learner-centered approaches to faculty development (Daley, 2003; Froyd, Fowler, Layne, & Simpson, 2005). In 1990, the Task Force on Education was appointed by the American Psychological Association (APA) (McCombs, 2000). Among the goals of the Task Force was the intent to integrate educational and psychological theories into a set of general principles to guide school redesign and reform. This work resulted in a set of 14 Learner-Centered Psychological Principles**.** These learner-centered principles are grouped into four research-validated areas, which include cognitive and metacognitive factors, developmental and social factors, individual difference factors, and motivational and affective factors (APA Work Group of the Board of Educational Affairs, 1997, November). Understanding these four areas and their individual principles lays the foundation for learner-centered practices in schools.

Looking holistically at the principles also produces the following definition of learner-centered: A perspective that combines a focus on individual learners with a focus on learning (McCombs, 2001). McCombs (2002) explains that learner-centered education

places the learner in the center of instructional decision-making by recognizing the individual needs and characteristics of each learner and acknowledging a shared responsibility by teacher and student for knowledge acquisition in a rigorous and challenging environment.

Froyd et al. (2005) note that the current evolution of learner-centered teaching in the classroom, which suggests that students take an active and responsible role in their learning (Weimer, 2003) and make their learning part of themselves (Chickering & Gamson, 1987), should logically be partnered with a learner-centered approach to faculty development. From her own participation in a variety of professional development workshops, Daley (2003) concludes that providing faculty the opportunities to "develop the ability to learn from experience, to integrate knowledge, and to think reflectively" (p. 29) is the strength of a learner-centered approach to faculty development.

Social Constructivism

The constructivist paradigm has also found its place in faculty development theories. Viewing faculty development through the lens of constructivism affirms that participants construct their own theories of learning based on their own knowledge and experiences (Layne, Froyd, Simpson, Caso, & Merton, 2004). Social constructivism is a variation of the constructivist theory. Vygotsky (1978) proposed a theoretical framework for social constructivism that suggests learning does not take place in isolation but rather collaboratively in a social environment. He states that development and learning take place on two levels, first on the social level and then on the individual level. Vygotsky's theory also incorporates a concept known as the zone of proximal development (ZPD). According to Vygotsky, learners are in the ZPD when academic environments include a

social aspect and where interactions occur between others who possess a more advanced level of knowledge or experience than the learners. He posits that this ZPD gives learners an opportunity to attain a more advanced skill or knowledge level than if they were alone.

An analysis of the structure of the faculty development program being explored in this study, the University of Missouri New Faculty Teaching Scholars Program, revealed that it incorporated strategies from all three of these theoretical paradigms. Both the motivational paradigm and the social constructivist paradigm can be viewed through the lens of learner-centered teaching and the Learner-Centered Psychological Principles. In learner-centered teaching, motivation to learn is identified as an important principle that that can influence the breadth and depth of what is learned. Social constructivism can also be connected to learner-centered teaching, which recognizes that social interactions, interpersonal relationships, and communication with others all contribute to learning. Throughout each program year, motivated participants gathered as a community to explore and reflect on their own knowledge base, to listen and learn from others' experiences, and to construct new knowledge by incorporating what they know and have learned from others into a new knowledge base.

Program Evaluation

Definition of Program Evaluation

Program evaluation is an essential process that provides program stakeholders with a wide range of information and data. An evaluation can identify, clarify, and apply defensible criteria that will help determine the worth or merit of a program (Worthen, Sanders, & Fitzpatrick, 1997). The data collected through an evaluation can be used to revise and improve a program as it develops. It can also provide valid findings that

inform the decisions of program administrators about the viability, worth, or continuation of a program (Rossi et al., 1999).

As Worthen et al. (1997) explain, evaluations can be informal or formal. Informal evaluations generally rely on the experiences, instincts, and observations of program stakeholders, but lack the rigor and systematic planning of formal evaluations. In many instances, informal evaluations are used to review the progress of a program and revise and improve it as it unfolds. Formal evaluations are structured and employ specific principles, methods, and implementation guidelines. Formal evaluations are often used in a summative manner to aid program administrators in making decisions about the value, effectiveness, or continuation of a program.

Internally implemented evaluations are often conducted by those directly involved in the program and who are very familiar with program details and history. Because of their familiarity with the program, internal evaluators are able to convey evaluation results in an understandable manner to program stakeholders, but run the risk of biased judgments and sometime questionable credibility of results. Externally implemented evaluations are conducted by individuals with no stake in the program. External evaluators offer a broad experience in evaluation and bring an objective point of view to the evaluation. A well implemented external evaluation objectively conveys program issues and outcomes in a manner that is understandable and beneficial to all program stakeholders and will couch the results in the broader context of the program topic.

Above all, competent program evaluations must comply with the Standards for Program Evaluation (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994). Patton (1997) emphasizes that evaluators must embrace responsibility for these standards,

which require evaluations to meet four criteria: utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy. Utility suggests that the results will be useful to the program stakeholders, and feasibility infers that the time frame for the evaluation will be manageable and will produce useable information in a timely manner. Propriety demands that the evaluation be conducted in a responsible and ethical manner, and accuracy requires that the evaluation be based on correct and adequate results.

Properties of the Current Evaluative Study

This program evaluation was a formal, summative exploration of the impact of NFTS on participants five years after completing the program. I based my design of this evaluation on a model of training evaluation developed by Kirkpatrick (Kirkpatrick, 1975). I explain and address Kirkpatrick's model in Chapter Three. As an external evaluator, I offer an objective point of view with more than 10 years of experience in educational and general program evaluation, as well as a familiarity with the NFTS program during a six year period. This evaluation's utility to faculty, UM, and the field of faculty development lies in its potential to suggest best practices for planning programs like this one. I conducted this evaluation over the past year and now have the results available. I adhered to all ethical standards directed by the Standards for Program Evaluation and the Institutional Research Board of my university. I compiled the results accurately and reported them in a consumer friendly manner.

Summary of Chapter Two

The field of faculty development has evolved over time, shifting strategies and emphasis in response to both economic and societal norms. Many faculty development programs target early-career faculty, who are often in most need of guidance and support to navigate the pathways of their professional lives successfully. Although there is no single theoretical concept that guides the field of faculty development, models that include learner-centered, motivational, and constructivist theories can be found in the literature. In spite of the proliferation of a variety of faculty development strategies and programs, few follow-up evaluations assess the long-term impact of those programs. This evaluative study intended to fill that gap by exploring both the long-term impact of a faculty development program on participants and the integration of the faculty development experience into participants' professional lives. This study was also designed to inform and contribute to the field of faculty development.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Introduction

I used a qualitative methodology for this study. The choice of this methodology was based on the guiding questions and purpose of this study. While quantitative methods concentrate on testing specific hypotheses (Worthen et al., 1997) and generally seek "explanations and predictions that will generalize to other persons and places" (Thomas, 2003, p. 2), qualitative methods, including qualitative evaluations, "permit the evaluator to study selected issues in depth and detail" (Patton, 1990, p. 13). Studying a small number of cases enables qualitative researchers to generate detailed information that can lead to a better understanding of specific cases or of the topic being studied (Patton). Based on the guiding questions, the purpose of this study was not to predict or generalize the impact of the NFTS program on participants, but rather to explore in detail what types of impact the program had on participants and how those program experiences are affecting participants' current professional lives. Therefore, a qualitative methodology was the most appropriate choice for this study.

According to Patton (1990), qualitative methodology can encompass three types of data collection: interviews, observations, and document review. I incorporated each of these methods as data collection instruments. I reviewed existing evaluation reports to learn from the experiences of participants in the years selected for study. I randomly selected 12 participants from two years and interviewed them to learn how the NFTS program had affected them over the long-term. I also reviewed the CVs and one course syllabi of the interviewees and identified professional activities that reflect and support their interview responses. I observed in the classrooms of two participants from the study.

These data points served as a triangulation of the data sources. Review of the evaluation responses indicated what the program participants reported they initially learned. The interviews with selected participants, the review of their CVs and course syllabi, and the classroom observations provided evidence of the impact the NFTS program had on their professional lives and how that initial impact continued to affect their professional behaviors.

Design

Kirkpatrick's Model

I used a model of training evaluation developed by Kirkpatrick (Kirkpatrick, 1975). His model continues to be a reliable standard for evaluating industry and business training programs. Kirkpatrick's evaluation model is based on four levels of measurement: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. He agrees that measuring any one of these program stages is informative, but states that an evaluation of all four levels provides a more complete picture of the effectiveness of a program. Kirkpatrick explains the four levels of evaluation in the following way.

> Level 1 – Reaction: This initial evaluation process "measures how those who participate in the program react to it" (Kirkpatrick, 1998, p. 19). The supposition is that people must generally like a training program to benefit from it and that interested and enthusiastic participants gain the most from training.
>
> Level 2 – Learning: This portion of the evaluation determines what the participants understood and absorbed. Kirkpatrick's model posits that learning takes place when one or more of these three conditions result: "participants change attitudes, improve knowledge, and/or increase skill" (Kirkpatrick, p. 20).

Level 3 – Behavior: This level of the evaluation model focuses on "the extent to which change in behavior has occurred because the participant attended the training program" (Kirkpatrick, p. 20). In this model, the application of learning is referred to as "transfer of training" (Kirkpatrick, p. 23), which examines how involvement in the program changed the relevant behavior of the participants.

Level 4 – Results: The last process in this four level model is to identify the end-products, which are the "final results that occurred because the participants attended the program" (Kirkpatrick, p. 23). These results should be related to the objectives of the program itself and can encompass individual, departmental, or organizational goals.

Kirkpatrick's (1998) model has been very successful in evaluating training programs in business and industry. His model has also been identified as applicable to academic evaluations. For example, Boyle and Crosby (1997) suggest that Kirkpatrick's four evaluation levels provide an equally appropriate model for evaluating programs of study at the higher education level. They propose that level one, reaction, could be measured by identifying students' likes or dislikes of a course through end of course surveys. Level two, learning, could be reviewed through some form of student mid-term and end of course examinations. Level three, application, could be assessed through student internships, practicums, and work experience programs, and level four, results, might be measured by student successes competing in the job market. Boyle and Crosby agree that utilizing an evaluation model like Kirkpatrick's could provide program-related data to ensure the support and success of educational courses of study.

Naugle, Naugle, and Naugle (2000) make a case for utilizing the Kirkpatrick (1998) model to evaluate the performance of teachers at all educational levels. Following the four level evaluation model, they suggest that the first level, reaction, can be gauged by collecting student feedback about the teacher's instructional and classroom management style. Level two, learning, could be measured through a comparison of students' pre and post course assessments, which already take place in many academic settings. The third level, behavior, would refer to the transfer of learning. This could be determined by reviewing how students apply newly learned skills to solve comparable problems in other settings. The final level, results, is challenging to measure in education. Naugle et al. suggest that educational systems develop follow-up procedures to assess the success of students' overall instruction after exiting the school system. They posit that school systems can gauge the effectiveness of teachers and the educational system as a whole through the implementation of Kirkpatrick's four level evaluation model.

The two examples above provide suggestions for implementing Kirkpatrick's four level model of evaluation in educational settings. Morzinski and Simpson (2003), however, applied Kirkpatrick's four level model to evaluate the longitudinal outcomes of a faculty development program for family medical practitioners. Morzinski and Simpson assessed the reaction level of the model by examining the program session evaluations and attendance data of the participants. They used a retrospective pre-data and post-data collection approach to evaluate the learning level of the model. In the retrospective approach, participants are asked to evaluate their learning at the end of the training by first retrospectively identifying pre-program competencies followed by identifying post-program competencies. Some researchers found that using retrospective pre and post-

training self-ratings is often more efficient and can be a more accurate assessment of learning than the standard pre-post evaluation method (Koele & Hoogstraten, 1988; Levinson, Gordon, & Skeff, 1990). Analysis of organizational change and projects that involved program participants provided a means to assess behavior changes, the third level of the evaluation model. In addition, Morzinski and Simpson analyzed the curriculum vitae of the participants to identify ways in which the training affected participants' careers, another indicator of behavior changes. They used retention in academic medicine, which was a benchmark of program success, as a measure of the model's forth level, results.

I addressed the guiding questions of this research using Kirkpatrick's model in the following manner:

1. *Reaction – What did the selected participants think about the retreats and campus events?*

   I reviewed and summarized the annual evaluation reports from the two years selected for this study, which reflected the participants' perceptions about the respective program years. During the interviews, I also asked the study participants to reflect on their thoughts about the program during their participation year.

2. *Learning – What did the selected participants learn? Did the selected participants learn more about teaching? Did their attitudes about teaching change? Did they learn additional skills?*

   I reviewed and summarized the annual evaluation reports from the two years selected for this study, which included participant responses to these questions.

During the interviews, I also asked the study participants to retrospectively relate what they learned from the program.

3. *Behavior – How has the professional behavior of the selected participants changed? How is it different? Did it change in the classroom? Did it change in relation to peers? Did it change their professional activities?*

   This level of the evaluation model was addressed during the in-depth interviews with study participants. I also reviewed their CVs and syllabi and made two classroom observations.

4. *Results - How has the NFTS program impacted the selected participants, their departments, their campus, or the university?*

   This level of the evaluation model was addressed during the in-depth interviews with participants.

Participants and Sample Size

I used purposeful random sampling to select participants for this study. Patton (1990) states that the intention of purposeful sampling is to select information rich cases that will illuminate the study topic in depth. He lists 16 qualitative purposeful sampling strategies, including purposeful random sampling. He notes that purposeful random sampling can be used when the purposeful sample is too large to manage and describes that strategy in the following manner. In qualitative research, using a small sample that is purposefully selected for in-depth exploration of a topic does not mean the sampling strategy cannot be random. Randomizing participant selection from even small samples substantially increases the credibility of results. Randomly selecting participants from even a small population indicates that the researcher is reporting on data *in advance of*

knowing the outcomes. Patton states that it is critical to understand that this is a purposeful random sample, not a representative random sample. The purpose of a small random sample is to offer credibility to the data, not representativeness or generalization to other populations.

I utilized purposeful random sampling to select faculty members who participated in and completed the NFTS program during the 2004 and 2005 academic years. This made those program participants four or five years post program. One reason behind selecting this group of participants is based on their career timeline. Most participants are selected for the program in their second year at the University. Based on the tenure track timeline of five years, most of the participants were either immediately approaching or past the tenure target date. Since tenure is the goal of most faculty members, this point in time was a logical time for participants to reflect on their career paths and what kinds of resources supported them. A second reason to select this group of participants is program continuity specifically related to program goals, content, and presenters. Although the basic structure of the NFTS program did not change, program administrators have revised the program goals over the years. However, the goals for the two years selected for this study are the same. Similarly, program administrators modified content over the years to better support the needs of the participants. The program content for these two years is almost identical. In addition, the program administrators also utilized a variety of presenters to facilitate the program retreats. Again, the presenters for the two years selected for this study are the same. These reasons make the NFTS experiences for the targeted participant groups very similar from the programmatic point of view.

Approximately 50 faculty members participate in the NFTS program each academic year, and targeting these two program years provided 106 faculty members as potential participants. Since face-to-face interviews and classroom observations were part of data collection, only faculty participants from the 2004 and 2005 NFTS program who were still employed by UM were included in this study. Of the 106 faculty members who participated in the NFTS program during the targeted years, 89 were still employed at the university.

Three participants from each of the four UM campus NFTS groups were randomly selected as potential participants, which resulted in a sample size of 12. There is minimal guidance regarding the number of interviews needed in qualitative research. After an extensive review of academic and medical literature, Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) found little help in determining the sample size for qualitative research. As a result, they conducted their own study on data saturation in qualitative interviewing. They conclude that 12 interviews generally suffice when a researcher's intention is to explore the common perceptions and experiences of a relatively homogeneous group of individuals. This supports my reasoning to include 12 selected participants in this study.

IRB Approval

I submitted an expedited review application to the University of Missouri-St. Louis College of Education representative and subsequently submitted the final application to the University of Missouri-St. Louis Office of Research Administration following that approval. Because I intended to interview NFTS participants from the three other UM campuses, I also submitted expedited review applications to the

appropriate offices on the other three campuses: Kansas City, Rolla, and Columbia. All four campuses approved my research applications prior to beginning my data collection.

Instruments

This study used three types of instruments to collect data that are inherent in qualitative research and evaluation: document review, interviews, and observations (Patton, 1990). These three data collection methods provided information to meet all four levels of the evaluation model.

Document Review

In many instances, evaluators can utilize existing information that is relevant to an evaluation (Worthen et al., 1997). I used document review to examine the existing evaluations of the NFTS program from both years selected for this study (University of Missouri System, 2001-2008). These evaluation reports partially answered the first two levels of the evaluation model: reaction and learning. As part of each yearly evaluation of NFTS, participants were asked what they thought of the program itself. Participants were also asked to reflect on what they learned from the program. Because I was employed as the program evaluator for NFTS and administered these evaluations, I am familiar with the program and with the evaluation data. This familiarity was an asset in reviewing and interpreting the evaluation documents. I reviewed the responses to these specific questions from the evaluations:

1. What was the overall value of the NFTS program?
2. How has NFTS changed the way you think about teaching?
3. How has NFTS changed the way you teach?

Using document review again, I examined the CVs of those selected participants who agreed to participate in the interviews. Morzinski and Schubot (2000) developed a strategy to utilize CVs as part of an evaluation of a faculty development program. They posit that CVs include valuable information about the activities of faculty members and that CV reviews provide a non-invasive evaluative method. In addition, they state that reviewing CVs eliminates the necessity of constructing and administering another instrument. Morzinski and Schubot developed a template and subsequent categories to code entries on the CVs and then compared CV activities for pre-program, program experience, and post-program year activities that matched the goals of that particular faculty development program.

Although I used the same general idea to examine the CVs of the selected participants, I did not compare CV activities over time. In keeping with the qualitative methodology of this study, I did not use a checklist of relevant activities as a type of comparison guide. Rather, I identified any post-program professional activities that related to teaching and learning. For example, I noted publications or presentations that pointed to a professional interest in improving or sharing effective classroom strategies. I used those entries as possible discussion points during the interviews and as potential supporting evidence for interview responses. The CV review also identified several participants' professional activities not mentioned in the interviews that indicate an ongoing interest and commitment to improving teaching and learning in the classroom.

I also reviewed one course syllabus from each participant. I noted syllabus information that aligned with classroom behavior changes that resulted from participation in the NFTS program.

Interviews

Interviews can be valuable instruments to explore, clarify, and obtain a greater depth of information (Worthen et al., 1997). Although some researchers agree that interviews conducted via telephone have become more common and accepted (Thomas, 2003; Weisberg, Krosnik, & Bowen, 1996), others posit that face-to-face interviews are preferred (Rossi et al., 1999). I conducted the interviews for this research face-to-face. Interviewing can provide sources of anticipated and unexpected information from selected participants. Patton (1990) explains that the "purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in and on someone else's mind (p. 278)." Patton goes on to say that qualitative interviewing assumes that the subject's perspective is "meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit (p. 278)." I used a general interview guide (see Appendix A), which is a flexible structure for presenting interview prompts. In this approach, the interviewer uses the guide as a checklist to address the relevant topics to be covered, while not requiring the questions or topics to be presented in any specific order. This allows the interviewee more freedom to express thoughts and ideas without the confining structure of a standardized interview.

Observations

I also used observation as a data collection method. As Patton (1990) states, the purpose of utilizing observational data is to provide a description of the observational setting, the activities and people who took part in those activities, and the meaning of what was observed. In addition, when combined with other data collection methods, observational methods can reduce the disadvantage of self-report data by the direct observation of actions and behaviors (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

There are two main categories of observer involvement. Those two categories are identified by several different terms throughout the literature. Patton refers to the two categories as participant and onlooker, Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) use the terms participant observer and non-participant observer, and Worthen et al. (1997) reference the terms participant-as-observer and complete observer. The difference between these two types of observations is inherent in the words used to describe them. A participant observer becomes a part of the setting being studied when it is advantageous for the observer to actually experience what is happening or to blend in with other participants. Non-participant observers make no attempt to be part of the setting but rather focus on observing the setting itself and the actions and behaviors of the selected participants. The observations for this study were in the non-participant observer category. Again, in keeping with the qualitative methodology of this study, I did not use any type of checklist to compare or count teaching strategies. I observed and noted the classroom environment and activities and used that data to either support or supplement the other data points in the study.

Triangulation and Data Verification

One method of validating qualitative data is to triangulate findings, which combines different qualitative methods and uses multiple perspectives (Patton, 1990). Denzin (as cited by Patton, 1990) recognizes several types of triangulation, including data triangulation, which involves using a variety of sources in a study, and investigator triangulation, which uses multiple rather than a single observer or analyst.

I used data triangulation by reviewing the existing NFTS evaluation reports for participants' initial thoughts on the NFTS program. I also reviewed the study

participants' CVs to identify activities that relate to teaching and learning. I interviewed the study participants directly for their current perspectives on their own experiences in the program, and reviewed course syllabi and observed in the classrooms of several participating faculty members. The combination of these three types of data findings, document review, interviews, and observations, provided a broad and reinforcing perspective for the study results.

I also used data verification. I identified an external researcher who is familiar with the study topic but was not connected in any way to the program being evaluated. This external researcher reviewed approximately 10% of the interview data to identify themes and patterns. The external researcher used my initial coding sheet to review the data and suggested several additional codes to clarify some of the data. I revised my coding sheet based on some of the external researcher's suggestions.

When comparing my coding with that of the external researcher, I found that we agreed on approximately 75% of the coded data. Upon further review, I noted that we had coded some of the data in multiple categories. For example, I coded the use of a new technique in the classroom as a new instructional strategy while the external researcher coded that data point as an impact on the instructor. In addition, there were some data findings that either I did not code or the external reviewer did not code. This accounted for most of the 25% discrepancy in our coding. Of the 191 coded data points in the material that we both reviewed, I only questioned two coding items from the external researcher. After carefully reviewing both of our data coding, I was satisfied that the external researcher and I agreed on the coding themes and concluded that no additional

recoding was necessary. Patton (1990) notes that verification by multiple observers reduces the chances of bias in data collection and analysis.

Data Collection Procedures

Document Review of Existing Evaluations

I reviewed the completed annual evaluations of the NFTS faculty participants from the two years selected for this study. Since these evaluations were submitted anonymously, it is not possible to identify the evaluations of the NFTS participants who agreed to be part of this research**.** However, reviewing the feedback from the respective program years provided a general sense of what participants thought of the program and what they learned.

Identify, Contact, and Secure Participants

Using purposeful random selection, I solicited the participation of faculty who participated in and completed the NFTS program during the 2004 and 2005 academic years. Each of the four UM campuses were equally represented in this research. Using a random number table, I assigned numbers to each campus cohort and invited three individuals to participate. Although this type of sampling is termed random, it is still voluntary in the respect that an individual can self-select out of the research. In all, I contacted 28 of the 89 past NFTS faculty participants by an email letter (see Appendix B). If an individual declined to participate, I moved to the next random number selection from that campus cohort. If I did not hear back from an individual in two weeks, I resent the letter. Ten individuals declined to be part of the study by replying directly to me. I received no response from six individuals after the second letter, so I eliminated them by

default. That resulted in 12 individuals, three from each UM campus, who agreed to participate in this study.

Each participant signed a consent form (see Appendix C) and I assured them that their identity would remain confidential; therefore, I am providing only general characteristics of this research group. The list of faculty who participated in the NFTS program is available on the UM web site, and any additional information might make identities obvious. For that same reason, I chose to record participant responses anonymously, rather than give each participant a number and label responses with their respective numbers. That process could also result in the identification of participant identities. For these reasons and the purposes of this study, I will use the masculine pronoun for both male and female modifiers. The information below lists the gender, department, and current status of the 12 faculty members who participated in this study.

Demographic Information for NFTS Research Participants

Gender	
Male	6
Female	6
Department	
Anthropology	1
Biological Engineering	1
Business Information	1
Chemistry	1
Communication	1
Computer Science	1
Engineering	1
Law	1
Nursing	1
Dentistry	1
Social Work	1
Statistics	1

Teaching experience	
None	2
Taught as TA	2
Two years	2
Three years	1
Eight years	2
Nine or more years	2
Previous experience, years not known	1
Current UM Status	
Associate Professor	6
Assistant Professor	3
Non-tenure Track	2
No longer at UM	1

The NFTS participants who were randomly selected from the two targeted program years received an email letter of introduction from me explaining the reason for the communication. I included a brief description of my dissertation research topic, why it is important, and why their participation would be helpful. I asked the NFTS alums to consider participating in an interview to explore the long-term effects of the program on their current professional lives. I also asked them if I could review a copy of their most current and complete CV and a copy of a course syllabus.

Document Review of Curriculum Vitae (CV)

I requested a copy of the curriculum vitae from the NFTS participants who agreed to take part in the interviews. Based on the strategy used by Morzinski and Schubot (2000), I used inductive content analysis to review those CVs.

Interview Selected Participants

I traveled to the four UM campuses and conducted all of the interviews in person. The selected participants' responses are confidential, and I obtained permission to tape record the conversations. Recording allows for a more conversational interview. It also

makes the most efficient use of interview time, since taking written notes often results in asking interviewees to pause while the interviewer writes or asking interviewees to repeat a response for clarification. Recorded responses also assure accuracy, since they can be reviewed multiple times by the researcher. I offered to take notes on conversations with those participants who requested that their responses not be recorded.

Classroom Observations

When appropriate, I asked the selected participants if I could observe one of their classes. This was dependent on the selected participants' responses to the interview questions and their overall perceptions of the impact of the NFTS program on their teaching strategies. If an interviewee believed that NFTS has been a positive influence on their teaching strategies, I asked if I could observe that evidence in a classroom setting. If that was not possible, I asked the interviewee to share a course syllabus with me, which might provide evidence of innovative teaching and learning strategies. If an interviewee did not attribute improved teaching strategies to the NFTS program, a classroom observation was not indicated. The decision whether to observe in the classroom was made on a case by case basis and was a mutual agreement between myself and the interviewee.

Data Analysis

I used content analysis to analyze the results of this study. Unlike quantitative content analysis, which codes and counts data points, qualitative data analysis and interpretation involves organizing and categorizing data, making sense of the data, and presenting the findings in such a way that it answers the questions of the study (Patton, 1990). I used inductive analysis techniques, which allow for patterns, themes, and

categories to emerge from the data, rather than deductive analysis, which uses established patterns, categories, or themes to organize the data.

I used document review to analyze the existing evaluations from the two NFTS program years involved in this study. Worthen et al. (1997) note that document review provides a non-reactive source of information, since the data have already been collected and are not affected by any additional collection or analysis methods. Likewise, Patton (1990) comments that the review of existing documents can identify pertinent and important issues and can often generate questions for further data collection. I organized and categorized the data from the existing documents to begin to answer the first two questions of the evaluation model: How did the participants feel about the NFTS program? What did the participants learn from the program?

I used document review again to analyze the CVs and syllabi of the interview participants. I reviewed the CVs of participants and used inductive analysis to categorize professional activities and behaviors that related to participant experiences in the NFTS program. I reviewed the participants' course syllabi to explore the extent to which participants used the syllabi to stimulate interest and engagement in their courses.

The interviews were analyzed using cross-case analysis. In cross-case analysis, responses from different participants are grouped together by using topics from the interview guide (Patton, 1990). The interview guide was used as the analytical framework for the data. I organized the data from the interviews to answer the remaining two questions of the evaluation model*:* How has the professional behavior of the participants changed? How has the NFTS program impacted the individual, the department, the campus, or the university?

I also used cross-case analysis as a strategy to analyze the classroom observations. Patton (1990) suggests a variety of strategies for analyzing observations. One strategy is to focus on issues that are relevant to the evaluation questions. I identified and organized key points from the observations that offered additional support for answering the questions of the evaluation model as noted in the paragraph above.

Summary of Chapter Three

In this chapter, I presented a methodological framework for this research study. Through qualitative methods, I utilized Kirkpatrick's four step model of evaluation to collect data that informed and illuminated the long-term effects of a faculty development program on participants' professional careers. I used content and inductive analysis to organize, categorize, and present the findings of this study. Through document review, interviews, and observations, I triangulated and verified any effects the NFTS program had on faculty participants five years after their participation in the program.

Chapter Four: Results

Introduction

This follow-up evaluative inquiry focused on individuals who participated in the UM NFTS program approximately five years ago. The primary purpose of this study was to explore how the NFTS program affected the professional lives of those participants. A secondary purpose of this study was to provide research-based documentation of the long-term effects of faculty development programs that may be structured like NFTS. Results from this study may contribute to future program planning for UM and other institutions wishing to establish or revise existing faculty development programs. In addition, these study results may also add to the current knowledge base in the field of faculty development by identifying successful elements of faculty development programs and offering best practices for the field.

I utilized a qualitative methodology to explore the guiding questions of this study, which are:

1. In what ways has NFTS influenced the professional lives of participants five years after completing the program?
2. How have participants integrated NFTS experiences into their professional lives?
3. How do the results of this study offer recommendations for best practices in the field of faculty development?

Patton (1990) states that qualitative methods, including qualitative evaluations, allow for the exploration of selected issues in depth. Patton also suggests that studying a small number of cases allows a researcher to identify specific information that often

results in a more comprehensive understanding of the study topic. Based on the guiding questions and the small number of participants, the purpose of this study was not to predict or generalize the impact of the NFTS program on a broader population, but rather to explore in detail how the program experiences affected the study participants' current professional lives.

Through the lens of qualitative methodology, I used content and cross case analysis to analyze and interpret the results of this study. I organized, categorized, and interpreted the data according to topics rather than use a case study approach, which would organize data by participant. I also used inductive analysis techniques, which allow for patterns, themes, and categories to emerge from the data, rather than deductive analysis, which uses established patterns, categories, or themes to organize the data.

Because this is a program evaluation, I organized and presented the data in this chapter based on Kirkpatrick's (1998) evaluation model. His model encompasses four stages of evaluation: (a) reaction, which explores how participants felt about the program; (b) learning, which identifies what participants learned during the program; (c) behavior, which examines how program learning changed participant behavior; and (d) results, which explore the final results of the participants' experiences in the program.

Evaluation Model Stage One – Reaction

I used the first stage of the Kirkpatrick's (1998) evaluation model to explore how participants reacted to the NFTS program. Kirkpatrick explains that people who enjoy and are enthusiastic about a training program often gain the most from it. I documented the reaction stage of the model by using two sources of data. I examined the existing NFTS evaluation reports and then during the research interviews, I asked the participants

to reflect on their NFTS experiences during the program year. Even though it had been four or five years since the participants attended the NFTS program, all the current study participants were able to articulate their thoughts about the program.

Review of Existing NFTS Evaluations

I reviewed the existing NFTS end of program evaluations (University of Missouri System, 2001-2008). As mentioned earlier, those evaluation surveys were administered at the end of each program year. Survey responses were voluntary and anonymous, and 68% (73/106) of the participants from those two program years completed the end of year surveys and responded to the question of how they reacted to the program at the time. Although this evaluation cannot directly compare past responses to those given by the participants in the current study, past responses can give a sense of how particpants in general reacted to NFTS during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 program years.

In addition, there is no way of knowing how those non-responding survey participants reacted to the program, but those who responded to the survey did so in the following manner. In the surveys administered at the end of those two program years, participants were asked to rate the overall value of the NFTS program on a 1-10 scale, with 10 being the highest rating. The overall mean ratings for the two years were 8.51 and 8.86 respectively, with no ratings below 7 and 6, again respectively.

Some survey participants offered comments about the program. These responses are taken directly from the end of year surveys. Examples of the comments about the program in general include "…very good program" "This is a fantastic program. It needs to be continued and expanded…" and "I think the program will eventually have a positive impact on the culture of our campuses."

Survey participants also commented on more specific issues about the program. Several responses specifically mentioned networking, and comments included: "…the ability to meet and talk to other faculty has been the best part for me" "…the community aspect was really enjoyable" and "The system-wide approach in creating cohesive groups, both on each campus and NFTS as a whole, is a good one."

Other survey participants mentioned aspects of the program related to teaching. One participant commented, "This program has been extremely valuable in improving my teaching and the way I view teaching. It has increased my confidence and changed many of my perceptions about my own teaching methods." Another stated, "This is the first concerted effort I have experienced in 15 years of teaching that addresses teaching at the university level." Yet another said, "It is quite possible that I would be a very unhappy UM teacher right now if not for NFTS. The 300 students I taught this year would be significantly less enriched."

Survey participants' comments also reflected feelings about the university system's facilitation of the program. One participant said, "(I) am very thankful that UM continues to support this effort." Another commented, "…it demonstrated to me that UM cares about its people." Another individual said, "It made me feel much more a member of the University community."

Interview Reflections

At the beginning of the interviews, I asked each of the 12 study participants to recall how they reacted to the NFTS program during the year they participated. During this portion of the interviews, participants often used the words "liked" "enjoyed" "loved" and "helpful" to describe their general feelings about the program. Comments

included, “I really enjoyed it” “I think it was really helpful and “I really liked the program.” One participant said, “I loved it. I think the program really helped me so much.” Another commented, “I liked it very much, and it had a very positive influence on me.”

Study participants also mentioned specific areas in which the program was helpful. In terms of networking, one person said:

> For me, the nicest thing about the program was actually getting a better picture of what the University of Missouri is. There were people from all the different campuses and that was really helpful to talk with them about how their campus was structured, and how they viewed things. I think it helped me to feel PART of something that was bigger, and I really liked that.

Another study participant commented about the program events held on each campus during the year. “So there were local events, which were focused on teaching at this campus, which was a lot of networking with others, learning from others, learning from peers, and of course some concepts which were common on this campus.”

Participants in this study also recalled aspects of the program that related to teaching and learning. One person commented:

> …so it was nice to have space and time dedicated to thinking about teaching.…I felt that the program, especially the fall retreat, focusing on active engagement of students and student centered learning, I felt like that was really helpful. Actually, I still have a book they gave us and I pull it out once in a while: active learning. I think that was really great.

Another study participant said, "It really changed my view on how to conduct teaching. It gave me insight into some teaching philosophies that I had not considered before."

Additionally, several study participants recalled that the program supported tenure and promotion activities. One person said, "We had a special session that covered the NSF career award, and I thought that was very helpful and possibly contributed to me receiving the NSF Career Award, so that was all good." Another participant commented, "I was getting ready to go through my third year review at the time, and so there were parts of the program that were really helpful for me in terms of creating my portfolio."

Three participants in this study offered constructive suggestions based on their NFTS experiences. One participant said, "I felt they were saying things that were obvious and that I already knew." That person also added:

> I guess one of the things I found that was a drawback about it was that there were so many people from different fields, and I don't know that my field is that similar to the other things that people were doing. I think it would have been much more useful if I had been in another program with people in my own field. I understand that could be impossible. I was the only one in my field and I was the only new faculty member in my department.

Another study participant stated:

> Now, the parts that I wasn't quite as excited about…I teach in a fairly novel way, and so a lot of the approaches to how you teach effectively and so on and what you do were, I thought, behind the times. They weren't at the cutting edge of education research and that may have been appropriate for other people, but I didn't find any value in that part of it.

One other study participant said:

> I already had about eight years experience in the classroom, and it seemed like most of the people who were in NFTS were very new into their academic role. So I found the information to be helpful, but I don't think there was a lot of new information for me. I think it would have been more helpful had I taken it at the beginning.

Researcher Observations

Kirkpatrick (1998) states that the first step in the evaluation of a program is to assess the reaction of those who participated. He believes that the interest and motivation of participants bears significantly on the learning that takes place during a program. The participants who responded to the NFTS end of the year surveys four of five years ago and the participants who took part in the current research interviews responded similarly. The end of year survey responses and the post-program responses from the study participants reflect the same attention to issues in the professional lives of academics: networking, teaching, career advancement, and the perceived attitude of university support for faculty members. Because these issues were identified by participants in the NFTS end of year surveys and four or five years later during the study interviews, my observation is that they are important in the continuing professional lives of these academics.

Evaluation Model Stage Two – Learning

This stage of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model focuses on what participants understood and learned during the program. He states that learning takes place in an environment in which one or more of these results occur: "participants change attitudes,

improve knowledge, and/or increase skill" (Kirkpatrick, 1998, p. 20). I examined the existing end of year NFTS evaluation reports. Then during the research interviews I asked the participants to reflect on what they learned from their NFTS experiences.

Review of Existing NFTS Evaluations

In the existing NFTS end of program evaluations (University of Missouri System, 2001-2008) participants from the NFTS program years 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 responded to a survey and commented on what they learned during the program. Ninety-seven per cent (97%) and 86% of the survey participants respectively acknowledged that NFTS changed the way they thought about teaching. This parallels one aspect of the second stage of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model, attitude change. Ninety-two per cent (92%) and 81% respectively of the survey participants also recognized that NFTS changed the way they taught. This reflects the other two aspects of the second stage of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model, improving knowledge and/or increasing skills.

Participants who responded to the end of year surveys acknowledged that NFTS changed the way they thought about teaching. In reviewing the survey responses, participants mentioned several ways in which their thoughts about teaching had changed. They discussed how the program had changed their thinking about the instructional aspects of teaching, how they experienced a shift in their philosophy and focus on teaching, how their self-reflections about teaching had changed, and how their perceptions of learning-centered teaching had changed.

Addressing the process of thinking about the instructional aspects of teaching, one survey participant said: "I am more aware of how I structure my instructional courses

and of seeking regular feedback from the students." Another commented about shifts in his philosophy and focus on teaching:

> The NFTS program helped me think of teaching in an "out of the box" manner by seeing that teaching is much more than standing in front of a room and presenting information to students. It is interactive, creative, inspiring, trying, challenging, and rewarding. It is also a dynamic process which is often overlooked.

Self-reflections about teaching were mentioned by another survey participant:

> It has validated my feelings that teaching is important and given me the confidence to stand up to some more established faculty to effect change. It made me realize that effective teaching doesn't just happen, that a lot of work goes behind every good teacher.

Another survey respondent acknowledged a shift toward learner-centered teaching. "The program has expanded my learner-centered teaching approach. It has made me think extensively about how I can apply the suggestions/approaches we have discussed to my teaching encounters with students."

Not all survey comments were positive. One participant stated that the program had not made a significant impact on his teaching and was disappointed that the program didn't offer more useful ideas. This person said, "The program is heavily targeted for those teaching larger undergraduate classes, and I don't teach any of those." Several other participants said the program did not change their teaching, mentioning that "the material was too general for me to figure out how to adapt it to my classes" and "everything we discussed in the NFTS program I had already learned some five or six years ago." Another survey participant commented:

> This program is better suited for people who are new to teaching, not new to the university. If I had been a first or second year teacher fresh out of graduate school, this program would have been extremely useful…The substantive content of the program offers very little for someone who has been a teacher for a length of time.

Interview Reflections

During the research interviews, I asked the study participants to reflect on what they had learned during the NFTS program. Eleven of the twelve individuals recalled something specific that they learned during the program year. Their recollections reflected attitude changes as well as gaining knowledge and improving skills. Some participants' comments incorporated several of those categories.

Study participants mentioned that their attitudes about teaching changed. One individual commented how a personal attitude about teaching strategies had changed. That person said that it was "the opportunity to learn with other people who said 'This really didn't work for me' or 'This did work for me' that I found was the biggest part to get me to think about different approaches in my classroom." That person went on to give this example:

> I've never been a huge fan of student presentations. There are multiple reasons for that. Number one, as a student, I HATED it, because I always felt like the division of labor was always unequal. As a faculty member I've always struggled with it, in that how do you assign grades to a group of individuals when as faculty members we don't really know how much work is whose. I tripped over that a lot…but I realized that there are other things I can be doing (besides student

> presentations) after NFTS. For example, I teach graduate students who will soon be out in the community. What I've done is ask them to find lay books on parenting related to the subject of the class. They come to class and do presentations on these books that are written for lay individuals…. In fact, the last few years the students have taken to meeting at a restaurant for our last class for lunch and we have a kind of book club. I don't think I would have done that had I not been to NFTS and had that opportunity to think of pedagogy as more fluctuating as opposed to linear lockstep.

Some participants in this study recalled acquiring knowledge and gaining specific skills during the NFTS program. One person said:

> Specifically, I teach large lecture classes, so I learned how to make them student centered, how to make them active, the think-pair-share thing. I think that was the first year I started using clickers in the classroom, and there was a presentation that gave me some kind of real tangible ways of using the clickers and ways that I hadn't thought about before: using them for opinion-like thought questions instead of just attendance or quiz-like questions. It pushed me to use them in ways that I hadn't done before. Now I use them in a completely different way than I used to. Now I use them to gather evidence from the students to demonstrate a theory that we're discussing in class.

Another study participant remembered the interactive teaching methods that were discussed and said:

> There was a session about how to handle disruptive students in the classroom, and there was role play, I remember that, although we don't deal with that much

> in my particular case, since our students are already graduate students. I haven't dealt with disruptive behavior, but if I had it, I think they gave some good tips. I remember one tip was to take command of the class as soon as you come in. Don't let the students chit-chat. Sometimes the professor comes into the class and stands at the podium for a good five minutes and nobody even looks up.

One individual also mentioned learning a teaching tip and described it as follows:

> There is one thing I learned at NFTS and I use it every year. They talked about using clickers in the classroom and that you could do your own cheap form of clickers by using numbered three by five cards for the student to hold up. I use this in my classes, for example, when we are reviewing multiple choice questions for an exam. I don't really want to call on students, so I do this. The students enjoy it and it gives them something to do and gives me feedback if they are all getting it right or wrong.

Another participant in this study attributed classroom success to something learned during the NFTS program.

> I learned a lot of things, but probably the greatest thing I learned was working in large classrooms and how to make my strategies more interactive. That's something that has carried through all the way from the time I went through NFTS to the present. I've built on that and I think I've become much more successful in large classes because of that.

One individual mentioned how the different perceptions of other participants were helpful during the program workshop that addressed constructing a portfolio for tenure and promotion. That person stated:

> …in the spring, we sat at one point at our tables in groups and worked on our research and teaching statements for tenure. There was a guy in my group who was maybe a chemist, and there were really good discussions around the table about what to put in or what might be important; very different kinds of viewpoints because one person was an engineer, another person was a chemist, then there's me who is in the social sciences, and I really feel I gained a lot of insight just from interacting with those people, and from sharing stuff back and forth from reading. That was really helpful.

Several other study participants acquired information regarding promotion and tenure issues. One person said, "I got a lot of information, tips, and samples for my third year review, and I was doing my third year review. It helped dramatically, it helped so much." Another commented, "(One thing) I can specifically remember being very helpful was how to write about the impact of your career when you're putting together your portfolio for things like promotion and tenure."

Participants in this study also mentioned the importance of learning about and getting to know their colleagues. One comment was, "One of the most tangible things is that I learned there were people who were new on campus just like me, so working with other new faculty was great." Another person stated the importance of "…an opportunity to find collaborators across campuses, find out about other people who are going through their probationary period like you and establish rapport."

Not all study participants had positive comments about what they learned during the program. One individual response was simply: "I don't think I recall anything that I learned." Although this individual did not elaborate at this point, earlier in the interview

he stated that his teaching strategies were very different from those being discussed at NFTS and that he was committed to continuing with his own classroom strategies.

Another study participant acknowledged that although there was some benefit from the insight of others during the program, he did try to incorporate a new teaching strategy into his classroom without any success. He recalled the suggestion to assign groups in the classroom, rather than let students self-select into their own groups. He related:

> So I tried that in my class one semester and it absolutely didn't work. When I picked the groups, all I got were complaints. So and so never shows up, we can't pick a time that works for so and so. It was interesting, but it was not the reality of life on my campus.

Researcher Observations

In this second stage of the evaluation model, participants recalled what they learned during the NFTS program. As Kirkpatrick (1998) states, the learning stage of this model is characterized by a change in attitude or the acquisition of knowledge or skills. Most NFTS participants who completed the end of year surveys and those who participated in the current interview research agreed that they experienced attitude changes and gained knowledge or skills during their program participation. Participants from both groups mentioned shifts in their thoughts about how they approach their own teaching. There were participants from both groups who also identified specific teaching strategies that they learned in NFTS and continue to apply in their classrooms today. Additionally, several interview participants stated that they gained a broader

understanding of the promotion and tenure process and an appreciation for working with other faculty in the university system.

An interesting observation is that the participants who said that they did not learn much from NFTS gave some type of disconnection issue as a reason. Those participants seemed not to connect either with the content or the processes of the program. For example, they mentioned not teaching the same types of classes as others or being at a different experience level from others who were invited into the program. My thought is that this pattern of not making common connections with others may play a role in the level of success experienced by NFTS participants.

Evaluation Model Stage Three – Behavior

The third stage of this evaluation model focuses on what Kirkpatrick calls the "transfer of training," (Kirkpatrick, 1998, p. 23), which can also be thought of as the application of learning. The purpose of this evaluation stage is to explore how the professional behavior of the participants changed as a result of their experiences in the program. I used the personal interviews with participants to explore behavior changes. I also reviewed the participants' curriculum vitae, course syllabi, and did several classroom observations to further explore any professional behavior changes that might have been supported by NFTS participation.

Interview Reflections

During the interviews, I asked the participants to reflect on how any aspects of their professional behaviors have changed over the past four or five years and if they could attribute those changes to the NFTS program. As I stated in Chapter One, this evaluative study was based on the NFTS program. The NFTS program goals focus

mainly on the teaching and learning aspect of the participants' careers, but also address the issues of networking as a component of a successful academic career. During the interviews, I used prompts to initiate discussions on both of those topics.

As stated earlier, I learned that the previous teaching experience of the study participants varied widely. Two of the twelve participants had no prior teaching experience at all, and the others' experiences ranged from teaching in the classroom as a teaching assistant during their graduate studies to several participants who had as many as nine or more years of classroom experience. In addition, only two of the participants had any type of prior educational training. One participant took several education courses and the other participated in a onetime workshop that focused on teaching methods in his discipline.

Behavior changes in the classroom.

I asked the participants to think about the instructional strategies they use in their courses and talk about any strategies that might be a result of what they learned in NFTS. Most of the participants said that their instructional strategies have indeed changed over the years and that NFTS played some part in that. Participants talked about how they modified existing strategies or implemented new ones into their coursework after NFTS. Three participants acknowledged that NFTS had not made any difference in what they do in the classroom.

Several participants talked about modifications they made in an existing course strategy based on something they learned in NFTS. For example, clickers are individual response devices that can be used in large classes to gain student participation. The devices are purchased or rented by students, and used in a variety of ways by their

instructors. For example, students can click in for attendance or to answer questions in class. Based on presentations given at NFTS, a few participants began to use the clicker system in their classrooms in a more engaging way. For example, one participant stated:

> I try to do a combination of traditional lecture, but use a lot of innovative approaches. During the time I was in NFTS, we had started using clickers in the classroom. Following that, I have refined the methods of how to use clickers, how to optimize their use. I have written publications about that in educational journals….I enjoy teaching a lot. I particularly enjoy trying out new things…the motivation to try new things certainly comes from the NFTS program.

. Other participants discussed how they implemented new instructional strategies into their classrooms based on their NFTS experiences. They mentioned adding new strategies to what had been for some a strictly lecture-based course. Participants incorporated a variety of active learning strategies into their classrooms, including group work, questions during lecture, pop quizzes, and integrating assessments into course planning. In general, participants acknowledged that they attempted to get students more engaged in what was happening in the classroom and in the course.

For example, one participant talked about incorporating group work into the classroom. He stated:

> In the class I'm teaching now, I break the students into groups of three or four, and I'll have them go through some of the material we're supposed to cover that day and have them make kind of a class outline. It's also a way to make sure that they've gone through the reading. It seems like it's worked out pretty well in several of my classes, even my intro course which had about 100 students. I

> would find points in time where I could break them up into groups of 4 or 5 and randomly select groups to present. I think it really helped to engage the students and get them into the book. I think it also helped to get them engaged with each other…. I never thought about group work or trying to get students engaged with each other, as well as trying to engage them more myself in discussions, even in large groups. I never thought about anything like that until I went through the NFTS program.

Other participants added pop quizzes and questions to their lecture classes. One mentioned, "I started to use pop quizzes in class to help students understand the material and to help improve student participation. I had discussions right after the quizzes." Another stated:

> The other thing I think I learned was to do more than just lecture. That's all that was ever done when I was a student. And so for the first seven or eight years that I taught that's all I did. So I'm a little bit better at doing more hands on activities and having more questions in class…. Well, I still do some lecture, but I'll stop in the middle of lecture and question people, which I didn't ever used to do; and I'll have students actually be responsible for pieces of articles. They'll do a very brief synopsis of an article and pose questions on it. That helps generate discussion.

One participant discussed how he used assessment and group work in the classroom. He stated:

> The most immediate effect from NFTS was having real strategies for engaging students in the classroom. During that year we talked a lot about assessment and the importance of kind of meshing all that with your pedagogical goals for the

> class. So thinking about assessing not just how much they liked me or the content of the course, actually assessing whether they can do some of those things that I wanted them to do. So the program gave me tools for doing that kind of thing. Just like doing small and large group activities, those are things I still use in my classroom.

Three of the twelve participants stated that NFTS had not had any impact on their teaching strategies. One reiterated that he taught in a different manner and would continue teaching that way. Another commented that NFTS had more of an impact on how he interacted with people and planned his career than on his teaching, and the third stated that his strategies in the classroom were based on his prior teaching experiences.

Changes in student learning.

Because many participants mentioned implementing more active learning strategies in their courses, I also asked them if they thought the changes in their classroom strategies had affected student learning in their courses. The participants who learned and implemented more active and engaging strategies in their courses agreed that student learning was positively affected. However, they admitted that their perception of this benefit to the students could only be supported anecdotally. For example, one participant stated:

> I think these strategies have improved student learning, although I've never tried to measure that. However, I do have some anecdotal evidence that might support that. I was talking to a gentlemen in one of my classes, he was a little older. We were discussing the test, which I sometimes worried was too easy because a lot of my students did very well. He did not think the test was easy, thought it was

> actually pretty challenging. He commented that he was pleasantly surprised to hear the students intelligently discuss the concepts of the course. He said he has been in many other classes where that level of discussion does not happen. So, I hope that indicates a higher level of learning in my classes.

Another participant was discussing the use of a variety of learning strategies in the classroom and commented, "So some of the alternative learning experiences help the students' learning because it forces them to take a different lens or a different perspective on the situation and it forces them out of their comfort zone." One individual said incorporating a variety of learning strategies increased student learning and stated:

> One of the things that is important to me is that I want to be able to play to all different learning styles. So just standing up and lecturing is going to engage one learning style, but not the learning styles of others. So now my classes have a lot of change. If I'm teaching a 50 minute lecture class, I break it up into 10 minute sections. I try not to do anything for more than 10 minutes. So I have them talk to each other, I ask for feedback, we do clicker stuff, we watch a media example, we talk about the media example. So there's a lot of change. What I try to do is make the content as applicable to as many learning styles as I can. For that reason I think it's been beneficial for the students. I can't say that there's been a real sea change in my evaluations, because the students don't have anything to compare it to – there was no time before the semester they have me – but I think it's helping.

Another participant related how his involvement in review courses makes him think that improved teaching strategies have helped students retain material. He stated:

> Not only have the grades increased using the same textbook and the same teaching, I also do a fundamental review session with students who will be taking an assessment in their major. Faculty are asked to do review sessions, so you feel that you have to compress one semester of material into two hours just to bring them back up to speed. I've done this now for at least four years or longer, and I've seen that I don't need to go into the very basic topics, because they still remember that. So there is more retention. That's purely anecdotal, and I don't have data, but we'd like to collect data that actually showed that they retain more, but we lost kind of the before and after, because now they're in that process and we can only do future students with future innovations.

Changes in networking behaviors.

As documented earlier in this chapter, surveyed participants from the two study years as well as the interviewed participants frequently mentioned networking while discussing the NFTS program. They talked about how their social and professional networks had expanded. Therefore, I asked the study participants to reflect on the part networking played in any changes to their professional behavior since their NFTS experience.

All of the twelve study participants acknowledged that their peer networks expanded socially to some degree as a result of NFTS, mentioning connections with other participants either on their own campuses or across the UM system. For example, participants commented on general social interactions, stating, "I met some wonderful people…" and "It's been nice to go out on campus and see people that I know. That has been helpful personally." Another individual said, "…I do think the greatest strength of

the program is the opportunity to network with individuals that you wouldn't normally come across…" Several participants mentioned specifically getting to know peers on their own campuses. For example, one individual commented, "I think it helped me establish connections on my own campus, with our NFTS director and NFTS colleagues." Another stated, "There are people on campus I know only because we went through that program together…so that's been really nice." Other individuals acknowledged that they made connections with peers on their own and the other UM campuses. One person commented, "I certainly feel that I have met a lot of peers, not only on this campus but on the other campuses."

Nine of the twelve participants also talked about how NFTS affected their professional networks, both on their own campus and across the UM system. One person stated, "I had a few collaborations with people on my own campus…we still talk to each other and work together from time to time, not all academic, but other kinds of personal relationships." Another mentioned, "I had many discussions with peers, mainly from this campus but also from the other three campuses, about the instruction of students…and an exchange of ideas is great." One individual commented:

> A year before I was in NFTS, I was part of a program on my campus that was specifically for networking – that was the primary goal of it. So doing NFTS right after the other program gave me a couple dozen people outside of my department who were at a similar stage in their career as me. So those people have called on me to serve on their students' committees, vice versa, and I've done research with one of my colleagues from the first program. But definitely, when I would go into those kinds of situations, I would look for anyone who I could potentially work

> with. I've also guest lectured, and vice versa, in some of their classes. So I think it's given me a nice base of people who I know. Again, selfishly, it was most helpful to get to know the people on my campus, because we all had similar types of expectations, and so we could look for opportunities to collaborate on more than just teaching and instruction issues.

Several other participants mentioned using colleagues they met through NFTS as guest lecturers in their classes, and a few were asked to review NFTS colleagues' manuscripts or were able to suggest a reviewer to a colleague through their NFTS network. One individual said that having a reliable network of people allowed an uninhibited flow of communication around many issues. For example, he stated:

> …I can call my NFTS friend who's in another college and say: 'You know, I've got this student here, and this is the situation, this is what happened, and this is the argument they're making and this is what I'm thinking. What do you think? Is this appropriate or not?' …That's the greatest thing about that network, having that support, and people you can trust to go to and be vulnerable. That's the big thing, too, is there's ego involved. Having a network with people you can go to and trust and be comfortable with, possibly exposing yourself as an idiot…. Most of my networking is peer networking, the NFTS contacts.

Another participant talked about the results of building relationships among campus peers as a result of NFTS and stated, "I got to know our campus NFTS director, who has been very helpful….I've also been asked to participate in some of my campus NFTS programs. I've shared some of my experiences in teaching large classes."

Several of the participants commented that the peer relationships that developed from NFTS were helpful at the time, but unfortunately were not sustained. One individual said:

> The program gave me an opportunity to know people from other campuses and in different fields, so that was an advantage that I enjoyed. However, it is very sad that there is no follow up program. It stopped right there, at a time when I was ready to build my relationships with other campuses.

Although another participant acknowledged making connections with peers on his own campus, he said, "I was hoping for some better long term connections with other campuses. I made some friends who were at other UM campuses, but they really didn't follow through….There wasn't really any long term networking that I saw across campuses."

For a few of the participants, the NFTS experience did not contribute significantly to their networking. One participant admitted that he met a few people at NFTS but said, "I don't think it has been a very important thing in my professional life. I don't have a lot of connections from that experience." Another commented, "I did meet several people at NFTS, but that has not evolved into anything….I was on a clinical track. I should have pursued those NFTS connections, but I did not." Another individual said:

> It was kind of nice, in a way, to meet other people. I remember there were people in there from different disciplines who I run into now and then. It was nice to hear what they had to say and to meet them, but not really practically useful, to be perfectly honest.

As stated above, the study participants mentioned issues related to networking throughout the interviews, inferring that it was and is an important part of their professional lives. That led me to ask the participants how valuable networking was to them personally and how they networked.

Ten of the twelve participants agreed that networking was an essential part of their professional lives. Those ten participants used phrases like, "very valuable" "absolutely valuable" important" and "always valuable" to describe their feelings about networking. One participant shared a thought on the relationship of networking to broad, educational thinking. He said, "Again, I think that our greatest problem as educators is that we get very provincial. Networking, I think, is one of the most effective ways to get past provincial thinking and to think more globally."

Several individuals mentioned that networking was critical to career advancement and provided opportunities to collaborate with people who shared common interests. One participant said, "I feel it is very important, not just in research, in everything. It helps you advance when you have a solid network." Another commented, "It's the one way to get your name out there and get to be known in your profession." Several participants mentioned that networking with other faculty members who shared common interests was important, and one individual stated, "I've benefited from being here (NFTS program) in collaborative research and that's come about largely from my networking." Two of the participants said that networking was a very important part of the NFTS program. One said, "I would even say for some of the participants, it was the major aspect to engage and stay in the program."

Two participants noted that the networking aspect of NFTS was not significant. One commented, "…there was one other person in the program in my field…we talked a bit, but the areas I work in are not very common. So from a networking prospective it was not that important." The other individual acknowledged that he was "not the kind of person that is very active networking…I don't have a lot of connections from that experience."

When asked to talk about how they networked, the participants mentioned a variety of avenues. One participant networked through socializing at lunches and department meetings and another said that he had starting blogging as part of his networking. A few others networked by using the snowball method. One individual explained:

> Generally, I guess I use what is called the snowball effect. I'll find somebody who knows somebody. Or, I've been asked to be in a situation and there might be an individual there who I think might have some information that I'm interested in or they might be in a particular position that I think might be helpful and I might spend some time talking to them. So some of it is a result of people being introduced to me or being in a situation where I'm in contact with them and I introduce myself.

Another person said, "I think it's through connections that are already established that you build a network. You find somebody that you're interested in and they introduce you to people that are doing the same kind of thing."

Six of the ten participants acknowledged that the main avenue for their networking was through some type of planned event, usually conferences and workshops

on the campus, university, or national level. Participants talked about attending conferences or workshops in their field or related to a specific interest. For example, one person said:

> I'm very outgoing and I can talk to anyone. If there is an event that is planned, I will try to go and talk to different people. If I know who will be there, I look them up and try to come up with conversation topics. That's how I do things.

Of those six participants, four mentioned the importance of following up with new professional acquaintances. One individual discussed the personal benefit of following up with a colleague he met at a conference. He stated:

> For example, I was at a conference last year, and someone stood up and asked a question. She identified herself as someone from my campus, and I thought, I don't even know her, so we were standing in line waiting for an author to sign our books, and I introduced myself. We started talking, then we went out to lunch, now we are doing a collaborative thing in our classes.

Another participant talked about how he actively networks.

> I try to, within reason, actively network. I don't want to take someone's business card and then never look at it again. So I do try to follow up. We're all busy, and I don't want to keep hounding people, but I do try to make a practice of following up after I meet with somebody or talk to somebody, and just send them a short email about how I was really interested in talking to you, keep me in mind if anything comes up, or let's stay in touch about this.

One other individual mentioned how he follows up after meeting someone at a conference.

> (I network) by traveling around, meeting people at conferences, by socializing; whenever there is an opportunity after a meeting to stay around for a half hour to talk, maybe even go out together for dinner or a drink, it's a great opportunity to get inside what moves people and even get information about a third person who does that and try to stay in contact or start a new contact.

He went on to say:

> I think it's important after you have a meeting to work up the material that you got and maybe even contact somebody and say oh, I just met this person and they referred me to you and said you might be interested in this or I have a question that you can answer. And then look for the next opportunity to actually meet these people in person. So when somebody calls on me, it's always a good opportunity to say would you be willing to come and present a seminar. I think this is how you are supposed to network in a professional world, but the start up is sometimes what is lacking. Particularly, professors tend to sit in their office and not get out and meet others. It's also personality. You need to be somebody who actually enjoys that kind of thing.

Researcher Observations

Kirkpatrick (1998) believes that one aspect of program success is reflected in the behavior changes of the participants. Most participants agreed that they experienced changes in their professional behaviors over the past four or five years. They talked about how their classroom behaviors have changed, how they've noticed changes in student learning in their courses, and how their social and professional networks with peers expanded since their participation in NFTS.

Participants mentioned modifying existing classroom strategies to make them more engaging for the students and discussed implementing new strategies in their courses. Several participants talked about how student learning may have increased because of these more engaging strategies, but they admitted that evidence of that was anecdotal. All participants agreed that their peer networks expanded socially or professionally on their home campuses or across the UM system during the NFTS year, but several participants admitted that some of those connections were not sustained after they completed the program. Most of the participants believed networking was an important part of their professional lives, and many commented that planned events, such as conferences or workshops, provided the most productive opportunities to network.

I find it interesting that many participants believed that the active and more engaging strategies they learned about in NFTS made the most difference in their classroom behaviors and possibly in student learning in their classes. Many participants also talked about how they enjoyed and sometimes learned from discussions and conversations with their NFTS peers. There were several participants who mentioned that the NFTS experience was not productive for them, again talking about the lack of a connection because of different content areas or teaching strategies. Again, my thought is that this issue of connection may be relevant in structuring a faculty development program that offers something for all participants.

Supporting Data

One method of validating qualitative data is to triangulate findings, which combines different qualitative methods and uses multiple perspectives (Patton, 1990). In addition to reviewing previous survey responses and interviewing study participants, I

observed in the classrooms of several participating faculty members and reviewed participants' course syllabi and CVs to identify activities that relate to teaching and learning. Reviewing the combination these three additional data sources contributed to a broad and reinforcing perspective for the study results.

Classroom observations.

As an additional means of documenting behavior changes from their NFTS experiences, I was able to observe in the classrooms of two participants. I purposefully chose those participants based on the following criteria. Of the twelve study participants, three said that NFTS had no significant impact on their teaching strategies, seven mentioned that the impact of NFTS overall was moderate, and two firmly stated that NFTS had a considerable effect on how they now teach. Therefore, I decided to explore further the effects of the NFTS program by observing in the classrooms of those two participants. My intent was to observe the teaching strategies of those two individuals in practice.

Patton (1990) states that there are a variety of methods one can use to observe in the field, ranging from a narrow to a broad focus. For these two observations, I chose to use a narrow focus and concentrate on one element of the program, observing the teaching strategies implemented by the two participants. I will refer to the two participants as Professor A and Professor B.

Professor A's class was held in a large lecture hall with auditorium seating. I estimate that there were approximately 250 students in the class the day I observed. During our interview, Professor A mentioned that he learned new teaching strategies from his NFTS experience and continues to implement them in his classes. He talked

about wanting to engage students more in the classroom and play to different learning styles through a variety of classroom strategies. He mentioned using clickers, media examples, peer discussions, and asking for feedback during class.

Professor A opened the class by reviewing exam policies and talking about some technical issues. The instructional part of the class began when he asked the students to respond to a multiple choice question by using clickers. The question was a knowledge based review question. After the students responded by clicker, Professor A projected a graph of the answers on a screen in the front of the classroom. The majority of the students answered correctly, and Professor A then discussed all the answer choices. Next, Professor A used a combination of lecture and a slide presentation to discuss new material. Students were encouraged to respond and discuss the material among themselves. Professor A used a student response as an example to make the concept relevant, and Professor A wound up that part of the class with a projected cartoon strip to reinforce the point.

Professor A continued by showing a video clip to highlight a new concept, and then showed a power point to illustrate and represent the idea. Professor A concluded the class by asking the students to respond by clicker to a multiple choice opinion survey. There was some discussion among the students about the opinion question. The results of the survey were again projected on a screen, and Professor A encouraged class discussion as a way to make the concept relevant to their personal lives. After class was dismissed, there were a number of students who stayed to talk to Professor A.

From the students' perspective, Professor A provided a variety of ways to access the class material. I observed some students taking notes by hand in a notebook, as well

as students tapping out notes on their laptops. I also saw that the slide and power point presentations were available online, and I observed students following along and taking notes in the appropriate places on their laptops. I also noticed that some students had printed out the presentations and were taking notes on the printouts. There were students who had laptops open but were on social network sites periodically during the class. I did not count those students, but they constituted a small minority of the class.

My observation was that Professor A implemented a variety of strategies in the classroom and provided learning opportunities for students with different learning styles. Professor A used a combination of lecture, peer discussion, clickers, and student feedback as teaching strategies. He also appealed to different learning styles by presenting the material verbally, online, in print, and by using audio visual aids.

Professor B's class was held in a classroom with long tables and chairs facing the front of the room for the students. There were approximately 40 students in class the day I observed. During our interview, Professor B said that NFTS was the motivating factor for trying new and innovative strategies in the classroom. He mentioned using clickers in a variety of ways, learning how to incorporate group work into his classroom, and realizing the importance of peer involvement in learning.

Professor B opened the class by addressing some issues about the final exam. He began the instructional portion of the class by putting a problem from the previous class on the board. He questioned the class about the solution and a student answered correctly. Professor B then explained why the student's answer was correct. Next Professor B projected a question on a screen and offered three choices as the correct answer. He asked the students to talk among themselves to try to figure out the correct solution. The

students immediately began talking in small groups and discussing the problem. Professor B walked around the room to listen in on the student conversations, and when one student asked him about a possible answer, he suggested that the student pose his question to another group of students. When the allotted time had passed, Professor B had all the students record their solution choices by using the clickers. Seventy-nine per cent of the students chose the correct solution, but Professor B prodded those students to explain why they chose that solution. He then went on to explain why the other two solutions were incorrect. There were two students who sat by themselves in the back of the class and did not engage with their peers or the instructor.

The remainder of the class was a review session for an upcoming exam. Again Professor B posed a question and asked the students to select the correct answer by using the clickers. He allowed time for the students to discuss the answers among themselves. Some students talked with peers, some looked back over their notes, and some paged through the textbook looking for the correct answer. Professor B walked around the classroom and gave hints when a student asked about the answer. When the allotted time had passed, the students recorded their answers by clicker and Professor B projected the results on a screen. The students had selected the three choices almost evenly, so Professor B asked the class to discuss their answers. After some discussion, he gave the students another chance to select an answer. Then he revealed and explained the correct solution as well as explained why the other two answers were incorrect.

The remaining class time was devoted to similar review questions and ended with Professor B posing what he said was the most difficult conceptual question he could construct. He told the students that answering this question would show them what they

learned during the semester. Again, it was a multiple choice question to be answered by clickers. The students began discussing possible solutions, reviewing their notes, trying to solve the problem by talking it through with others, and one student got up and walked across the room to talk to another student about a possible solution. Professor B walked around the class and talked to the students during this time. In the end, about one third of the students answered the question correctly. Professor B explained not only the correct solution but why the other choices were incorrect.

My observation was that Professor B implemented the strategies he discussed in the interview. He used the clicker system to pose questions and stimulate discussion. He encouraged group work and peer learning by giving students time to discuss problems and possible solutions among themselves before revealing the correct answer.

Review of course syllabi.

I asked each participant if they would share a copy of a course syllabus with me. During the NFTS program, presenters briefly discussed that a well constructed syllabus can communicate not only course logistics and requirements, but can convey student responsibilities and stimulate engagement and interest in the course. My intention was to examine the syllabi to ascertain whether the content of the participants' syllabi reflected these suggestions or the incorporation of any new or modified strategies or behaviors they learned from their NFTS experience. All of the 12 study participants shared a copy of their syllabus with me.

Of the 12 syllabi that I reviewed, all contained information about the logistics and requirements of the course including course information, instructor information, required course materials, grading policies, and course policies. Eleven syllabi listed a complete

course calendar, resources for support services, and the campus policy regarding academic honesty. Nine syllabi noted the course goals and objectives, three listed instructional strategies that would be implemented during the course, and three stated the course rationale. When considering all the above mentioned items listed on the syllabi, only two participants' syllabi contained all of them. One of those two participants additionally included his philosophy of teaching in the syllabus.

The three participants who mentioned instructional strategies on their syllabi stated that they would be using a variety of instructional methods, including lecture, discussion, audiovisuals, group work, applying theories in class, written and oral presentations, and student led presentations. These strategies align with what many participants commented that they learned through NFTS and continue to apply in their classrooms.

I must add, however, that many of the participants' syllabi instructed students to use their campus password to visit the course web site for additional documents and resources. I did not have access to those course web sites, so I cannot assume that the course information contained on each syllabus was all encompassing for any particular course. Therefore, I concluded that I did not have sufficient information and that reviewing only the syllabi did not present the entire picture of the instructors' information about each course.

Review of curriculum vitae.

Presentations, publications, grants, and awards are among the professional activates that support academic careers. These activities are generally documented in the curriculum vitae of academics. Based on a model developed by Morzinski and Simpson

(2003), I reviewed the professional activities of the study participants and focused on those that took place after participation in the NFTS. During the interviews, I discussed those activities with the participants and asked them to indicate which ones were influenced by their experiences in the program. Looking specifically at the years after NFTS participation, ten of the twelve participants listed some type of professional activity on their curriculum vitae that related to teaching or learning.

Seven participants were honored with a variety of campus teaching awards, including awards for outstanding teaching innovation, outstanding teaching commendation, excellence in teaching, distinguished teaching, good teaching, and outstanding professor of the year. Most of these seven participants received recognition for their teaching over multiple years. One of the seven was recognized as educator of the year by a national academy and another received the President's Award for Innovative Teaching by the University of Missouri, one of the most prestigious awards given by the university system. Although the documentation of seven out of twelve study participants receiving teaching awards is noteworthy, it is not intended to be a generalization of all NFTS participants but rather a credible reporting of the data from this research project.

Two of the participants listed publications related to teaching strategies. One of them had two articles published and the other listed 17 teaching focused publications. Four participants gave presentations dealing with teaching or learning, and three participants received grants to investigate teaching strategies. Two participants received the prestigious National Science Foundation Career Award, and those two individuals

specifically mentioned that the experiences and networking from the NFTS program directly contributed to the receipt of those awards.

Researcher Observations

The three additional sources of supporting data reinforced in part what the survey and study participants mentioned earlier. The two participants whose classes I observed did indeed implement many of the strategies not only discussed by them but by many of the other participants. Although I concluded that the review of the syllabi provided incomplete information, several of the participants' syllabi did include information describing strategies they would implement in the classroom to more fully engage students. My review of the participants' CVs indicated that some of them were writing publications, facilitating presentations, and receiving awards related to teaching and learning.

Evaluation Model Stage Four – Results

The final stage in this four level model is to explore and identify any outcomes of the program, which are "final results that occurred because the participants attended the program" (Kirkpatrick, 1998, p. 23). Although the objectives of the program are the main focus in identifying outcomes, unintended outcomes are identified as well. According to Kirkpatrick (1998), the results documented in this evaluation stage can encompass individual, departmental, or organizational goals. During the interviews, I asked the participants to reflect on how the program had impacted them personally, and how it had impacted their departments, their campuses, and the university in general.

Interview Reflections: Benefits on Personal Level

When asked to talk about the personal benefits of the NFTS program, participants mentioned several different areas of their professional lives that were supported by the program. They talked about how the program helped them in the areas of teaching, networking, and career advancement.

Eight of the twelve participants stated that they were better teachers now because of the program. They used phrases to describe themselves, such as "I'm a better teacher…" "…more successful in large classes…" and "I've gained confidence in the classroom." Others commented that their thoughts about teaching were different now, stating, "(NFTS) changed the way I think about teaching…" "…I try to make things more understandable for the students" and "(NFTS) has given me permission to try different approaches." Several participants commented that their attitude about teaching was different, stating, "I like it (teaching) more and enjoy trying new things…" "It's a more enjoyable experience…" and "I'm having more fun."

Five participants also mentioned that the networking from NFTS was beneficial. Several of those stated how the networking aspect of the program helped their teaching. One said:

> As I said, I had no teaching experience. I wasn't even a teaching assistant in grad school. I tried my best. I even read some books about teaching. I think the program was a really good experience to learn from those people who are really good at teaching. I think that's something very important. Because when you have problems, you can read a book but the solutions might not be really practical, or the book might give really good advice but you don't know how to implement it.

> Talking about these things with your peers is much better. It kind of helped build up my confidence in teaching.

Another stated, "And I think NFTS, in listening to other people's experiences, I think it encourages you to not be afraid to try something. And it might fall flat, oh well, don't do it again." A few other participants mentioned how they benefitted from the networking at NFTS. For example, one said:

> I think it was good, at the time, to get to know some of the people who are part of the administration in this campus – the dean of the graduate school was involved and it was good to get to know her as another kind of networking opportunity. I'd say it was a good use of my time at that stage of my career.

Another individual commented "…it was gaining a bigger picture and meeting people….I think getting together with other people in the system really makes you think that you are part of something larger." A few others talked about getting a sense that UM valued new faculty members. One participant said, "It seemed like it had symbolic significance that the system cared about trying to help you develop as a teacher." Another commented, "One thing I knew was that the administrators care about their new faculty to help them advance, to kind of welcome them."

A few participants indicated that NFTS was beneficial for their career advancement. One individual talked about how the program helped him write about his career, how to "compile the products of your career...the workshops where they made us actually sit down and do something…" Another person stated:

> Well, I think the whole piece of having people come in and talk about the tenure and promotion process really helped. I came in with years toward tenure, so it

> really helped me in writing the teaching statement, the research statement, and organizing my factual record. All that was really, really helpful. I was close to that point when I went through the NFTS program.

There were two participants who acknowledged that they benefited from their experience in the program, but said their career advancement might be hindered because the focus of NFTS seems to conflict with university values. One individual explained:

> I've always been very teaching focused. It's ironic. I'm going up for tenure now and the reviews from the students and everybody on the teaching side were outstanding. I think one of the biggest things I've taken away is that I wish everybody had the opportunity to go through NFTS and to really learn about teaching and different ways, because so many of us are educated as specialists within our discipline and we don't really learn how to teach. The unfortunate thing is I don't know that the system (UM) validates teaching. So you can have somebody who is an outstanding teacher who does exemplary service and "meh" (interviewee shrugged shoulders) research – and they're not going to get tenure.

Another person stated:

> I think my heavy involvement in the teaching aspect will probably delay my promotion to full professor. This is a very research active campus. Research counts a lot, and I got heavily involved into redesign and teaching innovation, and this might not be as rewarded as the same activity if it had been focused on research. But it doesn't mean I regret it, because I have found an area that I really enjoy.

Interview Reflections: Benefits on a Departmental Level

Most of the participants were able to broaden their thinking and suggest how their departments benefited from their participation in NFTS. They identified benefits stemming from improved instruction and expanded networks.

Several participants indicated that their departments benefited because they were better teachers. One person said, "Well, if I'm a better teacher, then the department will do better in the sense that we'll draw more students…so I think it's been helpful from that perspective." Another stated, "I do think I am definitely a better teacher….We are pretty student oriented in our department…and anything that helps our students be happier and learn more is a good thing." One participant explained:

> Oh absolutely. My department was known as a research active department that was not much involved in teaching. I think on this campus we currently have one of the highest reputations in teaching efforts, efforts to make teaching and learning successful.…And so currently, I don't think there is anybody seriously on campus that will say that we are not doing a good job teaching. Our department has been a showcase on this campus for faculty learning communities, learning technology sessions where we have shown how we do it to others, and we've been very much engaged in those things.

He went on to further explain how the NFTS program created a common vocabulary and knowledge base among faculty peers in his department. He said:

> When you talk to faculty who went to the NFTS program and you tell them you teach differently than a traditional lecture, it's not like an experience I had with an older professor here, who asked me if they MAKE me use this technology. I said,

> 'No, I choose to do that.' And then he said. 'They'll never make me do that because I think it's the most ridiculous thing.' If you go to a faculty member who went through the NFTS program, maybe they're not really enthusiastic about using it, but at least they understand why I use it. And that flow of information is very important. So currently in my department, when I have an innovative project I want to do, they're not like, 'Oh, go away with it.' They say, 'Yeah, you guys are known for doing this.' I think that is increasing the standard of how people think about teaching and learning. And all of our younger faculty have gone through NFTS, and we just hired another one, and it's too bad that he will not have that opportunity. So among the younger faculty, if I talk about strategies like think-pair-share or active learning, they know what this is, what it refers to.

Other participants commented on how their department benefited from the networking that grew out of the NFTS program. One individual mentioned:

> …it's good PR when one of the faculty members is involved in a program. And I think the department has benefited from my networking experiences. I had one of my NFTS colleagues come and give a talk at a colloquium we had in our department.

Another person said:

> I think that the networking that I've done has helped. There have been times when issues have come up, I've said, 'You know, I know somebody over in Sociology, if you want me to, I'll give them a buzz.' Or 'I know somebody on another UM campus who went through this, if you're ok with that, I can pick up the phone and call them.' Then those perspectives and those other departments' perspectives

> have then come into our department. I think it's helped the department because I went through the program, and I was one of the first to do that, and the administrative team heard feedback that it was worthwhile, so they made sure that they sent someone the next time around.

Interview Reflections: Benefits on a Campus and University Level

Some of the participants expanded their thoughts and suggested how the NFTS program was beneficial to their campus and ultimately to the university. They talked about the effects on student enrollment and retention, faculty retention, and alumni support. One person discussed how he makes an effort to help students get to know one another in his classes. He believes that encouraging student engagement can indirectly increase student enrollment, retention, and possibly alumni support. He believes that if students feel isolated on campus, they are less likely to stay. He said:

> I think the kind of exercises I do in class helps them get to know one another beyond just their name and majors. I have them talk about their favorite ethnic food, where they like to go in the city, etc., see if they can find some common ground. I think that does help, in the classroom, in the department, and eventually in the university in terms of keeping students here…. Well, it's going to be good for the university if people have a positive experience here. We're in a day and age where they need funds, and alumni and retention has to look good for the university. And if people come here and have a good experience, then they're going to like our campus and the whole UM system, and maybe be more supportive of it.

Another individual talked about how engaging students in the classroom can have long term benefits for the entire university system. He stated:

> Students that are in dynamic classrooms and have mentoring relationships with faculty are by definition more engaged. More engaged students are going to participate more on campus and they're going to have greater allegiances to the university. It's funny, if you ask the students who's the chancellor or who's the provost, the usually don't know, but they can tell you who teaches Psych 101. This is my perspective as a faculty member, but I think faculty are the face of the university for the students and in many instances the universe for the students. So if you make faculty more effective in teaching and make them more open to adult learning, then I think the students have a better experience, they're more engaged in the university, and that benefits everyone.

Several participants talked about how faculty retention could be affected by the NFTS program. For example, one person stated:

> I think that the campus should be interested – this will aid in the retention of faculty if they feel like they are supported. I think it really mattered to a lot of people on my campus that there was this opportunity to think about teaching where we're all kind of stressed out about getting our research program going. But I think it sent a nice message that '…we care about teaching and learning on this campus.' I think if you have a happy and connected faculty you're going to do better in terms of their well being and their investment in the institution.

He went on:

> I think for the system, the interest is to develop young faculty members into better teachers. So if they do become better teachers, then it benefits the system. There were efforts in NFTS to link us across campuses. I felt like that was more difficult to do and often felt a little more artificial, but if you have a more cohesive system, all kind of working with the same mission, I think that's going to help the overall system as well.

Another participant discussed the current trend of online universities and how programs like NFTS matter to universities. He said:

> We now get more than 60% of our money from tuition. It used to be that it was only 30% or so. It's now the majority of it, and good teaching strategies, innovative teaching, lets you compete with universities that are completely based on new technology. Some universities don't even have a campus anymore, everything is online. It lets us find our niche in there, but also even increased involvement when students go back to their high school friends, or family – and say we do all this engaging teaching and learning – and I think by the time they're sophomores, they see the benefits of doing this in a nontraditional way, in a way where the instructors are more engaged in the learning process. And just by communicating this back it attracts more students.

He concluded:

> As more and more students go online and more and more students try to get their degree in a different way, I still think there's potential to attract students to a

campus to experience a new type of learning. I think we're on the right track, and NFTS has been a part of that.

Participant Suggestions for Program Improvements

Before concluding the interviews, I asked participants to reflect back on their experiences in the NFTS program. I asked them to take into consideration how their professional lives have changed over the past four or five years because of NFTS and offer any suggestions that might have improved the program.

All the participants had some type of suggestion to offer. Six of the twelve participants offered suggestions related to connection issues, specifically mentioning a lack of connection to the content of the program. For example, participants stated, "I was the only one in my field…" "NFTS was more appropriate for education people than those in the hard sciences" "NFTS presented teaching strategies that were behind the times" and "a lot of content was not applicable to my field." Other individuals commented that, "NFTS focuses on teaching, but that is undervalued and ignored in tenure" and "There was no overlap with my own experiences."

Several participants noted that follow up activities would have been beneficial. Comments included, "…be nice to have more things to connect faculty across the UM system… I really like the NFTS idea and the idea of people getting together and sharing ideas, those teaching ideas…" and "…we do need to have follow up events. It would make it more complete. After NFTS, people need the most guidance, mentoring, or support." Another individual said, "The alumni events for NFTS unfortunately have not been that successful, because everybody is extremely busy."

One participant suggested incorporating "a very good teacher available as a mentor. I think that might be a useful component. Maybe have that person attend a session of your teaching and give you some advice." Another suggested broadening the participation of campus administration beyond the NFTS director.

Several of the participants commented that they were disappointed to hear that the NFTS program at UM has been suspended. They talked about the value of the program and the benefits lost due to its discontinuation. One individual said:

> Well, the program isn't going on anymore, is it? That was kind of a bummer when I heard about that. It kind of makes me think about if this isn't an ongoing thing whether the full potential impact of NFTS could be realized. If the goal is to keep these young faculty engaged and improve teaching, then it seems like it should be something that is ongoing. For my new colleagues coming in, there aren't really a lot of things I can offer them in terms of getting integrated into the campus in the kind of formal ways that I was able to.

Another commented:

> I think it's a <u>really</u> important program. I think we have a good program on our campus that orients new teachers, but NFTS orients you to the system. I think both are really important. I know that the money for NFTS has been cut in recent years, and I think that's a shame, because you don't really build a community of scholars unless you have these kinds of things to bring people together and get them talking. I think it's a really valuable program. I used to sell NFTS when we had new faculty coming in and they would ask about ways to get support on campus, network with other departments. I would say, 'I've got two programs for

> you, but now both (including NFTS) are gone.' So the burden goes back on the individual. I'm not sure that people would turn us down because of that, but it was nice PR, it was a nice recruitment strategy to be able to count on those programs in those situations.

One individual added:

> It's a nice program. It's a good program to create a sense of community as well. At least you know that these four campuses exist as one unit. You can put a face on the names that you hear about, especially having a chance to interact with the higher ups in administration, the system president coming and talking, that's valuable. It gives you a sense of community. It doesn't probably translate into anything solid, like how you teach or write or do research, but it's heartwarming. I'm sorry to hear that it is no longer going.

Researcher Observations

Participants suggested the NFTS program might be improved by incorporating content that was relevant to their own professional lives. They mentioned the perceived benefit of discussing common teaching strategies or having peers in the program with similar academic experiences. Participants also suggested that follow-up activities after the completion of the NFTS program would be beneficial. They talked about scheduling campus or UM system events and the possibility of implementing a mentoring situation. Several participants also expressed their disappointment in hearing about the discontinuation of the NFTS program a few years ago. They said that the program had created a sense of community for new faculty members on their campuses and across the UM system.

My thought is that almost all of these suggestions and comments relate in some way to relationships and to some type of connection issue. Participants wanted the program content to be relative to their teaching, they wanted program peers to be in some type of similar situation as themselves, and they wanted follow up activities to be able to maintain connections and relationships built during the program.

Summary of Chapter Four

This qualitative study explored how the UM-NFTS program changed the professional lives of faculty who participated in the program four or five years ago. Through personal interviews, document review, and classroom observations, the study participants indicated that changes had indeed occurred in several areas of their professional lives, mostly in teaching, learning, and networking. In Chapter 5, I discuss those changes and how I utilized Kirkpatrick's evaluation model to connect them to the guiding questions of this study. I also discuss the results of this study as they relate to current literature and suggest implications for best practices and future research in the field of faculty development.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Overall Findings

This qualitative evaluative study explored the long-term impact of faculty development in higher education by focusing on participants who completed the University of Missouri's New Faculty Teaching Scholars Program (NFTS) approximately five years prior to this research. Four distinct campuses situated across the state of Missouri make up the University of Missouri System, and this faculty development program was available to faculty from all four campuses. Three participants from each of the four campuses participated in this study. The primary purpose of this study was to explore how the NFTS program affected the professional lives of those participants. The secondary intent of this study was to provide research-based documentation of the long-term effects of faculty development programs that are structured like NFTS. This documentation may add to the current knowledge base in the field of faculty development by identifying successful elements of faculty development programs and offering best practices for the field.

Using Kirkpatrick's (1998) four level evaluation model as a framework, I addressed the purposes and guiding questions of this research. I used document review, personal interviews, and classroom observations as data sources to explore the study participants' professional behaviors and their perceptions of any benefits from their NFTS experiences.

Connections to Literature

Research and literature indicate that faculty development programs are necessary to offer opportunities and support to faculty amid the ever changing landscape of modern

education (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). Faculty development programs can also be significant factors in creating a campus culture where teaching is supported and organizational collegiality is encouraged (Eib & Miller, 2006). For some, faculty development is considered to be fundamental to success in higher education (Camblin & Steger, 2000). Research also documents the implementation of faculty development programs, which include brief, one time workshops as well as long-term seminars (Amundsen, 2005) and discipline specific programs (Brawner, Felder, Allen, & Brent, 2002; Eib & Miller, 2006; Meacham & Ludwig, 1997).

The outcomes of faculty development programs are documented in the literature, and most reported outcomes are positive. Participants of those documented programs report that program benefits manifest themselves as improved teaching skills (Camblin & Steger, 2000; Davidson-Shivers, Salazar, & Hamilton, 2005; Pittas, 2000), increased confidence in the classroom (Knight, Carrese, & Wright, 2007), and expanded social and professional relationships with peers (Pittas, Morzinski, & Fisher, 2002). The results of this evaluative study reflect in some way all three of the above mentioned issues addressed in the literature of faculty development: necessity, implementation, and outcomes.

The concept for the UM NFTS program began as part of the University's 2001 strategic plan, which called for the development of campus environments that directly and intentionally focus on student learning. University administrators acknowledged the need for a program that would create an environment where early career faculty would be encouraged to engage with students and one another in a learner-centered environment.

They also hoped to offer opportunities for program participants to get to know their colleagues and expand their collegial networks.

NFTS was implemented as a program that spanned the nine month academic year. The program included three extended seminars that took place in a location away from all campuses and lasted over a weekend. In addition, each campus held monthly workshops for the program participants which addressed topics specific to each campus or to the individual interests of the participants.

The outcomes of the NFTS program mirror what is found in the literature. Participants acknowledged gaining skills and confidence in the classroom and appreciated the expansion of their social and professional networks with peers on their own campuses and across the UM system.

Use of Kirkpatrick's Model

The guiding questions of this study focused on how NFTS participants' professional lives changed as a result of the program and explored the broader impact of those changes. Kirkpatrick's (1998) four level evaluation model offered a vehicle for accessing that information. Through the utilization of Kirkpatrick's model, participants discussed their reactions to the program, what they learned, how their behaviors changed, and what impact their program experiences had on their professional lives and the extended university environment. As mentioned in an earlier chapter, all participants in this study will be will be referred to as male to protect the participants' identities.

Reaction

The general reaction to the NFTS program was positive. Participant responses on the end of year surveys and study participants' interview comments mostly reflected

satisfaction and an appreciation for the program. The majority of both participant groups welcomed the opportunities provided by NFTS to improve their teaching and expand their peer networks. Others appreciated the guidance offered for their career advancement and the efforts of the University to welcome them as new faculty. Positive reactions from the study participants were similar to reactions from surveyed participants four or five years ago. This indicated that positive feelings about the program were basically held constant over time for many of the participants. As Kirkpatrick (1998) states, those who liked and enjoyed a program have the potential to reap the greatest benefits.

Although there were no surveyed participants who expressed disappointment in the program, three of the study participants had suggestions that reflected a less positive reaction to the program. All three comments reflected a lack of connection with the program on some level. One participant mentioned that he was the only one in his field, another commented that the content presented didn't apply to his educational strategies, and the last stated that he had more teaching experience than the other participants.

Learning

Most participants from both groups, those who responded to the end of year surveys and those who participated in this study, responded in a similar manner when asked about what they learned from the NFTS program. They mentioned how their attitudes toward teaching shifted to be more active and engaging and identified specific teaching strategies that they incorporated into their classrooms. Some participants learned to modify an existing course strategy and others learned to implement new ones. According to Kirkpatrick's (1998) model, these positive responses are evidence that these participants did in fact have a learning experience during the program.

Not all comments about what was learned during NFTS were positive. Several survey participants indicated that their NFTS experience resulted in minimal learning. Again, the comments reflected a lack of connection with the program at some level. One participant said the program content dealt with class sizes that did not match his, a few thought the content of the program was too general to apply to their own courses, and another said the program was better suited to inexperienced teachers. One study participant reiterated again that his teaching strategies were very different than those presented at NFTS and that he would continue teaching in that way.

Behavior

The participants in this study mostly agreed that NFTS had changed their professional behaviors in some way. Expanding on the discussions of what they learned in the program, most participants agreed that their professional behaviors in the classroom have changed to include instructional strategies focused on active and engaged learning. Participants also mentioned that they benefitted from conversations and discussions about teaching strategies with their NFTS peers. Anecdotally, some of those participants said that the strategies they learned and implemented from NFTS had a positive impact on student learning in their classes.

Three of the twelve study participants acknowledged that NFTS had not made any specific difference in their classroom and teaching behaviors. Of those three, the same participant reiterated that his teaching strategies differed from those presented at NFTS, one commented that he would continue teaching based on his previous experience, and the other noted that NFTS had more of an impact on relationships with his peers. The inference of no connection with program content is evident again.

All the study participants acknowledged that their social or professional peer networks expanded during the NFTS program year. Some enjoyed new relationships with colleagues on their home campuses, and others forged collaborations with NFTS colleagues across the UM system. However, several participants lamented the fact that those peer relationships were not sustained after the end of the program year. Ten of the twelve participants agreed that networking was a vital part of their professional lives. They revealed that networking occurred in a variety of ways, but most of them acknowledged that the most productive opportunities to network took place at planned events. Supporting evidence from CV and syllabi reviews and from classroom observations corroborated the behavior changes discussed by participants. Based on Kirkpatrick's (1998) model, these behavior changes are indications of a positive program effect.

Results

The study participants thoughtfully discussed the benefits of their NFTS experiences. On a personal level, some agreed that their instructional knowledge and classroom confidence increased because of NFTS. Others acknowledged that the social and professional relationships developed during NFTS were both enjoyable and beneficial, and a few participants appreciated the guidance offered for their own career advancement. Interestingly, two participants who fully participated and embraced the NFTS program mentioned that their focus on improved teaching would probably delay their promotions, explaining that some aspects of the university culture continue to undervalue teaching.

Most participants recognized that their personal benefits from the program extended into their departments as well. They said that improved and engaged teaching positively impacted their departments by attracting and retaining more students. They also mentioned that expanded networking broadened and brought a more global perspective to their departments. Some participants noted that these same types of benefits carried over to their home campuses, adding that benefits from NFTS could also positively affect faculty retention. Although most of the participants had difficulty envisioning a connection between NFTS and benefits to the university system, a few added that the positive program outcomes could also contribute to alumni support. These results reflected Kirkpatrick's (1998) model by identifying outcomes that are beneficial on multiple levels.

Evaluative Conclusions

On all four levels of this evaluation model, NFTS produced positive results for participants. Most participants responded well to the program content and agenda. They learned and implemented effective teaching strategies in their classrooms and appreciated the opportunity to build and support new foundations for peer interaction. Participants also acknowledged personal benefits from their NFTS experiences and recognized that some of those benefits ultimately affected their departments, campuses, and the general university environment.

The positive results documented by participants are also an indication that NFTS met its goals on several levels. The purpose of the program was to help new faculty members become effective teachers and scholars by promoting engaging instructional strategies that support student-centered learning environments. The program also made

an effort to assist the participants in developing campus and system-wide peer networks, to support faculty teaching, research, and retention, and to support efforts to develop a culture of teaching throughout the university. As indicated by the data, most of these goals were met.

It is important to note that this evaluative study explored the long-term effects of the program on participants. Although it is valuable to obtain an assessment of program success at its conclusion, it is equally important to explore the long-term effects of a program on participants. This allows the evaluator to see if and how program participants are applying any recently acquired skills and knowledge to their current professional situation. Relevant literature calls for long-term evaluations of faculty development programs (Knight et al., 2007; Morzinski, & Simpson, 2003; Steinert, 2000) and this study answered that call.

Significance

The significance of this evaluative study is relevant to the faculty participants and the administrators of the NFTS program. This study also offered suggestions and recommendations for best practices in the field of faculty development, which are discussed in a following section. By reflecting on the long-term effects of this study, some participants were reminded of how participating in faculty development programs can positively affect their professional lives. This could encourage faculty to participate and support other programs that focus on faculty development. For UM, this evaluation provided important information about the long-term effects of this program and how NFTS participants directly or indirectly connected their program experiences to their

current situation. Understanding how the NFTS program supported early career faculty can inform future faculty development practices within the university environment.

Limitations

This study encompassed the elements and limitations of qualitative research. The results of this study are specific to faculty who participated in UM NFTS program and document each participant's personal story. Keeping with the qualitative methodology, these results should not be generalized to other populations. However, exploring the experiences of these participants may offer insight into how programs like NFTS do or do not have continuing impacts on the professional lives of faculty.

Many participants identified behavior changes in their professional lives after they participated in the NFTS program. However, changes over time often are the result of multiple sources, and it is difficult to attribute some changes to one specific event or experience.

Connections to Theory

Faculty development is not based on any one theoretical concept and some would posit that no single or unifying theory defines faculty development (Alstete, 2000; Wallin, 2003). My literature review found three theories that suggest a connection to faculty development: motivation (Wallin, 2003), learner-centered teaching (Daley, 2003; Froyd et al., 2005), and social constructivism (Layne et al., 2004). Support for all three of these theories of faculty development was evident at some level in this study data.

Wallin (2003) believes that faculty members who strive to make improvements in their professional lives do so because of motivating factors. In considering the structure of the NFTS program, presenting the tools to make courses more active and engaging for

students and more enjoying and fulfilling for instructors could be considered motivating factors. Some participants discussed how NFTS motivated them to try innovative strategies in the classroom or to make their course material more understandable for the students. Those comments reflect a motivating aspect of the NFTS program.

Froyd et al. (2005) hypothesize that approaches to faculty development should mirror the learner-centered teaching approaches currently implemented in many classrooms. The NFTS program presented a variety of learner-centered teaching strategies and many participants acknowledged that they effectively implemented those kinds of strategies in their classrooms. When looking at the structure of the NFTS program itself, there are some examples of the program structure that mirror a learner-centered approach. For example, participants were encouraged to bring their own materials to the system retreats. They had the time and opportunity to think about integrating new strategies with their current ones. In addition, the local campus activities often focused on topics that were specific to the needs and interests of the campus participants. These examples show that the NFTS program encouraged participants to reflect and integrate their own knowledge and skills with new strategies and to learn from their own experiences, which reflect several tenets of learner-centered teaching.

Layne et al. (2004) believe that faculty development should be viewed through the lens of constructivism, perhaps expanded to included social constructivism, which suggests that learning does not take place in isolation but rather collaboratively. The NFTS program provided multiple opportunities for participants to collaboratively explore new teaching strategies and discuss other aspects of their professional lives. The three system events brought participants from all four campuses together for several

days, which included academic presentations, opportunities for round table discussions, and scheduled social activities. Each day brought opportunities for participants to converse in both casual and formal situations. The data from this study confirm that most participants appreciated those networking opportunities and found them beneficial socially and professionally. This social component of the NFTS program reflects the basis for social constructivism.

Concepts from all three theoretical viewpoints are reflected in the structure of the NFTS program. Which theoretical viewpoint made the most impact? That could be debated, but it was my observation that the social constructivist viewpoint was most effective. The motivation and learner-centered approaches were certainly valuable to some participants, but I believe their basic premise hinges on the individual. For example, motivation may encourage the individual to be a better teacher and learner-centered instruction may be based on individual needs. Both of these theoretical viewpoints resulted in participant successes, but I believe that the collaborative nature of social constructivism contributed more to participant satisfaction and success in the program. Participants so frequently alluded to the benefits of their networking and general connections to peers in the program that I agree with one faculty participant who commented, "…for some of the participants…(networking) was the major aspect to engage in the program and stay in the program." Many participants acknowledged the benefits of NFTS networking, and conversely, the few participants who perceived minimal benefits from the program mentioned a lack of connection with program peers or program content as reasons.

Implications for Best Practices

The results of this follow-up evaluation offered implications for best practices by identifying successful elements of faculty development programs. As documented in the literature and detailed in this study's results, successful faculty development programs share several common themes.

Successful programs offer content that is current, relevant, and accessible and provide an opportunity for participants to fully engage in the program. Faculty who participated in the NFTS program differed in discipline, teaching experience, and training. The purpose of the NFTS program was to bring heterogeneous groups of early career faculty together and offer opportunities for them to experience the commonality of active and engaged teaching and learning strategies. The diversity of participants' experiences enhanced the social and professional conversations during the program, but that diversity was isolating and hindered some participants from fully experiencing the program. If possible, program planners should attempt to provide some measure of individualized attention for participants to access and integrate program content into their own professional lives. Those who plan programs like NFTS could also be transparent and explicit about the objectives and content of the program so that faculty members can make an informed decision about participation. For example, in this study, it was my observation that several participants would not have elected to be part of the program if they were aware of the exact program content. Even programs that are thoughtfully planned and successful overall may not be appropriate for every person.

Successful programs also provide opportunities for participants to get to know one another and build relationships on both a social and professional level. The NFTS program provided multiple opportunities for discussion and conversations among

participants. Networking played an important part in participants' perceived benefits from the NFTS program. The participants in this study who learned and successfully implemented engaging teaching and learning strategies attributed some of that learning to the networking that occurred during the program year.

Successful programs provide structured follow-up activities for program participants. Many NFTS participants commented on the value of networking and expressed an interest in continued connections with their NFTS peers after the program ended. Program planners could incorporate follow-up events to nurture the relationships built during NFTS and provide continuing opportunities for program alumni to maintain social and professional relationships with their NFTS peers.

Considerations for Future Research

This study posed and qualitatively answered three questions about the long-term impact of a faculty development program. The data collected and the results of this study also pose considerations for future research.

- This study used the perspectives of the program participants to present the outcomes. Although this study used several sources of data, one consideration for future research into faculty development would be to structure a study utilizing multiple perspectives. Using this current study as an example, a researcher could expand the data sources to include discussions with students, peers, departmental supervisors, program administrators, and appropriate campus administrators to explore the effects of the program. The challenge in this type of data collection is to

have conversations about the effects of the program in a non-threatening way and without specifically critiquing a particular participant.

- This qualitative study explored the experiences of 12 NFTS program participants. Even within this small group, multiple factors emerged that might have affected the participants' successes in the program. For example, participants listed a wide range of previous teaching experience in the classroom and training in education. They worked in a variety of disciplines from the hard sciences to the humanities. Participants' instructional obligations encompassed teaching small graduate classes to large lecture ones. Some participants embraced the networking opportunities within the program and others did not take advantage of them. On a broader scale, it would be interesting to investigate which, if any, of these participant differences contribute to positive experiences in programs like NFTS.
- Another consideration for future research would be to explore how campus cultures have changed because of faculty development programs like NFTS that focus on teaching, learning, and improving classroom instruction. As stated by several participants and noted in the literature, many university environments continue to value research activities over teaching. An area to explore would be how departments, campuses, and universities provide support for programs like NFTS and how that support may be changing the campus culture to appreciate and reward teaching activities.

- The process in this study was interactive and involved personal, face-to-face contact with the participants. One might ask what a different methodology might yield. Would it be productive to conduct a study like this in a different manner, for example, as a written survey, with data collection done over the phone, or as an online study?
- Another direction for future research would be to explore whether individuals who participate in programs like NFTS would be more likely to participate in other faculty development programs or in professional programs in general.
- A question related specifically to this NFTS study would be to investigate whether the different campuses and campus cultures of the four University of Missouri campuses had any impact on participants' successes in the program.
- The participants in this study were five years post program. A consideration for future research would be to ask whether five years is long enough to measure program impact. Would it be informative to repeat this study or conduct a new one after a longer period of time had elapsed after program completion?
- The UM retention study of NFTS participants versus new faculty who did not go through the program indicated that there was an 11% higher retention rate for faculty who went through the program. A cost benefit analysis could be conducted to examine the cost of facilitating a program like NFTS versus the cost of recruiting new faculty members.

- Several participants in this study offered anecdotal evidence of increased student learning in their courses because of the active and engaging strategies learned in NFTS. In the current academic environment, measuring student learning gains is a hot topic. However, if conducted appropriately, it would be beneficial to explore whether programs like NFTS result in not only more effective teachers, but ultimately in increased student learning.

Conclusion

This qualitative evaluation study explored the long-term impact of a faculty development program. This study focused on participants from the University of Missouri's New Faculty Teaching Scholars program who were five years post program. Kirkpatrick's (1998) four level evaluation model was used to gather data for the study. Although the Kirkpatrick model of evaluation was created to evaluate training programs in the business field, this research reinforced previous studies that found the Kirkpatrick model to be an effective tool in evaluating educational programs as well. Through document review, interviews, and observations, the study results provided evidence that the NFTS faculty development program continued to have positive impacts on the participants over time.

References

Alstete, J. W. (2000). Posttenure faculty development: Building a system for faculty improvement and appreciation. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 27* (4), 1-114.

Amundsen, C., McAlpine, L., Weston, C., Krbavac, M., Mundy, A., & Wilson, M. (2005). *The what and why of faculty development in higher education: An in-depth review of the literature.* Retrieved April 2, 2008, from Simon Fraser University: http://www.sfu.ca/rethinkingteaching/publications/CAmundsen.etal.pdf

APA Work Group of the Board of Educational Affairs. (1997, November). Learner-centered psychological principles: A framework for school reform and design. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Arreola, R.A., Theall, M., & Aleamoni, L. M. (2003). *Beyond scholarship: Recognizing the multiple roles of the professoriate.* Retrieved July 10, 2007, from http://www.cedanet.com/meta/Beyond%20Scholarship.pdf

Baum, S., & Ma, J. (2007). *Trends in college pricing.* Retrieved March 27, 2008, from College Board: http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/about/news_info/trends/trends_pricing_07_pdf

Blumberg, R. B. (2008, January). Lessons from consumerism: A note for faculty thinking about technology. *The Teaching Exchange*. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from Brown University: http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Italian_Studies/dweb/pedagogy/consumerism.shtml

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyle, M. A., & Crosby, R. (1997). Academic program evaluation: Lessons from business and industry. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 34* (3), 81-85.

Brawner, C. E., Felder, R. M., Allen, R., & Brent, R. (2002, October). A survey of faculty teaching practices and involvement in faculty development activities [Electronic version]. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 393-396.

Camblin, Jr., L. D., & Steger, J. A. (2000). Rethinking faculty development [Electronic version]. *Higher Education, 39*, 1-18.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin, 39(*7), 3-7.

Daley, B. J. (2003). A case for learner-centered teaching and learning [Electronic version]. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 98*, 23-30.

Davidson-Shivers, G. V., Salazar, J., & Hamilton, K. H. (2005). Design of faculty development workshops: Attempting to practice what we preach [Electronic version]. *College Student Journal, 39* (3), 528-539.

Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum Press.

Eib, B. J., & Miller, P. (2006). *Faculty development as community building* [Electronic version]. Retrieved July 9, 2007, from The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning: http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/299/639

Fairchild, E., Crage, S., Pescosolido, B., Martin, J., Smith, R., Perry, D., & Kurz, L. (2005). Getting our money's worth: Consumerist attitudes among Indiana University students. Retrieved March 27, 2008 from http://www.indiana.edu/~sotl/download/050211_exec_sum.doc

Fowler, F. J. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Froyd, J., Fowler, D., Layne, J., & Simpson, N. (2005, October). *Frameworks for faculty development (S3E).* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Society for Engineering Education/Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Indianapolis, IN.

Gardiner, L. F. (2000). *Faculty development in higher education.* Retrieved July 9, 2007, from The National Academy for Academic Leadership: http://thenationalacademy.org/readings/facdev.html

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods , 18* (1), 59-82.

Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes [Electronic version]. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 105*, 5-20.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave [Electronic version]. *Journal of Higher Education, 73* (4), 518-542.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kaya, N., Webb, J. D., & Weber, M. J. (2005). Faculty scholarly goals: Relationships between institutional, departmental, and individual's emphasis [Electronic version]. *Education, 125* (3), 446-453.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1975). *Evaluating training programs.* A collection of articles from the Journal of the American Society for Training and Development.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1998). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels.* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Berret-Koehler.

Knight, A. M., Carrese, J. A., & Wright, S. M. (2007). Qualitative assessment of the long-term impact of a faculty development programme in teaching skills [Electronic version]. *Medical Education, 41,* 592-600.

Knight, A. M., Cole, K. A., Kern, D. E., Barker, L. R., Kolodner, K., & Wright, S. M. (2005). Long-term follow-up of a longitudinal faculty development program in teaching skills [Electronic version]. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 20,* 721-725.

Koele, P. & Hoogstraten, J. (1988). A method for analyzing retrospective pretest/posttest designs. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 26,* (1), 51-54.

Kreber, C. (2001). The scholarship of teaching and its implementation in faculty development and graduate education [Electronic version]. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 86,* 79-88.

Layne, J., Froyd, J., Simpson, N., Caso, R., & Merton, P. (2004, October). *Understanding and improving faculty professional development in teaching (S1C).* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Society for Engineering Education/ Institute of Electrical and Electronics, Savannah, GA.

Leslie, D. W. (2002). Resolving the dispute [Electronic version]. *Journal of Higher Education, 73* (1), 49-73.

Levinson, W., Gordon, G., & Skeff, K. (1990). Retrospective versus actual pre-course self-assessments. *Evaluation & the Health* Professions, *13*, (4), 445-452.

McCombs, B. L. (2000). *Assessing the role of educational technology in the teaching and learning process: A learner-centered perspective.* Secretary's Conference on Educational Technology 2000.

McCombs, B. L. (2001, Spring). What do we know about learners and learning? The learner-centered framework: Bringing the educational system into balance [Electronic version]. *Educational Horizons,* 182-193.

McCombs, B. L. (2002, February). *The learner-centered framework: A research-validated rational for defining healthy educational environments.* Talking Paper for Educational Committee Hearing. Sacramento, CA.

Meacham, J., & Ludwig, J. (1997). Faculty and students at the center: Faculty development for general education courses [Electronic version]. *Journal of General Education, 46* (3), 169-183.

Melear, K. B. (2003, Summer). From in loco parentis to consumerism: A legal analysis of the contractual relationship between institution and student. *NASPA Journal, 40(4), 124-148.* Retrieved March 27, 2008, from Wilson Web database.

Menges, R. J. (1999). *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millis, B. J. (1994). Faculty development in the 1990s: What it is and why we can't wait [Electronic version]. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72*, 454-464.

Morzinski, J. A., & Fisher, J. C. (2002). A nationwide study of the influence of faculty development programs on colleague relationships [Electronic version]. *Academic Medicine, 77* (5), 402-406.

Morzinski, J. A., & Schubot, D. B. (2000). Evaluating faculty development outcomes by using curriculum vitae analysis [Electronic version]. *Family Medicine, 32 (3), 185-189.*

Morzinski, J. A., & Simpson, D. E. (2003). Outcomes of a comprehensive faculty development program for local, full-time faculty [Electronic version]. *Family Medicine, 35* (6), 434-439.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007a). *The Condition of Education.* Retrieved March 27, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2007/section3/table.asp?tableID=703

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007b). *Digest of education statistics: 2007.* Retrieved March 27, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07

Naugle, K. A., Naugle, L. B., & Naugle, R. J. (2000, Fall). Kirkpatrick's evaluation model as a means of evaluating teacher performance [Electronic version]. *Education, 121* (1), 135-144.

New Faculty Teaching Scholars. (2004). *General goals.* University of Missouri: Academic Affairs. Retrieved April 8, 2008 from http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/aa/nfts/goals.shtml

Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment [Electronic version]. *Journal of Higher Education, 64* (4), 453-471.

O'Meara, K. (2006). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Influence on faculty work life [Electronic version]. *Planning for Higher Education, 34* (2), 43-53.

Pacheco, M. T. (2001). *Design for the future: Creating the learner-centered research University - University of Missouri System Strategic Plan.* University of Missouri System: Office of the President.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pittas, P. A. (2000). A model program from the perspective of faculty development [Electronic version]. *Innovative Higher Education, 25* (2), 97-110.

Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education. (2007). *Faculty Development Definitions*. Retrieved July 9, 2007, from http://www.podnetwork.org/faculty_development/definitions.htm

Project Kaleidoscope, Core Institution Task Force. (2002). Investing in faculty [Electronic version]. *New Directions for Higher Education, 119*, 53-58.

Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45* (3), 285-309.

Rosser, V. J. (2005). Measuring the change in faculty perceptions over time: An examination of their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46* (1), 81-107.

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Lipsey, M. W. (1999). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motiviations: Classic definitions and new directions [Electronic version]. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25,* 54-67.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development [Electronic version]. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72*, 474-479.

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development.* Boston, MA: Anker.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Yun, J. (2007). From mentor to mentoring networks: Mentoring in the new academy [Electronic version]. *Change*, 58-61.

Steinert, Y. (2000). Faculty development in the new millennium: Key challenges and future directions [Electronic version]. *Medical Teacher, 22* (1), 44-50.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches* (Vol. 46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thomas, R. M. (2003). *Blending qualitative and quantitative research methods in theses and dissertations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tuition Inflation. (2008). Retrieved March 27, 2008, from FinAid: http://finaid.org/savings/tuition-inflation.phtml

University of Missouri System. (2001-2008). New faculty teaching scholars annual evaluation reports. *Academic Affairs.* Unpublished reports.

University of Missouri System. (2006). Retention for new faculty teaching scholars program. *Office of Institutional Research and Planning.* Unpublished report.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978*). Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wallin, D. L. (2003). Motivation and faculty development: A three-state study of presidential perceptions of faculty professional development needs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 27,* 317-335.

Weimer, M. E. (2003). Focus on learning, transfer teaching. *Change, 35*(5), 48-52.

Weisberg, H. F., Krosnik, J. A., & Bowen, B. D. (1996). *An introduction to survey research, polling, and data analysis* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Worthen, R. D., Sanders, J. R., Fitzpatrick, J. L. (1997). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Appendix A

Interview Guide

Prompt 1: How did you feel about the NFTS program during the year you participated? (If appropriate, ask the interviewee to recount any specific examples or experiences that support feelings about the program.)

Prompt 2: Talk about what you learned during the NFTS program year. (Ask for specific examples.)

Prompt 3: How do you think participating in the NFTS program has changed your professional behaviors? (If needed, use any or all of the following probes based on responses.)

Probes related to teaching and learning:

Tell me about your philosophy of teaching. Do you have a philosophy of teaching statement?

How has your approach to instructional strategies changed?

What kind of strategies have you incorporated into your courses?

What does learner-centered teaching mean to you?

Can you give me an example of a learner-centered instructional approach you use in your teaching?

How have these changes impacted student learning in your courses?

How have these changes affected you as an instructor? (Student evaluations, prep time, interactions with students in and out of class, etc.)

Probes related to peer networking:

How have your professional networks changed? (Within your discipline, across disciplines, within your home campus, across the UM system – horizontally and vertically)

How has NFTS contributed to collaborations with your colleagues? (Teaching, research, publications, grant applications and awards, interdisciplinary courses, conference presentations, service on committees, etc.)

Tell me about any mentoring experiences you have had, either as a mentor or a mentee, that have been a result of NFTS.

How is networking valuable to you? How do you network?

Tell me about your relationship with your immediate supervisor.

Probes related to tenure and promotion:

How did NFTS help prepare you for tenure or promotion? (Ask for specific examples.)

What kinds of resources helped you attain tenure or promotion? Intellectual resources? Social resources? Physical resources?

Have you participated in any other faculty development activities, formal or informal, since the NFTS program ended?

Prompt 4: In general, tell me about any benefits of participating in the NFTS program. (If needed, use the following probes to explore responses.)

Probes:

How have you benefited personally?

How has your department benefited?

How has your campus benefited?

How has the university system benefited?

Prompt 5: Looking back, what do you think was the most valuable aspect of the program?

Prompt 6: What one change would have most improved the program?

Appendix B

Dear Dr. Participant,

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri-St. Louis and am conducting research for my dissertation. As my research topic, I am exploring the long-term effects of faculty development programs and am using participants from the University of Missouri's New Faculty Teaching Scholars Program as my population of interest. I have identified 89 past NFTS participants who are approximately five years post program. I have randomly select 12 individuals to invite into this research study and am contacting you because you are one of those randomly selected individuals.

If you agree to be part of this study, I will ask you to participate in a face-to-face interview with me that will last approximately 45 minutes to an hour. I will travel to your campus and meet with you at a mutually agreed upon date and time. I will also ask you to provide me with a copy of a current and complete CV. As an optional part of this research, I will ask to observe one of your classes and will ask you to provide me with a copy of one of your syllabi. Participation in this optional component is at your discretion.

You may recognize my name, as I was the evaluator for the New Faculty Teaching Scholars Program for seven years. My involvement with the program has given me a very solid understanding of faculty development and a familiarity with the NFTS program itself. My hope is that this research will explore and identify any long-term effects of faculty development programs and contribute to best practices in the field.

I have attached the consent form for this study for your review. You will find additional information in the consent form that may answer further questions about my research. I am also happy to personally answer any questions or concerns you may have. If you agree to participate in this study, I will bring a copy of the consent form to the interview for you to sign.

I hope you will consider participating in this study. I can assure you that your identity and any data you provide will remain confidential. I will be the only person who knows the identity of the study subjects and who will have access to the raw data. I anticipate beginning my data collection very soon, so I would appreciate your timely response to this invitation.

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,
Marcia Tennill

MarciaTennill@umsl.edu
636-441-1262

Appendix C

Division of Educational Psychology

One University Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4499
Telephone: 314-516-5783
Fax: 314-516-5784
E-mail: MarciaTennill@umsl.edu

Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities
Five Year Follow-up Evaluation of a Faculty Development Program: A Qualitative Study

Participant _____ HSC Approval Number 100608T

Principal Investigator Marcia M. Tennill PI's Phone Number 636-441-1262

---

1. You are invited to participate in a dissertation research study conducted by Marcia M. Tennill, a doctoral student in the College of Education at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. The purpose of this study is to explore any long-term impact of the University of Missouri New Faculty Teaching Scholars program on participants. This will be accomplished through a follow-up evaluation conducted with participants approximately five years after completing the program. This study will explore how the New Faculty Teaching Scholars program has affected the professional lives of those participants.

This study will also provide research-based documentation of the long-term effects of faculty development programs that are structured like the New Faculty Teaching Scholars program. This may contribute to future program planning for the University of Missouri and other institutions wishing to establish or revise existing faculty development programs. Results from this study may also add to the current knowledge base in the field of faculty development by identifying successful elements of faculty development programs and offering best practices for the field.

2. a) Your participation will involve

- Providing the researcher with a current and complete CV.
- Participating in a face-to-face interview with the researcher, who will travel to your location and meet with you at a mutually agreeable time. The interview may be audio recorded.
- At your discretion, allowing the researcher to observe one of your classroom sessions.
- At your discretion, providing a current syllabus from one of your courses.
-

b) The amount of time involved in your participation will be approximately 45-60 minutes spent in a face-to-face interview with the researcher. If you so allow, an additional 45-60 would be involved if you consent to a classroom observation.

Approximately 12 subjects may be involved in this research, with three subjects being randomly selected from each of the four University of Missouri campuses.

There is no remuneration of any type involved in this research.

3. There are no anticipated risks associated with this research.

4. There are no direct benefits for you from your participation in this study. However, your participation will contribute to an understanding of how and why faculty development programs can benefit early career faculty on a long term basis.

5. Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to participate in this research study or to withdraw your consent at any time. You may choose not to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You will NOT be penalized in any way should you choose not to participate or to withdraw.

6. Any information gathered from this research that can be connected to you will remain confidential and will not be disclosed without your permission. The only person who will know that you have participated in this study and have access to the raw data is the researcher, Marcia Tennill. In addition, all data will be stored on a password-protected computer and/or in a locked office.

   By agreeing to participate, you understand and agree that your data may be shared with other researchers and educators in the form of presentations and/or publications. In all cases, your identity will not be revealed. In rare instances, a researcher's study must undergo an audit or program evaluation by an oversight agency (such as the Office for Human Research Protection). That agency would be required to maintain the confidentiality of your data.

7. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may call the Investigator, Marcia Tennill at 636-441-1262. You may also ask questions or state concerns regarding your rights as a research participant to the Office of Research Administration, at 314-516-5897.

   I have read this consent form and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I will also be given a copy of this consent form for my records. I consent to my participation in the research described above.

Participant's Signature	Date	Participant's Printed Name
		Marcia M. Tennill
Signature of Investigator	Date	Investigator Printed Name