2020

A Program Evaluation of a Community College's New Faculty Seminar

Kari McLean Proft
Walden University

Walden University

College of Education

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Kari M. Proft

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Maureen Ellis, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty
Dr. Carole Pearce, Committee Member, Education Faculty
Dr. Laura Siaya, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2020

Abstract

A Program Evaluation of a Community College's New Faculty Seminar

by

Kari M. Proft

MS, Illinois State University, 1990

BS, Illinois State University, 1988

Project Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

October 2020

APA 6th Edition

Abstract

A community college (CC) in the midwestern United States launched a New Faculty Seminar (NFS) in 1999 for new tenure-track faculty. The problem that prompted this project study is that the NFS has been implemented yearly since 1999 without a formal evaluation. Without an evaluation plan, college leadership cannot determine whether the program is meeting stated goals. The purpose of this program evaluation was to explore how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced and how they perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the CC environment and the development of their instructional delivery. Fredericks, Deegan, and Carman's logic model served as the conceptual framework. The research questions for this qualitative case study explored how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced, and their perceptions of the outcomes and impact of the NFS. Training documents were collected from 34 sources and 2 focus group interviews were conducted with 8 tenured faculty who had participated in the NFS. Data analysis was conducted using holistic, in-vivo, and evaluative coding cycles. A few key findings included that the resources allocated in the NFS for the development of instructional delivery strategies were perceived as beneficial, but the opportunity for relationship building and setting accurate institutional expectations were lacking in the NFS and this negatively impacted long-term collaborative work. An executive summary of recommendations for improvements in the NFS and ongoing evaluation plan was developed. The study promotes social change by addressing NSF challenges and possible improvements, which could improve new faculty training.

Program Evaluation of a Community College's New Faculty Seminar

by

Kari M. Proft

MS, Illinois State University, 1990

BS, Illinois State University, 1988

Project Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

October 2020

Table of Contents

Section 1: The Problem....1

Introduction....1

The Local Problem....1

Rationale....2

Definition of Terms....4

Significance of the Study....6

Research Questions....7

Review of the Literature....8

Conceptual Framework....9

Relationship to the Broader Research Problem....11

Purpose....12

Understanding Faculty Development....14

Implications....18

Summary....20

Section 2: The Methodology....22

Introduction....22

Qualitative Research Design and Approach....23

Justification of the Choice of Research Design....25

Description of the Type of Evaluation and Justification....26

Overall Program Evaluation Goals....26

Participants....27

Criteria for Selecting Participants....27

Justification for the Number of Participants....28

Procedures for Gaining Approval to Access Participants....29

Measures for Establishing Researcher-Participant Relationship....29

Measures for the Protection of Participants....30

Data Collection....32

Procedures and Processes for Documentary Data Collection....32

Procedures and Processes for Focus-Group Data Collection....33

Instrumentation....34

Data Safekeeping Status....36

Role of the Researcher....36

Data Analysis....38

Procedures for Data Analysis....38

Evidence of Quality and Procedures to Assure Accuracy and Credibility of the Findings....42

Researcher Bias....45

Procedures for Dealing with Case Discrepancy....46

Limitations....46

The Utility of Qualitative Case Study Design....46

Limited Availability of Documentary Data....47

The Utility of Self-Reported Data....47
The Utility of a Single Research Site and Program....49
Data Analysis Results....49
Summary of Data Generation....50
Research Question 1....52
Research Question 2....59
Evidence of Quality and Methods to Address Trustworthiness....67
Conclusion....70
Section 3: The Project....71
Introduction....71
Program Description and Goals....71
Rationale....72
How the Problem Is Addressed in the Evaluation....73
Review of the Literature....77
Literature Related to Genre and Search Terms....77
Professional Development....78
Adult Learning Theory....79
Adult Learning Theory and Professional Development....80
NFS Program Inputs....81
NFS Program Processes....83
NFS Program Outcomes....85

NFS Program Impact 86
Project Description....88
Overview....88
Needed Resources and Existing Supports....88
Potential Barriers and Solutions....91
Implementation and Timetable 91
Roles and Responsibilities 92
Project Implications 94
Possible Social Change Implications 94
Importance of Project to Key Stakeholders 95
Conclusion 96
Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions....97
Introduction....97
Project Strengths 97
Project Limitations....98
Recommendations for Alternative Approaches 98
Scholarship, Project Development, and Leadership and Change 99
Reflection on the Importance of the Work 102
Implications, Applications and Directions for Future Research....102
Conclusion 103
References....104

Appendix A: The Project 126
A Program Evaluation of a Community College's New Faculty Seminar 126
Program Evaluation of the New Faculty Seminar 127
Overview 127
Summary of Findings 129
Purpose of the NFS Program 143
Purpose of the NFS Evaluation 143
Program Evaluation Outcomes 144
Overview of Recommendations 145
Recommendation 1: Establish a consistent plan for program evaluation 145
Recommendation 2: Implement a needs assessment of new faculty member hires 146
Recommendation 3: Establish a clear description for faculty leads 147
Recommendation 4: Implement the NFS activities using adult learning strategies 148
Recommendation 5: Establish informal professional development programs for new faculty that include veteran faculty 149
Recommendation 6: Establish an internal recognition plan for ongoing faculty professional development 150
Recommendation 7: Implement institutional strategies that promote the correlation between quality instruction and student success 151
Summary 154
References 156
Appendix B: Focus Group Protocol 168

Section 1: The Problem

Introduction

Community colleges are charged with repurposing the skill sets of community members who are looking for employment in new career fields, bridging the knowledge gap between high school graduates and college-ready students and accommodating a growing student body that increases because of the economic considerations associated with the costs of a 2-year degree (AACC, 2015; Finley & Kinslow, 2016). Such skill development requires a different pedagogical paradigm for community college faculty than for faculty at 4-year institutions (Lancaster, Stein, MacLean, Van Amburgh, & Persky, 2014). Professional development programs are a critical component for community college new faculty members in adapting to the pedagogical paradigm shift (Gardner, 2014; Zielinski, 2017). The New Faculty Seminar (NFS) is a component of a professional development program at the institution of study to assist new tenure-tracked faculty hires in acclimating to the pedagogical paradigm of the community college.

The Local Problem

The defined goals of the NFS is to assist new full-time, tenure-track faculty members with the task of learning about the community college environment and encouraging the development of their instructional delivery (Program Handbook and Schedule, 2000). The seminar goals are addressed through a weekly 3-hour mandatory meeting for the new faculty tenure-tracked hires of each academic year during the fall semester. However, the gap in practice that prompted this project study was that a program evaluation plan was not included as part of the original program planning of the

NFS and therefore, a program evaluation has never been conducted since the NFS's launch in 1999 (Faculty Development/Instructional Developer, personal communication, April 20, 2016). The scholarly literature defines program evaluation for professional development is intended to be continuous and ongoing to provide useful feedback for program constituents and stakeholders (McDavid, Huse, & Hawthorn, 2012; Mertens & Wilson, 2018; Spaulding, 2016; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014).

The problem that prompted this project study is that for the last 20 years, the NFS has been implemented yearly without a formal evaluation of whether it is meeting the defined program goals. Without an existing evaluation plan for the NFS, it is impossible to determine whether the resources allocated to the program are adequate or excessive, how the program is implemented, whether participants are reached as intended, or whether the program is making a difference for the new faculty hires or the institutional environment (faculty development/instructional developer, personal communication, April 20, 2016). Within the larger educational situation, this study was needed for the institution of study in the responsibility to account for allocated resources and program effectiveness in developing faculty to meet the educational needs of community constituents. When presented to the Vice President of Educational Affairs at the institution of study, this program evaluation project study for the NFS was approved.

Rationale

The 2008 economic recession led to reduced funding for higher education institutions from the state and national levels (Kuh et al., 2015). Particularly at community colleges, new and tenured faculty had to take on additional responsibilities

beyond teaching and learning to support the financial health of their institutions (Meizlish, Wright, Howard, & Kaplan, 2017). Nevertheless, key decision-makers in community colleges who are involved in the faculty hiring process must take into consideration that recruiting, hiring, and retaining full-time faculty is a significant financial investment (Freeman et al., 2014; Meizlish et al., 2017). Therefore, this study was essential for the institution to discover the resources being allocated to new faculty members' professional development to enhance fiscal responsibility.

Beyond fiscal responsibility, this was a worthy study for the institution in the practical responsibility of providing new faculty hires a professional development program that impacts the pedagogical paradigm shift on the individuals' professional practices. Student diversity has required community college faculty to develop new teaching and learning strategies to meet the educational needs of the community they serve (Hansen & Dawson, 2019). As a community college, the mission of the institution of study is a commitment to teaching and learning excellence. Therefore, it is necessary to have evidence that the NFS promotes the development of new faculty members toward that mission (faculty development/instructional developer, personal communication, April 20, 2016). Without comprehensive evaluation data for over 20 years, program improvements and updates have not been assessed to ensure that the NFS stays relevant and useful in meeting the professional development needs of new faculty.

The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and how they perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of

the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. This program evaluation provides recommendations for improvements in the NFS to better meet the professional development needs of new faculty hires, as well as insights for evolving professional development programs at the institution of study.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions were used throughout the study:

Community college: Higher educational institutions with a focus on teaching and learning. These institutions provide open enrollment policies that produce a demographically and economically diverse student body, including students who have varying levels of academic preparedness and experiences with higher education (Eddy, 2010; Finley & Kinslow, 2016; Green & Ciez-Volz, 2010).

Faculty development: Directed activities that are designed to improve the professional skills of faculty members, specific to their needs, and to enhance the college teaching experience. For purposes of this study, the term *professional development* is limited in definition and is interchangeable with the term *faculty development* (Eddy, 2010; Gregory & Burbage, 2017; Law et al., 2012).

Faculty orientation program: Training initiatives of an academic institution that are intended to acclimate new faculty members to the academic environment, to develop professional skills for effective job implementation within the context of the academic institution, or both (Chauvin, Anderson, Mylona, Greenburg, & Yang, 2013; Law et al., 2012). Additionally, for purposes of this study, the term refers to a program component of faculty development for the institution at large. Also, a *program* is defined as a group

of related activities designed to achieve one or more intended objectives (McDavid et al., 2012; Spaulding, 2016). Interchangeable terms include references to *seminars, training programs, and professional development programs* for new faculty members.

New faculty: Individuals hired by the academic institution who have gained knowledge on a subject matter either through professional practice (as with those who are new to the academic environment) or through academic study (as with recent graduates who have been trained in a specific discipline); the majority of whom have not been trained to teach adult learners (Chauvin et al., 2013; Eddy, 2010; Green & Ciez-Volz, 2010; Pesce, 2015).

Program evaluation: The process of examining a program to define its value and make recommendations for implementation improvements (Mertens & Wilson, 2018; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). For purposes of this study, the term *program evaluation* reflects the premise of *program review*, in that the elements of the evaluation and the assessment of the program's perceived effectiveness include assessment of the aspirational role of the program to best meet the needs for faculty development and resource allocation in the success of the institution.

Training: A planned program to improve knowledge, skills, attitudes, or a combination of these in a specific activity or range of activities (Buckley & Caple, 2009). Also, *program* is defined as a group of related activities designed to achieve one or more intended objectives (McDavid et al., 2012; Spaulding, 2016). Interchangeable terms for *training* include *seminars*, *development*, and *orientation*.

Significance of the Study

The results of this research are significant to the institution of study for three reasons. First, the yearly NFS curriculum practices have not been recorded or retained by a program administrator. Changing supervision and succession leadership of the NFS program over a more-than-20-year period resulted in data not being available in only one location on campus. Instead, data was distributed across many locations, stored by faculty members or administrators who had varying roles in the organizational structure, and in some cases, held by people outside the institution. This project study produced a collection of relevant documents, dating back to the program launch that describes what resources and activities have been used in implementing the NFS. Program administrators now have a historical accumulation of data reference that is available at one designated location at the institution of study.

Second, this research is significant to the institution of study in capturing new faculty members' descriptions of their NFS participation about the initially defined goals of the program: to assist new full-time, tenure-track faculty members with the task of learning about the community college environment and encouraging the development of their instructional delivery. For the first time in 20 years, this project study provides college administrators input from faculty on how they describe the NFS implementation and their perception of the program results, giving faculty a voice in more fully assessing the program for its relevancy and improvements.

Third, this research is significant to the institution of study in identifying potential gaps in practice for implementing relevant professional development activities for new

full-time, tenure-track faculty members. Faculty "corridor conversations" (McKay & Monk, 2017, p. 1254) indicate that the implementation of the NFS has been fluid in curriculum and design strategies depending on the program faculty lead(s) and status of the institutional climate in their year of participation. Without a summative evaluation conducted every year, data metrics are absent on the effectiveness of varied curriculum and instruction strategies in meeting the participants' professional development needs. A result of this project study is a longitudinal reflection of data for the implementation of relevant practices in faculty development programs at the institution. This study promotes social change by encouraging the relevant development of new faculty training programs.

Research Questions

The NFS was launched in 1999 to assist new full-time, tenure-track faculty members with the task of learning about the community college environment and encouraging the development of their instructional delivery. The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and how they perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. This program evaluation provides recommendations for the relevant curriculum and design strategies to be implemented for new faculty member program development as well as insights for evolving professional development programs at the institution of study.

The problem that prompted this project study is that for the last 20 years the NFS has been implemented yearly without a formal review of whether it was meeting the

defined program goals. The absence of a program evaluation has resulted in a lack of data about the inputs, processes, outcomes, and impact for the NFS related to the faculty's understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. The following research questions guided the study:

RQ1: How do faculty describe the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during their year of participation?

RQ2: How do faculty perceive the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery?

Review of the Literature

The constructivist orientation to learning provided a theoretical foundation for this program evaluation. The constructivist orientation postulates that learning is a process of constructing meaning through lived experiences (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Gibbs, 2018; Merriam, 2015; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). Given this broad definition, a variety of perspectives regarding the constructivist orientation has evolved in scholarly research related to program evaluation and adult learning. The two primary categories that have emerged—each having several theoretical foundations and applications in support—emphasize whether making meaning is done from a personal-individual perspective or a social-interactive perspective. Researchers grounded in the personal-individual perspective advocate that meaning is derived from an individual's previous and present knowledge foundation. The social constructivist orientation of the social-interactive perspective, derived from the results of Vygotsky's (1978) culturally bound research,

advocates that meaning is socially co-constructed through interaction, using symbols and language, with others in the environment. Researching within the social constructivists' worldview for this project study provided a theoretical paradigm for understanding new faculty members who have a new role in the academic environment and who are introduced to new symbols and language by skilled members of the tenured faculty.

Conceptual Framework

Various conceptual frameworks and models for program evaluation have been established in the scholarly literature to serve as a foundation for evaluative evidence that defines program relativity (Mertens & Wilson, 2018; Payne, Madaus, & Stufflebeam, 2012; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). A standard logic-model framework is not necessarily generalizable to all program evaluations. The most crucial aspect of applying a logic-model framework is that it provides a conceptual illustration of a defined program's complexity and theory of change by linking contextual factors, resources, and activities to intended outcomes in program evaluation (Mertens & Wilson, 2018). The problem that prompted this project study is that for the last 20 years the NFS has been implemented yearly without a formal review of whether it is meeting the defined program goals. The absence of a program evaluation has resulted in a lack of data about the inputs, processes, outcomes, and impact for the NFS as they relate to faculty's understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery.

This project study was necessary to provide data to guide relevant future professional development programs for faculty. Fredericks, Deegan, and Carman's (2008) logic-model framework served as a conceptual framework to capture data and

provide systematic thinking between the NFS core components for inputs, processes, outcomes, and impacts to address the guiding research questions. Inputs are the resources that go into a program to accomplish its activities such as allocated human resources, financial apportionments, facility accommodations, and program supplies. Processes are the use of activities conducted to achieve program outcomes such as events, technology, instruction, and actions that work together to implement the program. Additionally, processes are influenced by attitudes and relationships, either established or that evolve, of the people involved in the program activities. Outcomes are the effects that occur as a result of the program which can include the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of individuals who participate in the program. Importantly, outcomes are influenced by the quality and quantity of the program inputs and processes. Impacts are the changes influenced by the program on a long-term, broad-scale for the organization, internally or externally. Also, a program's impacts can have intended or unintended effects on the broader community in which the organization exists, as well as on the greater social environment.

Using the Fredericks et al. (2008) logic-model framework, I planned and implemented the NFS program evaluation through five stages of the research project. First, I noted how the research questions aligned for participants to describe what resources have been going into the program and how the program is being implemented, as well how participants describe the outcomes and impact the NFS has had on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. Second, I refined the data collection instrument to focus on in-

depth data delineated by the core concepts of the framework. Third, I used the framework to provide boundaries to keep the data collection process focused on the NFS program. Fourth, I used the core concepts of the framework as a structure for sorting and analyzing the data in answering the research questions of the program evaluation. Last, I established that I would use the logic-model framework to organize the content for the final program evaluation report.

Relationship to the Broader Research Problem

I determined that the importance of establishing a critical review that would document any broader problems associated with the local program to be addressed in this study was another justification for this investigation as a worthwhile scholarly endeavor. I conducted an extensive literature search of scholarly articles, textbooks, and the Internet sites of educational institutions to identify theoretical concepts and program evaluation models. I used online databases to retrieve articles published in scholarly textbooks and well-accepted, peer-reviewed journals. I searched databases (for example, Academic Search Complete, EBSCO, Education Resources Information Center [ERIC] and Sage Publications) for the following terms: *new faculty orientation, faculty/professional development, college faculty, community college faculty, two-year colleges, program evaluation, program evaluation models and program relativity.* I included results from the literature that incorporated diverse perspectives, cultures, and genders. I provided relevant public data that referenced the political, social, and economic trends of the community college.

Understanding the Community College Environment

Purpose. The community college has an extensive role in the U.S. higher education system. Originally established as "junior colleges," community colleges now educate 50% of undergraduate students (Morest, 2013, 2015) and offer a more affordable means to attain a higher education (AACC, 2015). The role of the community college is also to provide educational services for repurposing the skill sets of community members who are looking for employment in new career fields, bridging the knowledge and skill gap between high school graduates and college-ready students and accommodating a student body that increasingly has diverse student learning needs (Finley & Kinslow, 2016; Hansen & Dawson, 2019; Magloire, 2019; Romano, 2012). Such skill development requires new pedagogical paradigms (Lancaster, et al., 2014). However, community college faculty are generally content experts in their discipline and not necessarily trained as educators (Gardner, 2014; McKee & Tew, 2013).

While community college faculty typically hold a master's degree in their academic discipline, an essential differentiating trait is that most also have real-world field experience as compared to their peers at 4-year institutions (Cunningham, 2018; Finley & Kinslow, 2016; Zielinski, 2017). The faculty at community colleges are also more diverse in gender, ethnicity, age, and professional experience (Banda, Flowers, & Robinson, 2017; Munday, Angel, Anik, Clay, Justice, et al., 2019; Soto, Gupta, Dick, & Appelgate, 2019). As such, the community college faculty profile supports the student experience with varied pathways to achieve their varied goals, which is considered part of the *social justice mission* of most community colleges (Kapitulik, 2013).

Recently, the advancing agenda to provide a community college education tuition-free to all solidifies the critical role of the community college in the American higher education system in providing the potential for community members to increase their earnings and set a path for change in their lives (Finley & Kinslow, 2016). To meet such an agenda, the community college faculty of the 21st Century will be expected to understand and adapt to the teaching and learning needs of a diverse student body with varied future goals. Whether free tuition comes to fruition or not, the community college must develop and retain faculty who are committed to the community college mission.

Accountability. Economic considerations impact the community college for which there has been an increased expectation in reporting accountability and documenting fiscal health (Bers & Head, 2014; Freeman et al., 2014). The impact of fiscal uncertainty on faculty members is that they are asked to assume additional administrative tasks in assessment and learning outcomes (Beane-Katner, 2013; Meizlish et al., 2017). The financial challenges that have led to cost-cutting decision making and increased administrative faculty responsibilities emphasize the need for higher education to ensure the relativity of teaching and learning (Kuh et al., 2015; McKee & Tew, 2013). Nevertheless, key decision-makers in community colleges who are involved in the faculty hiring process must take into consideration that recruiting, hiring, and retaining full-time faculty is a significant financial investment (Freeman et al., 2014; Meizlish et al., 2017).

Teaching tradition. In higher education, the primary form of instruction is teacher-centered (Carpenter, Sweet, & Blythe, 2016; Chauvin et al., 2013; Weimer, 2013). Students are passive learners as faculty control the curriculum, delivery method,

and forms of assessment. However, according to adult learning strategies relevant teachers integrate their content knowledge with student-centered teaching strategies (Gardner, 2014; Zielinski, 2017). Adults want to have a role in the learning process and be respected for the knowledge they bring to the learning environment (Martin & Collins, 2011; Mitchell, 2014; Owusu-Agyeman & Fourie-Malherbe, 2019). Learner-centered teaching strategies put adult learning theory into practice where students are active in the learning process (Gardner, 2014; Weimer, 2013). Generally, faculty in higher education are discipline-specific content experts. Based on their own experiences as a student in higher education, they therefore teach as they were taught, which is through teacher-centered strategies not tied to student learning outcomes (Gardner, 2014; McKee & Tew, 2013).

Status of current research. The primary role of a community college faculty member is to provide educational services. As such, research conducted by and for community college faculty members is limited in scope. One significant reason for this absence could be due to the establishment of the community college as an institution focused on teaching and learning rather than as an institution driven by research (Finley & Kinslow, 2016; Green & Ciez-Volz, 2010; Morest, 2015). Although faculty members in community colleges often conduct research, doing so is not the primary focus of their role in the institution.

Understanding Faculty Development

Purpose. The purpose of higher education is to promote learning, which is fundamentally about change (Frye & Hemmer, 2012). Change is promoted not only

through the practice of teaching provided by the institution of higher education to the community it serves but also through the practice of learning for the individuals it employs, which is the purpose of professional development programs. Relevant teaching in higher education includes the concept that faculty are invested in their learning, that institutional factors can either encourage or discourage and that teaching should be tied to its effects on student learning (Chauvin et al., 2013; Elliott & Oliver, 2016; Lewis & Ewing, 2016; Willett, Iverson, Rutz, & Manduca, 2014). As the cultural, social, and economic landscape changes in higher education, so will the role of the faculty member (Beane-Katner, 2013; Carpenter et al., 2016; Chauvin et al., 2013; Hott & Tietjen-Smith, 2018). In their review of the major shifts in American higher education, McKee and Tew (2013) made the case that faculty have a crucial role in the success of their educational institutions facing the next decade of challenges such that faculty development is not a luxury but a necessity. However, the allocation of resources can become significant in defining faculty development as critical to institutional success.

Accountability. Student success data metrics are one variable that higher education institutions use as a reporting factor in demonstrating viability to key stakeholders both internal and external to the institution. Research indicates a positive correlation between quality instruction and student success (Bedford & Rossow, 2017; Kane, Shaw, Pang, Salley, & Snider, 2016; Thurlings & den Brok, 2017). Therefore, student success becomes incumbent on the institution to ensure quality instructional delivery, for which professional development programs are one channel. Typically, community colleges have internal faculty developers as part of the teaching and learning

mission but training outside the institution is also provided. The current challenge is that research indicates that the programs being offered, internal and external, are still primarily conducted as passive learning events (Dron & Anderson, 2014; Holmes & Prieto-Rodriquz, 2018), lacking the demonstration of the adult learning theory of student-centered practices (Bedford, 2019; Krutka, Carpenter, & Trust, 2017).

Developing new faculty. While professional development programs are an essential component in supporting all faculty (Bedford, 2019; Lancaster et al., 2014; Pesce, 2015; Professional and Organizational Development Network Executive Committee, 2016; Saroyan & Trigwell, 2015), training is even more critical for new faculty members, the majority of whom have not been trained to teach (Beane-Katner, 2013; Behar-Horenstein, Garvan, Catalanotto, Su, & Feng, 2016; Gardner, 2014; McKee, Johnson, Ritchie, & Tew, 2013; Pesce, 2015). As previously stated, adults are more diversely represented in the community college environment and have learning needs that align with the social constructivist theory: they learn through developing meaning by conversing, building relationships and self-directed application of the knowledge (Dron & Anderson, 2014; Fleming, Goldman, Correll, & Taylor, 2016; Krutka et al., 2017; Saroyan & Trigwell, 2015). Such strategies are student-centered in nature, which in turn, should be demonstrated through new faculty professional development programs (Mitchell, 2014; Sullivan, Neu, & Yang, 2018). In addition to new faculty having minimal, if any, student-centered instructional experiences, they often experience a significant learning curve in acclimating to a learning environment as a faculty member rather than as a student (Eddy, 2010; Hott & Tietjen-Smith, 2018; Meizlish et al., 2017).

Status of current research. Many faculty members continue to use ineffective teaching strategies despite the widespread publication and availability of research-based instructional methods (Bosman & Voglewede, 2019). Several systematic reviews of new faculty development programs have been conducted, most extensively in medical education but a single model for implementation has not emerged (Bruner, Dunbar, Higgins, & Martyn, 2016; Chauvin et al., 2013; Lancaster et al., 2014; Meizlish et al., 2017). Program evaluations of new faculty professional development at community colleges in the scholarly literature are particularly scarce and dated. Also, the scholarly literature about program evaluation, which yielded results for effective new faculty training programs designed for faculty members who have significant research responsibilities, does not add to the increased understanding of the lived experiences of the community college faculty member.

However, the scholarly literature on mentoring programs designed for new faculty professional development is robust, spanning nearly 30 years. Mentor programs for new faculty members can establish collegiality with veteran faculty and learning to navigate the culture of the environment (Beane-Katner, 2014; Waddell, Martin, Schwind, & Lapum, 2016). Besides meeting inclusion needs for new faculty, mentoring programs have also been designed to provide support for building skills in the classroom (Haines & Popovich, 2014; Lynch, Barrere, O'Connor, Karosas, & Lange, 2017). Results from research in the field of medical education confirm that mentoring programs have a positive impact on new faculty morale and job satisfaction due to the specific problem-solving situations provided in mentor programs (Needleman, Bowman, Wyte-Lake, &

Dobalian, 2014; Nick et al., 2012). In their review of literature, Waddell et al. (2016) explained the various models of mentor programs implemented in higher education and suggested there is a need for more innovative and effective models to meet the needs of new faculty in the current educational environment. While scholarly research reveals a vast number of models and confirms the viability of new faculty mentor programs (Gresham, 2014), there is a lack of consistency in the generalizability of the programs. An ample framework to model the needs of new faculty members at a community college has not been provided.

In summary, the scholarly body of research on the topic of new faculty training programs in higher education provided limited descriptions of models based on adult learning theory. Higher education, especially in the community college sector, needs more timely research results that provide insights on educational strategies that are effective in supporting the success of adult students. Conducting this project study program evaluation and reporting the results adds to the body of research related to the professional development needs of new faculty members who teach in the community college environment.

Implications

The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and how they perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. According to the college administrator who ensures the NFS program is implemented

every year, there are three reasons for the lack of evaluative data. First, program development for the NFS did not include a plan for program evaluation and therefore a review of the program's effectiveness in achieving its goals was never conducted to produce an evaluation report. Second, as the NFS program transitioned through several different oversight administrators and NFS faculty leads implementing the program, documentary data was not available in a designated location at the institution. Third, the lack of consistency in leadership also contributed to a lack of summative data collection. In essence, the NFS program was implemented for 20 years without assessment of the resources allocated as inputs, teaching and learning processes for activities, outcomes related to the program goals, or the impact of the program on the organization environment.

The executive summary for the program evaluation (see Appendix A) provides the institution of study with historical data collected and contained in one location at the organization to serve as a reference in the future for program administrators. More importantly, NFS participants' perceptions of the resources and activities generated from this program evaluation provide administrative leadership with the data to assess the return on investment for the program resources and recommend best practices for new tenure track faculty teaching and learning professional development needs. Administrative leadership will also gain insights into how the outcomes of the NFS program can positively impact the institutional environment, particularly concerning student success. As student success initiatives are not currently linked to the NFS program, knowing the correlation of professional development to student success can

support the continuing initiative to collect data for analysis. Beyond local implications, this project study has the potential for social change in providing timely research to inform new faculty developers at community colleges with best practices, which currently has limited scholarly data for reference.

Summary

In Section 1, I defined the problem that for the last 20 years, the NFS has been implemented yearly at this community college without a formal review of whether it is meeting the defined program goals or developing participants as intended. The absence of a program evaluation has resulted in a lack of data about the inputs, processes, outcomes, and impact for the NFS as they relate to faculty's understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. The absence of evaluation data for the NFS is a significant educational problem that is worthy of study for three reasons: (a) the processes and practices of the NFS have not been recorded or retained through yearly summative evaluations; (b) the study captured new faculty members' descriptions of their NFS participation about the initially defined program goals; and (c) the study identified potential gaps in practice for implementing relevant professional development activities for new full-time, tenure-track faculty members. I established the significance of the problem by describing how closing the gap in practice potentially could promote social change by reforming new faculty professional development programs. I outlined how guiding research questions defined the project study outcomes. Drawing from the social constructivist theory, I noted the results of the comprehensive literature review that yielded support for my recommendation to conduct

a qualitative case study program evaluation using a logic model. I also explored the implications for possible project directions that are not bounded by the program evaluation model.

In Section 2, the research methodology, including a description of the research design, are defined. Also, the type of approach and selection of participants is justified. Last, the processes for data collection and analysis to support the trustworthiness of the research findings will be explained. In Section 3, the project and the rationale for choosing this particular project and a comprehensive review of the literature that supports the project goals are defined. Also, the project implementation and evaluation, including implications for social change are explained. Additionally, in Section 4, my reflections and conclusions on the project's strengths, limitations, and recommendations for addressing the problem differently are provided. Last, my development as a scholar, practitioner, and the project developer is assessed.

Section 2: The Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty describe the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and perceive the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. For this study, I used a qualitative approach with a descriptive case study design to conduct a program evaluation of a professional development seminar for new tenure-track faculty hires at a community college. A learning curve could exist for new faculty members in acclimating to the community college teaching and learning academic mission. Additionally, with the community college open-access enrollment practice, new faculty members are immersed in an environment of a diverse demographic student body that requires targeted teaching strategies.

To seek convergence and corroboration, qualitative researchers usually use at least two resources through using different data sources and methods. The purpose of triangulating is to provide a confluence of evidence that breeds credibility (Bowen, 2009). The two resources I used were document analysis and focus group interviews. Document analysis is a social research method and is an important research tool in its own right, and is an invaluable part of most schemes of triangulation, the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon (Bowen, 2009). I gathered documentary data from 34 sources that were NFS handbooks, schedules and weekly agendas, course planning, program syllabi, curriculum handouts, and participant

assignments. A review of NFS documents was necessary to provide clarification and confirmation, and possibly complete gaps in the data collection, for the data collected from the focus group interviews. Focus-group interviews are often critical elements of data collection in qualitative evaluative case studies (Creswell, 2015; Glesne, 2016; Krueger & Casey, 2015). I gathered data from two focus group interviews, with 8 tenured teaching faculty members who had participated in the NFS to analyze how the program was acclimating participants to the community college environment and developing their instructional delivery. Corroborating findings across these data sets facilitated reducing the impact of potential bias by examining information collected through different methods. This study promotes social change by encouraging the relevant development of new faculty training programs to produce high-impact outcomes such as faculty member efficacy and retention.

Qualitative Research Design and Approach

The problem that prompted this project study was that for the last 20 years, the NFS had been implemented yearly without a formal evaluation of whether it was meeting the defined program goals. Without a summative evaluation conducted every year, data were absent regarding the effectiveness of the program closing the gaps in practice for the professional development needs of new faculty. A qualitative research design was appropriate for this study because the problem statement identified a need to understand a specific phenomenon (Creswell, 2015; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). For this study, I used a qualitative descriptive case study approach to conduct a program evaluation. I chose a case study to conduct an in-depth analysis to produce an illustrative description of the

NFS as a single event or occurrence, from the perspective of participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Stake, 2010; Yin, 2014). Also, the NFS is a bounded system of limited participants within a specific time frame (Creswell, 2015; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Stake, 2010; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014; Yin, 2014).

The NFS was launched in 1999 to assist new full-time, tenure-track faculty members with the task of learning about the community college environment and encouraging the development of their instructional delivery. The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty describe the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and perceive the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. The problem that prompted this project study is that for the last 20 years the NFS had been implemented yearly without a formal review of whether it was meeting the defined program goals. The absence of a program evaluation has resulted in a lack of data about the inputs, processes, outcomes, and impact for the NFS related to the faculty's understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. Therefore, the following research questions guided this qualitative evaluation study:

RQ1: How do faculty describe the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during their year of participation?

RQ2: How do faculty perceive the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery?

Justification of the Choice of Research Design

The bounded system justifies the use of a case study design over other qualitative designs, such as phenomenology, ethnography, grounded theory, or biographical stories. In phenomenology studies, researchers seek an understanding of the personal perspectives of multiple individuals to derive structured meaning from an experience (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The approach is best applied when there is a lack of understanding concerning how or why phenomena may exist. The research results are intended to raise awareness and increase insight about the phenomena. Since the NFS began being implemented yearly since 1999, most of the current full-time faculty at the institution of study were aware of how and why it existed and therefore, a phenomenology design was not applicable.

Ethnography methodology is best applied when the focus of the research is on specific interactions of a group within a culture or larger society (Hancock & Algozzine, 2017; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Although this could be a plausible method for this study, an ethnography approach was not the best type to apply to this program evaluation because the research focus was on the outcomes of directed activity, rather than on learned behavior that established a culture of the participants. A grounded theory approach also did not apply to this program evaluation study because this approach is best applied when a significant amount of data exists within a context that a theory can be derived to apply to other contexts (Glesne, 2016). The scholarly literature on new faculty development programs, especially in the community college environment, is not established enough to support emerging theory. Last, although biographical studies, or

narratives, provide insight into the participants' understanding of the questions asked of them, the narrative of these stories are individually focused and historical (Creswell, 2014; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The focus of this project study was on a specific unit of analysis experienced by participants within a defined period; therefore, a narrative approach that covers an extended time was not the best application.

Description of the Type of Evaluation and Justification

A summative evaluation approach was used in conducting focus group interviews with participants to develop an illustrated description of the NFS (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Spaulding, 2016). The collection of summative data is applicable when a program has a cyclical implementation pattern and the purpose of the evaluation is to measure outcomes as they relate to the goals of the program (Spaulding, 2016). The review of archived NFS documents provided clarification and confirmation for the data collected from the focus group interviews regarding the inputs and processes of the program. The logic model served as a conceptual framework to capture the NFS complexity and theory of change by linking resources and activities to intended outcomes and impacts (Mertens & Wilson, 2018). Summative program evaluation is appropriately applied to identify and define the evaluative data on the effectiveness of the program closing the gaps in practice for the professional development needs of new faculty.

Overall Program Evaluation Goals

The overall goal of this qualitative program evaluation was to produce evaluative data on how faculty describe the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and describe the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their

understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. The program development for the NFS launch in 1999 did not include a plan for program evaluation and therefore, a review of the program relevant to its goals was never conducted to produce an evaluation report. For the first time in 20 years (1999 to present), this project study provided college administrators with a description of the inputs, processes, outcomes, and impacts of implementing the NFS program. Also, the program evaluation yielded data beneficial to the community college administration.

Participants

Criteria for Selecting Participants

Purposeful sampling was used to identify participants that had in-depth information to provide a rich description of their experiences within the NFS as a bounded system (Creswell, 2015; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Stake, 2010; Yin, 2014). The type of purposeful sampling to best answer the guiding research questions of this program evaluation was criterion sampling. Criterion sampling involves selecting participants that meet a predefined criterion to ensure data collection will yield rich information. The criteria for participation in this study was that individuals had to be: (a) a participant in the NFS, (b) a current tenured teaching faculty member at the college, and (c) willing to participate fully in the study.

The criterion of using current tenured teaching faculty was derived from the NFS program goals that were defined to assist new full-time tenure-track faculty hires with the task of learning the community college environment and encouraging the development of

their instructional delivery. Human resources employment records indicated a maximum potential sample size of 177 faculty-member participants. The faculty-member participant selection was further narrowed through criterion sampling based on the year they participated in the NFS. To achieve the largest number of potential focus group participants, all full-time tenured faculty still employed at the institution since the NFS program began were included; however, non-tenured faculty who had participated in the NFS were not included, which was the year 2012 as date of hire at the time of data collection (spring 2017). There were two reasons for defining the participant criterion: (a) the opportunity to attain longitudinal data to capture changes in the program during its existence, and (b) non-tenured faculty were not considered to of had a sufficient amount of time past their NFS participation to be able to ascertain program outcomes and impacts (changes influenced by the program on a long-term, broad-scale for the organization). Additionally, the NFS was not implemented in the 2016-2017 academic year (period of data collection) as no new faculty were hired, creating a natural bounded system of limited participants within a specific time frame. Except for the 2016-2017 academic year, the NFS has been continuously implemented from 1999 to the present day.

Justification for the Number of Participants

The depth of inquiry in a bounded case study program evaluation limits the number of participants (Creswell, 2015). Based on having a potential sample size of 177 eligible faculty members, my goal was to conduct three to five focus group interviews, each with six to 10 participants. Individual interviews were not deemed the best option in collecting data due to the original intention of gathering longitudinal data on changes the

program may have undergone since it started. The consideration was that the collective discussions within the focus group interviews could prompt participant recall of differences in the NFS curriculum and design that may have influenced the outcomes and impacts of the program. Because faculty members have schedules with significant time constraints, including teaching, office hours, and committee work priorities, I conducted two focus group interviews with a total of 16 participants; each focus group had eight participants. Case study research results support having a small sample size, ranging between four to 10 participants, to yield sufficient data for a detailed analysis (Creswell & Plano, 2011).

Procedures for Gaining Approval to Access Participants

Gaining permission to conduct the focus group interviews required me to seek approval from various administrators. The procedures to gain access to participants included gaining approval from the following: (a) Walden University's Institutional Review Board (IRB; Approval #03-21-19-0140705); (b) the administrator who had oversight of the NFS program; and (c) the institution of study's IRB from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Research. Upon receiving these approvals, the human resources department provided me with the professional email addresses for the potential participants.

Measures for Establishing Researcher-Participant Relationship

Implementing measures designed to establish trust is an essential component to creating good working relationships that promote open and honest communication without fear of repercussions (Fleming et al., 2016; Samovar, Porter, & McDaniel, 2017;

Stewart & Cash, 2018; Wood, 2016). After receiving IRB approval, the first strategy I employed was sending emails to potential participants, requesting their voluntary participation in the project study, indicating that their time commitment would not exceed 90 minutes, explaining that I would keep their information confidential in the research results, and an attached Informed Consent Form. The second strategy I employed was to conduct the focus group interviews in a private, non-threatening environment to ensure the confidentiality of the participants. The third strategy I employed was to begin each focus group interview by establishing my role as a researcher and explaining that I was serving as a facilitator to manage the discussion, which would follow agreed-upon ground rules. I reminded participants that they were volunteers and could withdraw from the study at any point without personal or professional penalties. I continued to employ methods for maintaining trust in the researcher-participant relationship during the implementation of the focus group interviews, which included (a) posing initial, moderately open-ended questions designed to help participants become comfortable with sharing information; (b) using verbal and nonverbal responses that expressed neutrality to participants' responses; and (c) ensuring that the established ground rules were maintained.

Measures for the Protection of Participants

I implemented measures for protecting participants by displaying professional behaviors that supported the program evaluation field, as defined by the Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards (2011). To ensure participants' rights to protection from harm, I applied for approval to conduct human-subject research and received IRB

approval from the institution of study, which granted oversight for the study by Walden University's IRB. I provided participants with an informed consent form, which I had designed based on established IRB guidelines for gaining access to participants. To ensure the ethical protection of participants, I preserved each participant's confidentiality throughout the research process by assigning pseudonyms. Focus-group participants were instructed during data collection that the discussion was to remain within the framed time of the video recording and not to share any information related to any statements made or to any person making a statement upon the conclusion of the focus group meeting. Video recording was chosen over audio recording to ensure accuracy in capturing specific participant comments in the event of multiple speakers at one time and additionally to capture nonverbal communication that could support the accuracy of interpreting participant comments based on the other members' behaviors. I used a unique labeling system during the data transcription process to avoid participant identification. Although participants would be able to recall the peer comments from the focus group, the labeling system would mask identification of the specific participant. Participants were only given access to the focus group transcripts from their group. I continue to store all computer files in private, password-protected folders on my personal laptop computer and I keep all print materials in a locked cabinet file in my locked, private faculty office. All computer files and materials will continue to be safeguarded as required until 5 years following the conclusion of the study.

Data Collection

Procedures and Processes for Documentary Data Collection

Gathering documentary data that provide an understanding of the central phenomenon is appropriate for a bounded case study program evaluation (Creswell, 2014, 2015; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Stake, 2010; Yin, 2014). Document analysis is an important research tool in social science research and is an invaluable part of most schemes of triangulation (Bowen, 2009). The purpose of triangulating data is to provide a confluence of evidence that breeds credibility (Bowen, 2009). A review of NFS documents was necessary to provide clarification and confirmation, and possibly complete gaps in the data collection, for the data collected from the focus group interviews. Corroborating findings across data sets reduces the impact of potential bias by examining information collected through different methods.

The NFS documentary data were not centrally filed in one department at the institution. As a result, I needed to conduct an exploratory process to ask individuals to produce data. First, I contacted the current NFS program administrator, who provided a list of faculty leads for the NFS at any time in the past and a limited number of hard-copy files containing program materials that were mostly meeting agendas and supplemental readings. Second, I sent an email request to the current NFS faculty leads, who did not want to share their documentary data. Third, I asked the faculty members who participated in the focus group interviews to share any relevant documentary data from their NFS program year (between 2002 and 2012). From these sources, I obtained 2 years of complete archival data documents for 2008 through 2009 academic years, in addition

to a list of other NFS faculty members I could contact. I continued this system of inquiry until I exhausted all potential resources.

The results of my efforts provided yearly written records to support the illustrative description of the NFS inputs and processes associated with the data collected from the relating cohort year of the individual participants in the focus groups. Documentary data was gathered from 34 documents that were NFS handbooks, schedules and weekly agendas, course planning, program syllabi, curriculum handouts, and participant assignments. Although I attempted to collect and analyze data specific to the NFS year span applied to the participant selection process for the focus groups (between 2002 and 2012 academic years, I was unable to retrieve program data for 2002 and 2003.

Procedures and Processes for Focus-Group Data Collection

Focus-group interviews are often critical elements of data collection in qualitative evaluative case studies (Creswell, 2015; Glesne, 2016; Krueger & Casey, 2015). I followed the established protocols for the practice of collecting data from humans. To gain access to participants, I obtained approval from the institution administrator with oversight for the NFS program. Upon receiving written approval, I obtained IRB and Human Subjects Research Review approval from the institution of study. I simultaneously requested approval from Walden University's IRB. After both institutions considered my requests, I received approval to conduct the study (IRB approval #0006232), and the institution of study was designated as the authority for the oversight of the research project. Obtaining campus institutional approval is necessary to guarantee that research procedures will be ethical in the treatment of participants and provide

protection from harm (Creswell, 2014, 2015; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014; Yin, 2014). Additionally, I completed certification through the National Institutes of Health (#2117280) to ensure the protection and ethical treatment of human participants.

After gaining IRB approval, I started the process of identifying participants for the focus group interviews by acquiring a list of 177 potential participants from the college's human resources department. I sent an email to each person to request their voluntary participation. For the 24 faculty members who responded, I established two different dates to accommodate their schedules best, and 16 people were able to participate in one of these two dates. During the spring 2017 semester, I conducted the focus group interviews in a private classroom at the institution of study. Each participant signed a consent form, which included their approval for the session to be videotaped.

Instrumentation

I generated data from the focus group interviews by using a semistructured focus group protocol (see Appendix B). I designed the focus group interview questions based on the guiding research questions of the study and Fredericks, et al. (2008) logic-model framework analytic features for inputs, processes, outcomes, and impacts. The first research question explored how faculty described the new-faculty seminar inputs and processes they experienced during their year of participation. Inputs are the resources that go into a program to accomplish its activities such as allocated human resources, facility accommodations, and program supplies. Processes are the use of activities conducted to achieve program outcomes such as instruction and actions that work together to implement the program. To address the inputs feature of the first research question, the

focus group protocol included questions prompting discussion of the purpose and relevancy of the NFS program in meeting their professional development needs as new faculty hires. To address the processes feature of the first research question, the focus group protocol included questions prompting discussion who was involved with providing information in their respective year of NFS participation, what was their level of involvement and who should have been participating/contributing (or not) to the NFS. Additionally, questions were intentionally developed to gain descriptions for the learning format/environment, as well as the implementation of specific program activities that had been gleaned from the documentary data.

The second research question explored how faculty perceived the new-faculty seminar outputs and impacts as a result of their participation. Outcomes are the effects that occur as a result of the program which can include the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of individuals who participate in the program. Importantly, outcomes are influenced by the quality and quantity of the program inputs and processes. Impacts are the changes influenced by the program on a long-term, broad-scale for the organization, internally or externally. To address the outcomes feature of the second research question, the focus group protocol included questions prompting discussion of what they do differently as a result of having participated in the NFS and what they wished they could have learned to do differently. To address the impacts feature of the second research question, the focus group protocol included questions on their perceptions of the impact that participating in the NFS has had on their role as a faculty member at the institution of study.

Data Safekeeping Status

I did not disclose the data collected beyond the boundaries of the time required for data collection and analysis for this project study. I stored all computer files in private, password-protected folders on my personal laptop computer and kept all paper materials in a locked cabinet file in my locked private faculty office. I will continue to safeguard all computer files and materials, as required by Walden University guidelines, for 5 years following the conclusion of the study.

Role of the Researcher

When the researcher will be directly involved in the data collection, the researcher must establish the process of reflexivity, which involves self-monitoring personal biases, experiences, and values (Creswell, 2014; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Yin, 2014). Three considerations required my critical reflection and actions to avoid introducing bias in conclusions: (a) I am an employee at the study site, (b) I have prior professional experience in corporate organizations, and (c) I have professional experience in the field of adult training and development. First, I taught at the institution of study as an adjunct and interim full-time faculty member for more than 10 years before being hired as a full-time, tenure-track faculty member in 2008. While this experience provided me with significant teaching experience and acclimated me to the environment, I needed to participate in the NFS program (Fall 2008). Throughout my tenure, I have been avidly involved in the college community, serving in a variety of capacities to support the college's mission.

My active role in the institution with various projects and programs on various was advantageous in providing me with a personal perspective on the environment of the institution and direct access to participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I did not need to make an introduction to the participants as all knew me professionally from my involvement in the college community since 2008. More specifically, two participants are my department colleagues and several participants are cross-discipline colleagues that I work with on specific college initiatives. I did not find any of these roles and relationships to negatively affect my data collections or contribute to negative experiences or biases related to the topic, me personally, or professionally. I had a respectful working relationship with all of the focus group participants and I hold each in strong regard for their commitment to faculty and student success. I do not have a social relationship with any of the participants. Importantly, as a measure in protecting participants, I have not held a supervisory role, in any form, for any of the focus group participants. Overall, my participation in college initiatives proved to be an asset in the data collection process, in that I was familiar with the program and was able to form insightful questions during the focus group interviews to draw out any potential discrepant cases.

My second consideration in critical reflection was that my prior professional experience in corporate settings had indoctrinated me to have a more time-sensitive approach to identifying and accessing information. I established rapport—gained through my roles and relationships at the institution of study—that helped reduce the time it took to open the areas of exploration, particularly regarding documentary data collection.

Also, with my various established relationships and the willingness of my colleagues to share data and documents, I followed through on evolving areas of inquiry.

The third consideration in critical reflection was my background as a training and development professional for adult learners. My personal preferences for curriculum delivery strategies did not influence my interpretation of the NFS described experiences, as I centered this study on a profile of stakeholders who were different than those in corporate environments. Also, I used the processes of member checking, triangulation, and peer review, as well as procedures for dealing with case discrepancy to support the evidence of quality and the methods to address trustworthiness.

Data Analysis

I anchored the data analysis for this project study in the proven analytic methods described in the scholarly literature for implementing qualitative case study and program evaluation research (Creswell, 2014; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Stake, 2010; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014; Yin, 2014). The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery.

Procedures for Data Analysis

I organized documents by NFS program year to analyze consistency or change as the program evolved. First, I assessed the documents I obtained for each year for utility. The utility of the documentary data was assessed based on its historical relevance,

integrity and appropriateness, accuracy, the reason why it was produced, its purpose, and who created it, and with what intent (Hancock & Algozzine, 2017). I organized documents that did not provide utility for the project study's data analysis goals, such as those related to the orientation week program and human resource personal data requirements and I stored them to be provided to the appropriate institution personnel upon the conclusion of the study. Maintaining these documents during the research process was necessary to ensure they were not connected to the data collection or reflect data analysis or results. While comparing the documents available by year, I identified the NFS program curricula documentary data as a consistent source of data for analysis. During the data coding process, I used the NFS planned agenda topics, listed resource materials for participant preparation, and the identified personnel sources who provided the information for each weekly meeting.

The purpose of the first cycle of the coding process was to identify basic categories for the data before I could implement a more detailed process after completing the focus group data collection. Therefore, I applied the exploratory method of holistic coding, as defined by Dey (2016). A holistic process is applicable in data coding for analysis when the researcher has information to guide how to categorize content into broad topic areas as the first step in the analysis (Bazeley, 2014). The goals of the NFS are to support new faculty members in the task of learning about the college environment and encouraging the development of their instructional delivery were used as the general categories for initial investigation. As I progressed through the second cycle of coding, I identified that the original NFS curriculum included strategies to assist participants in

practicing critically reflective teaching, bringing cause for me to reflect and reorganize the categories (Abbott, 2004). The practice of critically reflective teaching would be related to an outcome of the NFS program. Therefore, it became apparent that Fredericks, et al., (2008) logic-model framework analytic features for inputs, processes, outcomes, and impacts as basic categories would be better aligned with the research questions and the NFS goals to serve as subcategories for each of the logic model analytic features. Additionally, in capturing the data, coding and labeling the broad categories, my participation in the NFS as a new tenure-tracked faculty hire in 2008 influenced my analyses of the study findings but also reflects the purpose of the study (Adler & Adler, 1987; Creswell, 2014; Merriam, 2015).

The broad categories were labeled as follows: (a) community college: culture, process, and procedure; (b) teaching: methods, assessment and technology; and (c) teacher: self-reflexivity and peer relationships. During this data analysis stage, I identified a fourth preliminary broad category: students: demographics and services. The first broad category, "community college" in summary, referenced data as inputs of the logic model analytic feature of resources that go into a program to accomplish its activities such as allocated human resources and program supplies. The second broad category, "teaching" in summary, referenced data as processes of the logic model analytic feature as the use of activities conducted to achieve program outcomes such as instruction. Therefore, the first and second categories align with the research question on how faculty describe the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during their year of participation. The third broad category, "teacher" in summary, referenced data as

outcomes of the logic model analytic feature as the effects that occur as a result of the program which can include the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of individuals who participate in the program. The fourth broad category, "students" in summary, referenced data as impacts of the logic model analytic feature which were changes influenced by the program on a long-term, broad scale for the organization, internally or externally. Therefore, the third and fourth categories align with the research question on how faculty perceive the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. The broad-based categories, each with the subcategories of "adapting to the environment" and "instructional delivery," as the goals of the NFS program, provided a guide to the terminology, or participant reference, to different features of the logic model framework that align with the research question of the study in coding the focus group interview raw transcripts.

For qualitative research studies focused on the intentional meanings of participant knowledge, in-vivo coding can be appropriately applied (Saldana, 2016). Therefore, I applied the elemental method of in-vivo coding, defined by Strauss (2010) as the process of developing labels based on the actual words or short phrases used by the participants in the qualitative data. In this cycle of the data analysis, I first read the transcripts for accuracy and considered the data relative to the documentary data analysis and the research questions (Gibbs, 2018; Krueger & Casey, 2015; Seidman, 2013). Then I assessed each line of the transcript in hand-written form to note an identifying term that summarized the main idea of the statement. I created a master list of each identifier,

repetitive or unique, to assess the patterns in references. I then grouped repetitive identifiers by the number of times they were used.

To synthesize the documentary data and the focus group interview data, I applied the evaluation coding strategy to organize the data for description, comparison, and prediction. Descriptions refer to patterned observations of participants' responses, while comparisons refer to the exploration of the expectations of the program and predictions refer to the possible changes for program improvement (Saldana, 2016). From the evaluation coding process, emerging themes evolved that I could use to report the data analysis results.

Evidence of Quality and Procedures to Assure Accuracy and Credibility of the Findings

When conducting scholarly research, investigators are required to treat human participants ethically and, just as importantly, use ethical actions to produce findings and conclusions that are accurate and consistent. To ensure the accuracy and consistency of the conclusions for the quality of qualitative program evaluations, researchers need to establish dependability and trustworthiness (Mertens & Wilson, 2018). In conducting a program evaluation through a case study, as the researcher collects data, the researcher may change processes to gain more depth of understanding in an emerging theme (Yin, 2014). To ensure dependability for this study, I documented the data collection and analysis process and noted any changes in my understanding that may have influenced the data collection. I also checked the transcripts for mistakes and continuously reviewed the data analysis strategies for consistency (Creswell, 2014; Gibbs, 2018; Mertens &

Wilson, 2018). I used the following strategies to establish trustworthiness in my collection and analysis of the data.

Member checking. I used a system of member checking to make sure that my own personal bias did not influence the data results. Conducting member checks helps to improve the accuracy, credibility, and validity by asking each participant interviewed to check the raw transcription and interpretation of the data collection and analysis is completed (Creswell, 2015; Glesne, 2016). After completing the focus group interviews, the video recordings were transcribed. For each participant, I also developed field notes that included my observations during the focus group interviews. I emailed each of the participants a complete file of their focus group transcript, which masked individual participant identification, to verify I had accurately captured their statements as there were instances during the focus group interviews when participants were speaking at the same time. I allowed participants the option to add, change, or delete their input as described by Birt, Scott, Cavers, Campbell, and Walter (2016). Two of the 16 participants shared with me in a personal conversation that they had read the transcripts and did not have any edits. The focus group participants were provided with another opportunity to review the transcripts after the completion of the data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2015; Glesne, 2016). After several group and individual reminders, none of the participants accepted the opportunity to review the transcripts.

Triangulation. Triangulation becomes evident when data from different types of sources validate descriptions and themes produced in qualitative research (Gibbs, 2018; Mertens & Wilson, 2018; Yin, 2014). The purpose of triangulating is to provide a

confluence of evidence that breeds credibility (Bowen, 2009). I established triangulation by using multiple data collection techniques, as well as multiple data sources. Data collection techniques included gathering NFS documents and conducting focus group interviews with faculty members who participated in the NFS. Documentary data was gathered from 34 sources that were NFS handbooks, schedules and weekly agendas, course planning, program syllabi, curriculum handouts, and participant assignments. Two focus group interviews were conducted, each with 8 tenured teaching faculty member participants. Corroborating findings across these data sets facilitated reducing the impact of potential bias by examining information collected through different methods.

Peer debriefing. I worked with a peer debriefer throughout the proposal, data collection, and data analysis stages to enhance the validity of my research results. Peer debriefers promote reflective dialogue to challenge the researcher to clarify their views, identify potential biases and uncover ways in which values and beliefs may factor into analyzing and reporting the data (Spillett, 2003). My peer debriefer was an individual who demonstrated integrity and competency in work responsibilities, had an active interest in educational research and professional experience in faculty professional development. We have been colleagues at the community college for 15 years; however, we work in different roles for the institution of study and have not had a supervisory relationship either way with one another. Peer debriefing was particularly valuable during the coding process for the focus group transcripts to ensure I did not self-direct the themes based on my own biases but instead identified the themes that emerged from the

data. The process of peer debriefing enhanced the credibility and validity of this project study (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2010).

Researcher Bias

I share a work environment with the participants in this study and I participated in the NFS program in 2008. Creswell (2014) cautioned that *backyard* research can lead to problems with reporting data that are biased, incomplete, or compromised. Also, the use of focus group interviews with participants that I have known and worked with as their peer in various initiatives had the potential to challenge my ability to be impartial in the analysis based on these other lived experiences. For example, during the focus group interviews, there were instances when I internally pondered the accuracy of a participant's statement. I remained impartial to such statements but made field notes after the focus group interviews to keep the instances in check during the data analysis.

As addressed above, I used three processes to counter the limitation of my bias as follows. First, by comparing the data forms of the raw data from the focus group interviews verbatim by a transcriptionist and viewing the videotape of the group dynamics, I minimized my biases in the data interpretations (Glesne, 2016). Second, I used a system of member checking. After completing the focus group interviews, I provided each of the participants a complete copy of their focus group transcript with masked individual participant identification and offered the opportunity again after the data analysis (Glesne, 2016; Mertens & Wilson, 2018). Third, I worked with a peer debriefer to promote reflective dialogue that challenged me to clarify my views and

identify potential biases in analyzing and reporting the data (Spillett, 2003). The three strategies proved effective in limiting my researcher bias.

Procedures for Dealing with Case Discrepancy

Identifying discrepant information and discussing the evidence for a theme increases the validity of qualitative data analysis (Creswell, 2014). To seek case discrepancy, Glesne (2016) suggests the process of posing secondary questions during the focus group interview data collection process that purposely contradicted expected findings based on the evolution of the data analysis. For example, when a focus group topic discussion approached a general conclusion, I provided a summative statement to clarify agreement and ask for reference in which there would not be agreement. A result of the process uncovered one case discrepancy which is delineated in the data analysis results.

Limitations

The Utility of Qualitative Case Study Design

I used a qualitative case study design for this investigation because it was the most appropriate design given the research questions and the educational problem being examined. As qualitative data cannot determine effectiveness, only perceived effectiveness, the data results were reported as improvements to the NFS to provide relevancy in the curriculum and design (quality and quantity of the inputs and processes) to influence the outcomes and impacts of the NFS. However, all study designs have inherent limitations, and enumerating the limitations adds to the trustworthiness of the study research and informs future research (Creswell, 2015; Glesne, 2016). Although the

limitations in this study did not prevent the development of plausible findings and conclusions, three limitations were notable: (a) limited availability of documentary data, (b) the utility of self-reported data, and (c) the utility of a single research site and program.

Limited Availability of Documentary Data

A review of archived NFS documents was necessary to provide clarification and confirmation, and possibly complete gaps in the data collection, for the data collected from the focus group interviews regarding the inputs and processes of the program. The challenge was that due to changing supervision and succession leadership of the NFS program over a more-than-20-year period resulted in data not being available in only one location on campus. Instead, data was distributed across many locations, stored by faculty members or administrators who had varying roles in the organizational structure, and in some cases, held by people outside the institution. However, an exhaustive inquiry provided sufficient data for findings that included 2 years of complete archival data documents for the 2008 through 2009 academic years, plus additional documents from other years that included NFS handbooks, schedules and weekly agendas, course planning, program syllabi, curriculum handouts, and participant assignments. Documents were irretrievable for the years 2002 and 2003.

The Utility of Self-Reported Data

Focus-group interviews allow the researcher to have flexibility in the data collection process (Glesne, 2016; Hancock & Algozzine, 2017; Krueger & Casey, 2015; Stewart & Cash, 2018). The social constructivist orientation, derived from Vygotsky's

(1978) culturally bound research, advocates that *meaning* is socially co-constructed through interaction, using symbols and language with others in the environment. Therefore, I used focus group interviews for this project study instead of one-on-one individual interviews. The social constructivists' worldview for this project study provided a theoretical understanding of new faculty members as individuals who have a new role in the academic environment and who are introduced to new symbols and language by skilled members of the tenured faculty.

However, the primary limitation of this case study was within the culturally bound data collection. Data was collected from focus group participants that had participated in the NFS during a year between 2002 and 2012. The concern was whether the NFS program input and processes could be recalled by focus group participants who had been new faculty members in the early 2000s. However, the NFS established memorable socially co-constructed meaning for focus group participants regardless of their year of NFS participation. The collective discussions within each of the focus group interviews were rich with participant recall of similarities and differences in their NFS cohort experiences. After conducting two focus groups, each with a participant pool that represented a diverse number of years in tenure and teaching focus, I determined, given the repetition of the responses that developed, that data saturation had been achieved and deemed it appropriate to not coordinate another focus group. In conclusion, although it is never an absolute that all descriptive data are obtained, I collected significant data that could provide an overall assessment of the program.

The Utility of a Single Research Site and Program

Although the definition of one problem was having an established rationale for conducting the research project study at the institution of study, it presented the limitation of being based on a single new full-time, tenure-track faculty professional development program, which can limit the generalizability of the results. However, this project study was the start of an evaluation process to establish the continuance and relevancy of the NFS program. The data results identify suggested improvements to the NFS to provide relevancy in the curriculum and design (quality and quantity of the inputs and processes) to influence the outcomes and impacts of the NFS. The results of the project study provide other institutions with the depth of understanding in developing and implementing new faculty professional development programs with targeted curriculum and design strategies specific to the needs of the new faculty hires.

Data Analysis Results

The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and how they perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. This program evaluation provides recommendations for the most relevant teaching and learning strategies to be implemented for new faculty member program development as well as insights for evolving professional development programs at the institution of study. The institution of study instituted the NFS program to assist new faculty members with the task of learning about the community college environment and encouraging the

development of their instructional delivery. I begin this section with a summary of the data collection and analysis process. Second, I provide an analysis of the data results aligning with the research questions with descriptive evidence from the emergent codes and themes. Third, I provide a summary of how the study outcomes align with the logic model conceptual framework for the project study. In conclusion, I establish how an evaluation report, created especially for the program's administrative decision-makers, will provide an explanation of faculty members' experiences with the NFS and outcomes of the NFS about its goals and objectives.

Summary of Data Generation

I designed the research questions for this project study to identify how participating faculty members described their experiences with the NFS and the outcomes as described by faculty participating in the NFS about its goals and objectives. Methods to collect, analyze, and interpret the data followed scholarly standards for accuracy and trustworthiness. Data collection included retrieving the yearly program documentary data and conducting two focus group interviews, each with eight participants. I implemented a semistructured focus group protocol aligned with the research questions for the study. Data analysis was conducted through several cycles of coding processes to develop themes that accurately represented the data (Saldana, 2016). First, I applied the cycle of *holistic coding* in the analysis of the documentary data. I used the logic model components of inputs and processes as the general categories for the data organization as it related to the defined goals of the NFS program. Second, I applied *in vivo coding* to analyze the data from the focus group interviews to identify and prioritize the

participants' statements that described inputs, processes, outputs, and impacts. Last, to synthesize the documentary data and the focus group interview data, I applied an *evaluation coding* strategy to organize all the data for description and comparison (Richards, 2014; Saldana, 2016).

Four themes emerged from the data analysis: (a) inputs are contingent on the individual NFS participants' prior professional experience, (b) processes for NFS pedagogical practices, (c) participant cohort-based relationship outcomes, and (d) participant institutional impacts. A brief explanation of each theme and how the logic model supported category organization related to the defined goals of the NFS program is described. Additionally, the emergent themes supporting data findings are discussed about the research questions.

Theme 1 explains how new faculty members have unique professional development needs based on their prior academic and community college professional experience. Depending on whether the new faculty hires had worked in the community college environment defined the logic-model input feature for resources allocated on acclimating to the environment. However, regardless of teaching experience, new faculty NFS participants positively described resources allocated for developing instructional delivery. Theme 2 explains how new faculty members prefer the NSF supporting sound pedagogical practice for adult learners. The logic-model process feature defined the teaching and learning strategies used in the NFS program. Participants negatively described the processes for acclimating to the environment and positively described the processes for developing instructional delivery. Theme 3 explains the logic-model

outcome feature of the importance of relationship-building for new faculty members with their cohort peers and faculty leads. NFS participants establish lasting collaborative relationships for acclimating to the challenges facing community colleges and developing instructional strategies for student success. Theme 4 explains the logic-model impact feature that, as a result of participation in the NFS, new faculty members establish a tenured professional expectation of institutional support for peer engagement and collaborative efforts. Influences in the institutional environment have the potential to encourage or discourage NFS participants' descriptions of job satisfaction.

The themes are aligned with the research questions and each theme provides supporting evidence with an explanation of case discrepancies. The relationship to the literature is also incorporated in theme development. The logic model core concepts are applied in each theme and in the summary of how the theme addresses the problem that prompted this NFS program evaluation.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked how faculty describe the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during their year of participation. Inputs are the resources that go into a program to accomplish its activities such as allocated human resources, facility accommodations, and program supplies. Processes are the use of activities conducted to achieve program outcomes such as instruction and actions that work together to implement the program. To address the inputs feature, the focus group protocol included questions to prompt discussion on the purpose and relevancy of the NFS program in meeting their professional development needs as new faculty hires. To address the

processes feature, the focus group protocol included questions to prompt discussion about who was involved with providing information in their respective year of NFS participation, what was their level of involvement, and who should have been participating/contributing (or not) to the NFS. Follow up questions focused on gaining descriptions for the learning format/environment, as well as the implementation of specific program activities that had been gleaned from the review of documentary data. Additionally, document analysis included seminar schedules, email correspondence between faculty leads about course planning, program syllabi, and curriculum handouts of presenter supplemental materials.

Theme 1: Inputs are contingent on the individual NFS participants' prior professional experience. The institution's human resources onboarding policies for new tenure-track faculty hires indicated mandatory participation in the NFS regardless of prior community college or teaching professional experience. These demographics were not considered in the criterion sampling for the participant pool as prior professional experience was not an evident variable in generating the data for analysis but emerged during the process of data collection in each of the focus group interviews. Inputs are the resources that go into a program to accomplish its activities such as allocated human resources, facility accommodations, and program supplies. The analysis indicated that NFS participants described varied professional development needs for the resources that go into the program (inputs) to accomplish acclimating to the environment and developing instructional delivery. The theme reflects three key findings: (a) resources allocated to acclimating to the environment were positively described by NFS

participants with community college experience, (b) resources allocated to acclimating to the environment were negatively described by NFS participants without community college experience, and (c) resources allocated to developing instructional delivery were positively described by the NFS participants regardless of teaching experience.

First, the data reflected that regardless of the NFS participant's prior employment experience as an adjunct or administrator at the institution, moving to a full-time faculty member position created a change in their perspective of the environment. As reported by Participant B-5 who was hired after having served as adjunct faculty at the institution of study for several years: "so as far as instructional ability, I kind of had developed that already. But I really appreciated getting to know more about [how] the college functions, about how things work in administration." Faculty members who were transitioning from an administrative role also supported the benefit of a change in perspective of the environment. As declared by Participant B-8: "As a staff member before I was hired as faculty, I was already acclimated to the environment but I learned the structural approach from a different perspective by participating in the NFS." Gardner (2014), Pesce (2015), and Saroyan and Trigwell (2015) provided the support that faculty development is critical to all new faculty. In this case study, even though some NFS participants were employees who were not new to the institution, they valued the resource allocations in acclimating to the environment through their new lens as a full-time faculty member.

Second, new faculty members hired who did not have any experience with a community college environment negatively described the NFS curriculum resources allocated to acclimating to the environment. As explained by Participant B-6: "I was too

overwhelmed trying to come up to speed and prep everything for teaching. My brain wasn't ready to be fed all of that information on the college environment so intensively in that first semester." Documentary data analysis of the seminar schedules, email correspondence between faculty leads about course planning, program syllabi and curriculum handouts of presenter supplemental materials indicated that two-thirds of the 3-hour weekly NFS meeting schedule was allocated to acclimating to the college's environment. Hott and Tietjen-Smith (2018) and Meizlish et al. (2017) provided the support that faculty are overwhelmed with the transition of participating in the higher education environment in their new role as an educator.

Third, the data reflected that regardless of a community college experience, NFS participants positively described the resources allocated to developing instructional delivery. New faculty members with prior teaching experience, such as adjuncts or teachers from another level of education, valued the resource allocations focused on developing instructional delivery. For example, Participant A-3 shared: "I taught high school full-time for four years and a bunch of part-time at other colleges. What was [valuable] for me was observing other faculty [teach]. I had never really observed anybody before that didn't teach what I taught." Also, data analysis indicated that new faculty members who had little to no teaching experience valued the resource allocations for instructional delivery on a more basic level. Participant B-2 detailed:

> I remember that when I started, I had never taught before. I had a number of issues, such as student issues and classroom management but being able to ask

fellow faculty members in the NFS who had taught before was valuable to me. Even learning how to develop a syllabus was helpful!

While professional development programs are an essential component in supporting all faculty (Bedford, 2019; Lancaster et al., 2014; Pesce, 2015; Professional and Organizational Development Network Executive Committee, 2016; Saroyan & Trigwell, 2015); training is even more critical for new faculty members, the majority of whom have not been trained to teach (Beane-Katner, 2013; Behar-Horenstein et al., 2016; Gardner, 2014; McKee et al., 2013; Pesce, 2015). Without an existing evaluation plan for the NFS, it was not known whether the resources allocated to the program are adequate or excessive. In summary, theme 1 answers the research question indicating that NFS resource allocations (inputs) for adapting to the environment should be modified based on new faculty community college experience and more resources (inputs) should be allocated to developing instructional delivery.

Theme 2: Processes for NFS pedagogical practices. Processes are the use of activities conducted to achieve program outcomes such as instruction and actions that work together to implement the program. Theme 2 reflects two key findings: (a) challenges with logistic processes in adapting to the environment, and (b) satisfaction with the processes in developing instructional delivery. First, NFS participants negatively described the pedagogical practice of a self-contained learning environment for acclimating new faculty to the institutional environment. In a review of the human resource hiring records and NFS schedules integrated with the data from the focus group interviews, I noticed that as new faculty member groups grew larger in the number of

participants, the NFS began to be held in a classroom or conference room each week. NFS participants from the larger groups referred to the meeting logistics as a "prison" without windows or a "stagnant place with people rotating in" and not leaving the room during the 3 hours. Participant B-3 described: "We felt disconnected from experiencing student services as we didn't even know where they were to be able to refer students." However, in the first few years of the NFS program, new faculty members visited the various administrative offices for student services to meet the office personnel and learn about the available programs. Participant B-2 reflected on the experience in this way: "It was so nice because I got to know the person, I got to know how to get to the office, I got to know the services and that was so valuable to me." McAllister, Oprescu, and Jones (2014) provided the support that social interactions build on the outcomes of new faculty acclimating to the environment.

Additionally, NFS participants negatively described the pedagogical practice of a rigid meeting agenda. Documentary data identified that the NFS had a set schedule of events for each weekly meeting. Participants who attended the NFS in the first few years of its existence corroborated the document analysis in that they stated the NFS schedule was "established like a graduate course with texts and assignments." The documentary data indicated that, in the later years of the NFS program, more than half of the set schedule of events was allocated to presentations given by institution personnel about programs and services. For example, Participant A-6 indicated: "Our NFS faculty leads were very good about planning what was going to happen and we would say, "No! We want to talk about this today." However, the time allocation for discussion was limited.

Participant B-7 corroborated this finding stating, “Sadly, the guest speakers impacted the rest of the way we spent our time.” McAllister et al. (2014) provided the support that social interactions with seasoned faculty build on the outcomes of new faculty acclimating to the environment.

Second, data results showed that NFS participants preferred the pedagogical practices for developing instructional delivery to be collaborative with their peers. My data analysis indicated that whether the members of an NFS cohort were experienced teachers or content experts, learning teaching strategies from each other was how they wanted to develop their instructional skills. Participant B-1 clarified this finding best with the statement: “just seeing each other in action through peer observations is important, probably more so than the scholarship of teaching.” The latter part of the statement reflects group learning versus independent learning. Gibbs (2018), Merriam (2015), and Stufflebeam and Coryn (2014) provided the support that the social constructivist approach that engaged the new faculty hires to learn from each other was significant in developing their instructional skills.

Without an existing evaluation plan for the NFS, the processes were unknown of how the NFS was acclimating participants to the environment and developing instructional delivery. In summary, results in theme 2 answer the research question indicating that NFS processes for adapting to the environment and developing instructional strategies should be grounded in adult learning theory regardless of the number of participants in the cohort. Dron and Anderson (2014) and Holmes and Prieto-Rodriquz (2018) provided the support that as adult learners, faculty development

programs should be implemented in a student-centered format. The NFS teacher-centered learning strategies of "talking heads" from administrative services and the predefined meeting agenda as processes for acclimating to the environment were negatively described by participants. Instead, NFS participants positively described the pedagogical practice of "field trips" to departments as more effective in acclimating to the environment. Additionally, NFS participants positively described the collaborative work of peer teaching activities in developing instructional delivery.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 addressed how faculty perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. Outcomes are the effects that occur as a result of the program which can include the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of individuals who participate in the program. Importantly, outcomes are influenced by the quality and quantity of the program inputs and processes. Impacts are the changes influenced by the program on a long-term, broad scale for the organization, internally or externally. To address the outcomes feature, the focus group protocol included questions prompting discussion on what they do differently as a result of having participated in the NFS and what they wished they could have learned to do differently. To address the impacts feature of the second research question, the focus group protocol included questions on their perceptions of the impact that participating in the NFS has had on their role as a faculty member at the institution of study. Additionally, document analysis included

seminar schedules, a *New Faculty Institute Program Handbook*, program syllabi, example project assignments such as teaching portfolios and faculty self-evaluations.

Theme 3: Participant cohort-based relationship outcomes. Outcomes are the effects that occur as a result of the program which can include the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of individuals who participate in the program. Importantly, outcomes are influenced by the quality and quantity of the program inputs and processes My data analysis reflected that focus group participants positively perceived the relationships established within their NFS cohort and with their cohort faculty leads as outcomes of their NFS participation. Theme 3 reflects two key findings: (a) abiding collaborative relationships as cohort peers invested in the community college environment and developing instructional delivery, and (b) cohort participants trusting on the cohort faculty leads beyond the NFS program to continuously guide them in acclimating to the environment. First, NFS participants positively perceived cohort tenured relationships as an NFS outcome for being invested in the environment and future development of instructional delivery. Participants referred to their cohort as a "family" or a "team" with whom they looked forward to spending time with each week. Participant B-6 shared:

> I did feel that there was that camaraderie across disciplines. We had chosen to come to a community college. Whether we had come from a big university or not, we had chosen to come to a community college because we wanted that student-centered focus.

The relationship outcome supports the mission of community college and student-centered teaching as research indicates a positive correlation between quality instruction

and student success (Bedford & Rossow, 2017; Kane et al., 2016; Thurlings & den Brok, 2017). The shared environment of the NFS forum produced the outcome feature of unity among participants as faculty invested in the community college mission.

Gardner (2014) indicated that the demographics of community college institutions require effective teachers who integrate their content knowledge with student-centered teaching strategies. The outcome of the established NFS cohort relationships was positively perceived for the continued development of instructional strategies. Participant A-4 provided the following statement:

> You meet a bunch of colleagues that you keep in touch with that are in different disciplines from you. So, they have a different approach, a different style and I might have some, Well, this is not working. Maybe I'll go talk to somebody in the math or I'll go talk to somebody in nursing or something and see what they're doing. So, there's always this sounding board. To run different things by people.

Krutka et al. (2017), Saroyan and Trigwell (2015), and Sullivan et al. (2018) indicated that the social constructivist approach that encourages relationship-building learning processes in professional development is important to new faculty.

However, the literature regarding new faculty development does not explicitly reflect how the outcome of peer relationships built within the cohort establishes a benchmark for future behavior. In this case study the data analysis indicated that the cohort relationships implicitly established an expectancy of the new faculty member's role in the environment beyond NFS participation. Participants in both focus groups referred to how their cohort peers were "benchmarks" for their role as faculty members in

supporting the initiatives of the institution. Participant A-6 detailed: “I gauge what I should be doing and if I’m doing the job that I should by comparing myself to my esteemed peers from the NFS. These peers keep me working hard.” Benchmarks were also established for instructional delivery. Cohort peers connected across disciplines to get different perspectives on a specific teaching curriculum plan or building linked programs across disciplines to have a dual impact on student success. This conclusion was represented by a statement by Participant A-2:

> Having significant discussions with peers from different disciplines during NFS turned into collaborations later. For example, as a faculty member in the English department, I have had the opportunity to co-teach with a Biology faculty peer and develop several projects with a Library faculty peer because of my NFS relationships. I feel that these experiences have been a benefit to me but even more so to students.

Through the NFS, cohort peers built relationships and expectations of themselves that they perceived as having a positive outcome in how they participate in the institutional environment and on their individual professional development for instructional strategies.

Second, NFS participants positively perceived the outcome feature of an established relationship with the cohort faculty leads in acclimating to the environment. The new faculty members perceived their faculty leads as experienced and trusted mentors who would guide maneuvering the college processes free of judgment. Focus-group participants referred to their faculty leads as being “great,” a “go-to person,” a “sounding board,” a “buffer,” and “great role models” beyond the time of their

participation in the NFS. During one focus group session, participants explained how their faculty leads continued to always make time for them. Participant A-6 stated: “We knew that if we had a problem, they were there. We could run back to them and they would support us and help us whenever we needed.” During another focus group session, Participant B-1 shared a similar sentiment about a faculty lead: “She was a very ‘take you under her wing’ type of person and she’s got your back no matter what.” However, there was a case discrepancy for one NFS cohort year. Participant B-3 declared: “We actually felt that the instruction and leadership of the person facilitating was very poor. And that bonded us together even more.” Beane-Katner (2014) and Waddell et al. (2016) provided support for the importance of established collegiality with veteran faculty in learning to navigate the environment.

Without an existing evaluation plan for the NFS, the perceived outcomes from having participated in the NFS were not known. In summary, results in theme 3 answers the research question that NFS cohort peer and cohort faculty lead relationships are a positively perceived outcome for new faculty continuing to acclimate to the environment and develop instructional delivery. The cross-discipline relationships support the community college environment and the development of student-centered teaching instructional delivery. Furthermore, the NFS cohorts develop an implicit expectancy of continued achievement in teaching and learning excellence by having an active role in the environment and developing instructional initiatives for student success.

The most crucial aspect of applying a logic-model framework is that it provides a conceptual illustration of a defined program’s complexity and theory of change by

linking contextual factors, resources, and activities to intended outcomes in program evaluation (Mertens & Wilson, 2018). The logic model outcome features captured data that may have been overlooked. The NFS outcomes of cohort relationships positively influence acclimating to the environment and developing instructional delivery beyond NFS participation is not a defined goal of the NFS program. Also, the outcome feature of the reliance on the cohort faculty lead beyond the NFS program year is not evident in the logic-model input feature of the program evaluation. Analysis of the available documentary data does not indicate an intentional description for the role of the cohort faculty lead(s). In summary, results from theme 3 indicate that the outcomes of members' participation in the NFS are not connected to the input features of the program. To maximize the NFS program outcomes, the process features should include best practices for supporting ongoing collaborative efforts for engagement in the environment and ongoing participation in instructional delivery professional development. Also, the NFS input feature should include identifying a job description and expectations for the faculty lead(s) to ensure positive outcomes for continuous acclimating to the environment.

Theme 4: Participant institutional expectation impacts. Impacts are the changes influenced by the program on a long-term, broad-scale for the organization, internally or externally. My analysis of the focus group transcripts reflects that NFS participants perceive the impact of the program as a long-term expectation of institutional support for peer engagement in acclimating to changes in the environment and collaborative efforts for the development of instructional strategies. At the time of data collection, the focus group participants negatively perceived the expected institutional

support that had been indoctrinated during their NFS participation. Theme 4 reflects two key findings: (a) increasing workload allocations are challenging peer engagement in acclimating to environment changes, and (b) limited opportunities for organic collaboration are challenging collaborative efforts for developing instruction delivery.

First, the tenured NFS participants negatively perceived how time constraints in the institution were impacting their NFS established expectation of being dedicated to the community college mission of a teaching and learning environment. However, community colleges across the nation are facing financial challenges (Bers & Head, 2014; Price, Schneider, & Quick, 2015). As such, college-wide budget cuts resulted in the necessity for full-time faculty members to assume some administrative functions in addition to their existing roles, which was particularly noted by faculty members who teach career programs or serve as department chairs. Participant B-7 explained the impact: “I mean if you keep putting work on top of people, they become more siloed because there isn’t time to do anything but just work.” Participants in the other focus group expressed concerns that the “silos” were negatively influencing the opportunities to approach institution circumstances collectively. Participant A-3 stated:

> I think the most valuable thing about NFS was getting out of your silo, talking to people in other divisions, and recognizing that some of the problems we’re having in biology are similar to what you’re having in math, which is the same that you’re having in writing.

While describing the feeling of being overworked and overwhelmed, faculty members still expressed the need to connect with their peers to feel engaged in the environment and developing instructional delivery strategies.

Second, the impact feature of the members' participation in the NFS was that the institution will remain constant in providing the planned opportunities for collaboration on instructional development strategies as a priority. McAllister et al. (2014), McKay and Monk (2017), and Thomson (2015) supported the idea that faculty desire more time to discuss and collaborate on instructional delivery but are now reduced to corridor conversations that minimize the results from the interaction. As declared by Participant A-7:

> We are all so damn busy. And the greatest conversations sometimes happen at the copier. My peer and I will start talking about an assignment and then 20 minutes go by. That can't be scheduled. So random but usually the highlight of my day and confirmation that we are still connected.

Research confirms that effective teaching in higher education includes faculty that are invested in their learning, something that institutional factors can either encourage or discourage (Chauvin et al., 2013; Lewis & Ewing, 2016; Willett et al., 2014). Without an existing evaluation plan for the NFS, the perceptions of long-term institutional support participants established as a result of their NFS participation were not known. In summary, the results in theme 4 answer the research question that the impact of the NFS is the expectation of long-term institutional support for acclimating to changes in the environment and developing instructional delivery. However, the impact of fiscal

uncertainty on faculty members is having to assume additional administrative tasks in assessment and learning outcomes (Beane-Katner, 2013; Meizlish et al., 2017). As a result, faculty experienced constraints in peer engagement and collaborating on instructional delivery. As faculty dedicated to the community college mission, new faculty members want intentional institutional support continued for engagement in the environment and development of instructional strategies. Results from theme 4 indicate that the impact of the NFS program is developing potentially tenured faculty invested in a teaching and learning environment. To promote job satisfaction, the institution should be intentional in supporting a collaborative environment regardless of negative economic factors.

Evidence of Quality and Methods to Address Trustworthiness

When conducting scholarly research, investigators are required to treat human participants ethically and, just as importantly, to use ethical actions to produce findings and conclusions that are accurate and consistent. To ensure the accuracy and consistency of the conclusions for the quality of qualitative program evaluations, researchers need to establish dependability and trustworthiness (Mertens & Wilson, 2018). I used the following strategies to establish trustworthiness in my collection and analysis of the data.

Member checking. I used a system of member checking to make sure that my own personal bias did not influence the data results. Conducting member checks helps to improve the accuracy, credibility, and validity by asking each participant interviewed to check the raw transcription and interpretation of the data collection and analysis is completed (Creswell, 2015; Glesne, 2016). Participants were informed when the data

collection and analysis was completed that they had the opportunity to check for interpretation to provide any feedback or comments regarding whether the data analyzed reflected their descriptions and perspectives about the topic (Glesne, 2016; Mertens & Wilson, 2018). However, there were not any participants that accepted the opportunity, even after a reminder.

Three reasons may have contributed to this situation. First, the mission of the institution is focused on teaching and learning; therefore, few faculty members have an interest in investing time into the detail of colleague research-based endeavors. Second, the data analysis was conducted during a timeframe in which most faculty were on the summer semester break and therefore focused on other priorities. Lastly, when I would personally confirm with the participants, they referred to the respect of my professional practices based on their experiences with me in other peer-based institution initiatives. Although I had planned to conduct in-depth, follow-up interviews with participants to refine the themes in the data analysis, the lack of response I received made me deem this process to be unnecessary.

Triangulation. Triangulation becomes evident when data from different types of sources validate descriptions and themes produced in qualitative research (Gibbs, 2018; Mertens & Wilson, 2018; Yin, 2014). The purpose of triangulating is to provide a confluence of evidence that breeds credibility (Bowen, 2009). I established triangulation by using multiple data collection techniques, as well as multiple data sources. Data collection techniques included gathering NFS documents and conducting focus group interviews with faculty members who participated in the NFS. Documentary data was

gathered from 34 sources that were NFS handbooks, schedules and weekly agendas, course planning, program syllabi, curriculum handouts, and participant assignments. Two focus group interviews were conducted, each with 8 tenured teaching faculty member participants.

For each of the research findings, I found that multiple quotes from participants in the focus group interviews were applicable. I chose the supporting quotes that I used to corroborate the findings by establishing equity of data between the two groups and the diversity of the participants within the groups. Because participants were willing to give their time and input to this project study, I took care to document as many of their responses as possible in the results. Corroborating findings across these data sets facilitated reducing the impact of potential bias by examining information collected through different methods.

Peer debriefing. I worked with a peer debriefer throughout the proposal, data collection, and data analysis stages to enhance the validity of my research results. Peer debriefers promote reflective dialogue to challenge the researcher to clarify their views, identify potential biases and uncover ways in which values and beliefs may factor into analyzing and reporting the data (Spillett, 2003). My peer debriefer was an individual who demonstrated integrity and competency in work responsibilities, had an active interest in educational research and professional experience in faculty professional development. We have been colleagues at the community college for 15 years; however, we work in different roles for the institution of study and have not had a supervisory relationship either way with one another. Peer debriefing was particularly valuable during

the coding process for the focus group transcripts to ensure I did not self-direct the themes based on my own biases but instead identified the themes that emerged from the data. The process of peer debriefing enhanced the credibility and validity of this project study (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2010).

Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and how they perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. In Section 2 I justified and described the research methodology that would be applied in this project study, the criteria for selecting participants, and the procedures for gaining approval to collect data through focus group interviews and documentary data, as well as a description of the data analysis strategies, including associated limitations. Also, in this section I presented the data results in response to the two guiding research questions. Four emergent themes and the relating findings were explained and the evidence of quality and methods to address trustworthiness was established. In Section 3 of this paper, a program evaluation is presented with recommendations aligned with the data results. I will present this program evaluation to key stakeholders, explain the process of the evaluation, and describe the findings and recommendations, which are based on scholarly research.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

Community colleges are supposed to be responsive to the educational needs of the communities they serve. Economic challenges and the evolving student demographic of community colleges prompt evaluation of their educational services to be responsive to educational needs. Faculty have a crucial role in the success of their institutions' responsiveness (Hott & Tietjen-Smith, 2018). Professional development is necessary for faculty to make changes in practice to support institution success (McKee & Tew, 2013). In Section 3, I provide an overview of the development and implementation of program evaluation for a community college's NFS. This section includes a program description, goals, implementation plan, benchmarks, implications for change, and recommendations. A summative report is integrated into the study outlining recommendations for change in the current program and suggesting that the program be adopted as the formal new faculty development program.

Program Description and Goals

The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty describe the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and how they describe the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. The problem that prompted this project study was that for the last 20 years the NFS has been implemented yearly without a formal review of whether it is meeting the defined program goals or developing participants as intended. The goal of this project study was to

conduct a program evaluation and answer the research questions. I developed an executive summary based on the research findings to inform college administrators about the evaluation data. The summary also includes a recommendation for key program decision-makers to conduct an ongoing evaluation to assure program quality.

Rationale

The NFS has been implemented yearly without any formal or informal review. The rationale for choosing the NFS program to evaluate was based on identifying whether the defined program goals have been met and to develop an appropriate evaluation plan. Without an existing evaluation plan for the NFS, which examines the resources allocated to the program and how the program is implemented, it is impossible to know whether participants are reached as intended or whether the program makes a difference for new faculty hires or the institutional environment. According to the studied institution's vice president of educational affairs, college administrators need evaluative data regarding the professional development needs of new faculty and how well the institution was responding to those needs to help guide decision making and processes to best recruit and retain quality faculty members (personal communication, December 8, 2016).

The genre of program evaluation as a qualitative descriptive case study proved expedient in providing evaluative data to college administrators (Creswell, 2015; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Stake, 2010; Yin, 2014). Applying Fredericks et al.'s (2008) logic-model framework provided a conceptual illustration and systematic thinking between the NFS core components for inputs, processes, outcomes, and impacts to

address the guiding research questions (Mertens & Wilson, 2018). The logic-model framework was used to address the problem, as stated in the executive summary (see Appendix A). This program evaluation provides recommendations for the most relevant teaching and learning strategies to be implemented for new faculty member program development as well as insights for evolving professional development programs at the institution of study.

How the Problem Is Addressed in the Evaluation

The problem that prompted this project study was that for the last 20 years, the NFS has been implemented yearly without a formal evaluation of whether it was meeting the defined program goals or developing participants as intended. The purpose of the NFS is to assist new full-time, tenure-track faculty members with the task of learning about the community college environment and encouraging the development of their instructional delivery. The seminar consists of a weekly 3-hour mandatory meeting for all members of each academic year's new faculty cohort during the fall semester. The NFS has been implemented yearly at the institution of study without an evaluation of how well faculty development needs were being addressed. Evaluating the data regarding the NFS program was necessary to provide college administrators with evaluative evidence about what the institution has done to meet the needs of new faculty members based on the goals defined through the formative assessment used to establish the program. Program evaluation provides decision-makers with definitive data related to a program's effectiveness (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Stake, 2010).

This NFS program evaluation provides an executive summary of the resources allocated to the program, the processes of the program implementation, the outcomes gained by participants, and how the program impacts new faculty hires and the institutional environment. Four themes emerged from the data analysis: (a) inputs are contingent on the individual NFS participants' prior professional experience, (b) processes for NFS pedagogical practices, (c) participant cohort-based relationship outcomes, and (d) participant institutional impacts. The following is a description of how each of the emergent themes addresses the research problem, providing recommendations for improvements in the NFS to reduce the gaps in practice for the program.

Theme 1 represents how new faculty members described the NFS input features of the program. New faculty hires from within the institution value the new perspective of learning about the institution environment as they transition to the role of full-time faculty members. On the other hand, new faculty members who have been hired from outside of the institution experience added stress in learning the college's environment in addition to instructional delivery. At the same time, the data findings and related research indicated that NFS input features to encourage the development of instructional delivery are positively described by participants. In summary, results in theme 1 indicated that the resource allocations for adapting to the environment should be modified based on new faculty point of hire and more input features should be allocated to encourage instructional delivery, which is described positively by participants.

Theme 2 represents how new faculty members described the NFS process features of the program. Dron and Anderson (2014) and Holmes and Prieto-Rodriquz (2018)

noted that faculty development programs should be implemented in a student-centered format because the students are adult learners. The NFS teacher-centered learning strategies of "talking heads" from administrative services and the predefined meeting agenda as processes for acclimating to the environment do not reach participants as intended. Instead, NFS participants described positively the pedagogical practice of "field trips" to departments as more effective in acclimating to the environment. Furthermore, NFS participants positively described the collaborative work of peer teaching activities as best practices for developing instructional delivery. In summary, results in theme 2 indicated that the pedagogical practices for the NFS need to be grounded in adult learning theory.

Theme 3 reflects how new faculty members perceived the NFS outcome features of the program in acclimating to the environment and the development of their instructional delivery. Relationships established between cohort peers extend beyond their year of NFS participation. As a result of their participation in NFS, an outcome is an established cross-discipline peer group to support the community college environment for student-centered teaching and the development of those strategies. Furthermore, the NFS cohorts develop an implicit expectancy of continued achievement in teaching and learning by having an active role in the environment and developing instructional initiatives for student success. The logic-model "outcomes" feature captured data that may have been overlooked. Cohort relationships positively influencing acclimating to the environment and developing instructional delivery beyond NFS participation are not defined goals of the NFS program. Also, the outcome feature of reliance on the cohort

faculty lead beyond the NFS program year is not evident in the logic-model input feature of the program evaluation. Analysis of the available documentary data did not indicate an intentional description for the role of the cohort faculty lead(s). In summary, results from theme 3 indicated that the outcomes of members' participation in the NFS were not connected to the input features of the program. To maximize the NFS program outcomes, the process features should include best practices for supporting ongoing collaborative efforts for engagement in the environment and ongoing participation in instructional delivery professional development. Also, the NFS input feature should include identifying a job description and expectations for the faculty lead(s) to ensure positive outcomes for continuously acclimating to the environment.

Theme 4 represents how new faculty members perceived the NFS impact features of the program in acclimating to the environment and the development of their instructional delivery. As a result of participating in the NFS, new faculty members establish a tenured professional expectation for peer engagement and institutional support for collaborative efforts. However, the impact of fiscal uncertainty on faculty members is to make them assume additional administrative tasks in assessment and learning outcomes (Beane-Katner, 2013; Meizlish et al., 2017). As a result, faculty experienced constraints in allocating time to the priority of working collaboratively on environment circumstances or instructional development. As faculty dedicated to the community college mission, new faculty members want intentional institutional support continued for engagement in the environment and development of instructional strategies. In summary, results from theme 4 indicated that the impact of the NFS program for tenured faculty is

expectations of institutional investment in their contribution to the teaching and learning mission. To promote job satisfaction, the institution should be intentional in supporting a collaborative environment regardless of negative economic factors.

As described here, the four emergent themes from the data analysis directed the review of scholarly literature in identifying effective strategies for improving the NFS in meeting the professional development needs of new faculty members at the institution of study. The following literature review provides support for the recommendations delivered in the executive summary (see Appendix A) for the project study.

Review of the Literature

Literature Related to Genre and Search Terms

I expanded the literature review conducted for this section of the project study beyond the search that established the development of the project. I reviewed scholarly articles, textbooks and Internet sites of educational institutions to identify research-based practices that achieve effective outcomes for faculty development programs. I used online databases to retrieve articles published in textbooks and well-accepted, peer-reviewed journals. I searched databases (for example, Academic Search Complete, EBSCO, ERIC and Sage Publications) for the following terms: *adult learning theory, professional development, student-centered learning, active learning, new faculty job satisfaction, new faculty mentor programs, faculty collaboration, cross-discipline collaboration, learning communities, faculty recognition and reward programs, teaching and learning centers, and constructivist teaching strategies/methods.* Also, I searched for relevant public data that referenced the political, social, and economic trends of the community college. I

conducted the search until I retrieved the same sources or until the search terms did not render relevant sources.

Professional Development

The evaluation plan approached the NFS as a professional development program for new full-time, tenure-track faculty members to learn about the community college environment and encourage the development of their instructional delivery. Professional development in education refers to the formal teaching and learning programs to improve faculty scholarship and implementation of instructional delivery strategies (Jaramillo-Baquerizo, Valcke, & Vanderlinde, 2019; Merchie, Tuytens, Devos, & Vanderlinde, 2018; Nor, 2019). Faculty members in higher education are typically trained in their discipline and not necessarily in teaching pedagogy, even if the role of teaching was experienced in their academic program (O'Shea Lane, 2018; Pesce, 2015). Key elements in the success of professional development programs include that the learning experiences are practical, theoretical and reflective for the faculty member (Engelbrecht & Ankiewicz, 2016). The results of the NFS program evaluation indicated a need for change in the learning experience to better meet the professional development needs of the new faculty members. While some of the inputs and processes for the NFS were deemed practical, the theoretical and reflective practices that promote the program outcomes and impacts were lacking. The impact of successful teaching and learning programs promotes professional development as ongoing lifelong learning for faculty (De Rijdt, Dochy, Bamelis, & van der Vleuten, 2016; Nor, 2019). When professional development programs are well-established in an educational institution, there is evolving

research that serves as a tool for faculty retention (Kane et al., 2016; O'Shea Lane, 2018; Scott, Lemus, Knotts, & Oh, 2016).

Adult Learning Theory

The evaluation was grounded in Knowles's (1984) theory of andragogy, which described how adults learn. The scholarly body of research on adult learning theory is robust. However, research results are directed toward the faculty's implementation of teaching strategies in the classroom. Additionally, research results are limited regarding how adult-learning teaching strategies are modeled in new faculty training programs in higher education. Knowles advanced the difference between pedagogy and andragogy as educational practice. Pedagogy is a model of teacher-directed learning, in that the teacher has the responsibility of defining and assessing learning outcomes for the student. In contrast, Knowles posited that andragogy is a more appropriate model for adult education. Andragogy takes into account how adults differ from children in their learning due to the degree of their lived experiences and that the adult learner's self-concept is advanced beyond a dependent personality to that of a self-directed human being. Knowles (1984) established the following six assumptions of the adult learner to be considered when implementing teaching strategies: (a) adult learners need to know why they need to learn something, (b) adult learners have established a self-concept of an independent personality; taking responsibility for their learning, (c) adult learners have lived experiences that are a rich resource for learning, (d) adult learners' readiness to learn is relative to his or her need to implement developmental tasks in his or her role, (e) adult learners are focused on the immediacy of applying new knowledge; problem-

centered learning is more applicable than subject-centered learning, and (f) adult learners are internally motivated rather than externally motivated (p. 57-63). The results of the NFS program evaluation indicate that the learning experience did not aptly utilize adult learning theory in the logic model framework processes, thus minimizing participant learning of the community college culture and instructional delivery.

Adult Learning Theory and Professional Development

Effective teaching in higher education includes faculty that are invested in their learning (Chauvin et al., 2013; Elliott & Oliver, 2016; Lewis & Ewing, 2016; Willett et al., 2014). Because faculty are adults, faculty professional development programs should be designed based on adult learning-theory practices. The NFS is professional development for new faculty members. However, the NFS program evaluation results indicate gaps in practice in utilizing adult learning practices as processes in the logic-model framework. Adult learning practices have been shown to enhance participant satisfaction with faculty development (Engelbrecht & Ankiewicz, 2016). Applying adult learning theory through the logic-model framework used for the NFS program evaluation would reflect that new faculty members identify a task based on their own lived experience (input), the faculty lead facilitates co-constructed shared meaning for the cohort and implements the learning in action (process), the learning outcome is immediately applied by the participants in the next week (outcome), for which the experience promotes lifelong learning for the participants (impact). To maximize the outcomes and impact of the NFS, adult learning strategies need to be used to meet their professional development needs and increase faculty satisfaction with the program.

NFS Program Inputs

The results of the NFS program evaluation conducted as this project study yielded the finding that new faculty hires have unique needs in professional development. The results in theme 1 indicate that the resource allocations for adapting to the environment should be modified based on new faculty point of hire and more input features should be allocated to encourage instructional delivery, which was positively described by participants. For professional development to have the greatest impact, it needs to be structured around the needs of the faculty (Dillard & Yu, 2018; MacPhail et al., 2019). To best address the professional development needs for NFS tenure-track faculty hires, the recommendation is cohort participants to be given a needs assessment to identify what they want to learn, how they want to learn and why they want to learn (Louws, Meirink, van Veen, & van Driel, 2017; Scarparolo & Hammond, 2018). Adults want to have a role in the learning process and to be respected for the knowledge they bring to the learning environment (Owusu-Agyeman & Fourie-Malherbe, 2019; Zielinski, 2017). A needs assessment for each NFS cohort will define the appropriate input resources for learning about the community college and developing instructional delivery. Implementing the input resources based on their professional development needs as individuals and as a cohort co-constructing meaning, allows the NFS participants to take ownership of the learning opportunity (Housel, 2020; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2015; Louws et al., 2017). Also, the recommendation to implement a needs assessment will support the appropriate identification of input resources to provide key decision-makers with the evidence for program accountability for resource allocations.

Evident in the data results regarding the input feature of the logic-model framework was the vital role of NFS program faculty leads in facilitating the transition of the new tenure-track faculty members to their role within the institution. Learning-centered teaching practicing adult learning theory places the role of the teacher, or faculty lead in the case of the NFS, as a facilitator to the student, or NFS participant, learning. Developing a rapport and respect with the faculty lead was described as a positive outcome by the NFS participants. In assessing the faculty lead as an input feature of the logic model framework suggests that choosing the cohort facilitator(s) should be carefully considered "with regards to their level of expertise and understanding of effective coaching practices in educational contexts" (Scarparolo & Hammond, 2018, p. 504) as the role relates to the effectiveness of the program (van den Bergh, Ros, & Beijaard, 2015). For the NFS, the faculty lead is responsible for contextualizing the professional development and creating co-constructed meaning for the participants regarding their beliefs and practices in instructional delivery. Also, if the NFS processes in the logic model are adapted to adult learning strategies, the role of the faculty lead will include teaching observations, supporting reflective practices and providing constructive feedback on participant professional development (Botham, 2018a, 2018b; Merchie et al., 2018; Scarparolo & Hammond, 2018). For the NFS, the faculty lead also serves in the role of a mentor after the cohort has completed the semester-long program. Given the increasing number of participants in the NFS cohorts and the continuity of the program implementation, a recommendation is to establish a mentoring program that includes interdisciplinary mentors in addition to the faculty lead.

NFS Program Processes

The results of the NFS program evaluation conducted as this project study yielded the finding that new faculty hires prefer the NSF supporting sound pedagogical practice in professional development activities. The results in theme 2 reflect that NFS participants negatively described the established weekly agenda topics and a self-contained learning environment. The administrative and student services personnel as preset guest speakers as "talking heads" do not treat new faculty members as adult learners with a readiness to learn as their experiences that week may not relate to the information being presented. Adult learners want to be actively involved in the proposed discussion where the speaker serves in the role of facilitator rather than presenter (Louws et al., 2017; Nor, 2019). Interestingly, the NFS cohorts established in the early years of the program described the "field trips" to the administrative and student services offices in the college promoted a strong learning outcome for the personnel and the services provided, as well as knowing where the offices were located. Revising the NFS to be based on participants' current learning needs for that week promotes the positive expectation that what they are learning will be valuable to their work (Knowles et al., 2015). The role of the faculty lead is to assess the learning need and then apply an active learning strategy, such as going to the office to learn about the services and meeting the personnel.

Effective professional development for educators includes practical demonstrations, modeled by experts or coaches (i.e., faculty lead), as well as having opportunities to practice and receive constructive feedback from peers (Barton, Williams,

Halle, & McGrew, 2018; Scarparolo & Hammond, 2018; Valle & Fuchs, 2015). Results in theme 2 reflected that the processes for instructional delivery that were grounded in adult learning theory were positively described by the NFS participants as the best practice for developing instructional delivery. The results also indicated that NFS participants desired more opportunities to engage in practical applications of teaching strategies, within their discipline as well as interdisciplinary (Barton et al., 2018; Soto et al., 2019).

Despite the research defining the effectiveness of learner-centered teaching strategies, faculty members are still inclined to teach their discipline primarily through lectures (Blickenstaff, Wolf, Falk, & Foltz, 2015; Bosman & Voglewede, 2019; De Rijdt et al., 2016; O'Shea Lane, 2018). The resistance to the pedagogical paradigm shift can be attributed to new faculty members not being appropriately trained in pedagogy, not having experience in higher education demonstrating active adult-learning practices and faculty development programs not modeling learner-centered strategies (Bedford, 2019; Holmes & Prieto-Rodriquz, 2018; Krutka et al., 2017; Yee, 2015). O'Shea Lane (2018) presented the premise that learner-centered new faculty professional development will prompt a paradigm shift away from passive learning practices in higher education if faculty are exposed to learner-centered instructional practices at the start of their career. The recommendation is for the NFS processes to be realigned with adult theory practices that engage the member participants and promote the immediate application in their work. Also, the revision in the program processes will provide key decision-makers with the evidence for responsible realignment of resource allocations.

NFS Program Outcomes

The results of the NFS program evaluation conducted as this project study yielded the finding that the relationships established between cohort peers extended beyond their year of NFS participation. After completion of the one-semester program, new faculty members' professional development becomes informal in that learning is formed through daily experiences (Gerken, Beausaert, & Segers, 2016). Maintaining relationships past the NFS conclusion can indicate that new faculty are continuing to seek collaborative professional development. A standard program for building on the formed relationships in the NFS is not currently established as the next phase for professional development. Without a planned action, an opportunity is missed for continued collaborative professional development for new faculty or the recognition of their growth in teaching and learning (Gerken et al., 2016). NFS participants may have established a pattern for continued individual learning and reflection through the faculty lead but reflection is more conducive when shared with others, particularly those that have the same lived experiences (Goh, 2019).

Communities of practice were established as effective professional development for faculty in supporting the importance of shared meaning, critical reflection and improving instructional practices (Banasik & Dean, 2016; Beauchamp, 2015; Dillard & Yu, 2018; Gast, Schildkamp, & van der Veen, 2017; Goh, 2019; Schreurs, Huveneers, & Dolmans, 2016). A variety of models defining the purpose, goals, and strategies of learning communities exist (Brown & Duguid, 1991; Dufour & Eaker, 2009; Hord, 2004; Murphy & Lick, 2005; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). Research conducted by

MacPhail et al. (2019) produced results indicating that access to professional colleagues was a preferred means of improving teaching pedagogy and skills. Connecting with veteran faculty has also proven to support new faculty in learning to navigate the environment (Beane-Katner, 2014; Waddell et al., 2016).

Also, the veteran faculty who participated in providing support to new faculty found the practice "rewarding and enriching, leading to further professional development" (MacPhail et al., 2019, p. 859). The recommendation to expand NFS learning outcomes for participants is to establish learning communities and incorporate a mentoring model, such as defined by Lynch et al. (2017), to continue the professional development of new faculty members in acclimating to the environment and developing instructional strategies. The result of utilizing a mentoring model that includes identifying the caliber and assignment of mentor-mentee would provide key decision-makers with the evidence for program outcome features and responsible realignment of resource allocations.

NFS Program Impact

Results from the program evaluation indicated that faculty members are committed to the mission of the institution but economic factors have had a negative impact on faculty job satisfaction. With increased workloads, allocating time for informal professional development opportunities is challenging. Institutional support prioritizing informal learning, in addition to formal learning, is essential in faculty motivation and job satisfaction (Gerken et al., 2016; Jaramillo-Baquerizo et al., 2019; Stankovska, Angelkoska, Osmani, & Grncarovska, 2017). Professional development is most effective

when connected to the institution's mission and goals (Condon, Iverson, Manduca, Rutz, & Willett, 2016; Stankovska et al., 2017; Wynants & Dennis, 2018). As faculty dedicated to the community college mission, new faculty members want continued engagement in the environment and instructional development beyond one semester into their tenure. Furthermore, faculty recognition for their efforts in professional development is a motivation for continued focus on improving teaching and learning skills (Botham, 2018a, 2018b; Gast et al., 2017).

Few community colleges established recognition programs for the scholarship of teaching, which can be attributed to the emphasis of the organization on teaching rather than research, the economic constraints community colleges are experiencing and the fact that most community colleges are supported by external organizations through grants and national awards (Morest, 2015). Research results support that faculty are primarily motivated by intrinsic factors, such as social relationship building, teaching activities, and responsibilities (Doran, 2019; Morest, 2015; Stankovska et al., 2017). Time to participate in professional development though is the strongest barrier (Bjelland, Miller, & Sprecher, 2014; Botham, 2018a, 2018b; Dillard & Yu, 2018; Wynants & Dennis, 2018). Institutional support, such as providing release time, immediate informal recognition, and awarding credentials for involvement, is effective (Banasik & Dean, 2016; Benito & Scott-Milligan, 2018; Peat, 2015). The data results from the NFS program evaluation showed that participants felt valued by and important to the institution and administration when they were hired as new faculty members. However, they reported that their sense of value dissipated over the years. A recommendation for immediate action to demonstrate

value is to develop internal reward programs that are tied to faculty professional development.

Project Description

Overview

The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS and how they perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. The project derived from this program evaluation provides recommendations for relevant teaching and learning strategies to be implemented for new faculty member program development as well as insights for evolving professional development programs at the institution of study. I present the executive summary to key stakeholders, explain the process of the evaluation, and describe the findings and recommendations, which are based on scholarly research. The following sections describe the existing supports and resources needed for changes to the NFS, as well as potential barriers and solutions to implementing changes to the NFS.

Needed Resources and Existing Supports

College administrators at the institution of study strongly supported the NFS program evaluation because of the college values and invests in faculty development programs. The college has a well-established center for teaching and learning, which demonstrates the importance the institution of study places on encouraging excellence in teaching and learning (Roberts, 2013). The Teaching, Learning, and Educational

Technology Center (TLETC) at the institution of study is staffed by a Faculty Development/Instructional Developer who reports directly to the Vice President of Educational Affairs. Additionally, each semester a full-time faculty member with a six-credit-hour load release works in the TLETC to support the development and implementation of teaching and learning programs and services. Therefore, since the TLETC allocated faculty for implementing the NFS, the indicated changes to the logic-model input and process features of the NFS may not incur additional costs to the institution. Recommended improvements include conducting a needs assessment of the new faculty member cohorts to determine their professional development needs on acclimating to the environment and developing their instructional delivery strategies, revising the program time allocation to include more focus on instructional delivery, redesigning the program processes into pedagogical practices grounded in adult learning theory and establishing a plan for consistent formative and summative evaluation for the NFS program. Depending on how college administrators prioritize faculty development initiatives with other programs and services of the college will define if allocating more resources is necessary to respond to the results of the program evaluation identifying changes to the logic-model outcome and impact features of the NFS. Recommended improvements include researching and developing best practices for supporting ongoing collaborative efforts for engagement in the environment and ongoing participation in instructional delivery professional development.

The college also as a fundamental practice in data-driven decision making could include the resources and support of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning

and Research that is primarily responsible for collecting, analyzing, and distributing data that are relevant for planning, decision-making and policy formulation. Student success data metrics are one variable that higher education institutions use as a reporting factor in demonstrating viability to key stakeholders, both internal and external to the institution. Research indicates a positive correlation between quality instruction and student success (Bedford & Rossow, 2017; Condon et al., 2016; Kane et al., 2016; Thurlings & den Brok, 2017). Therefore, to bolster student success it becomes incumbent on the institution to ensure quality instructional delivery, for which professional development programs are one channel.

A recommendation in establishing an NFS evaluation plan would be to identify research strategies to capture the correlation between faculty participation and student success (Condon et al., 2016; Dillard & Yu, 2018; Elliott & Oliver, 2016). The research data would provide additional insights on how the logic-model framework of inputs and processes of the NFS can be implemented as best practices. Initiatives to build the correlation between quality instruction and student success would include stronger collaboration between administration and faculty in prioritizing and measuring how the organization is meeting the mission of the community college. The result of implementing strategies to measure student success provides key decision-makers with the evidence for program impact features and responsible realignment of resource allocations.

Potential Barriers and Solutions

Potential barriers to the implementation of the recommendations derived from the NFS program evaluation are primarily based on the number of changes to be implemented and the extended time which it will take to implement all the changes. The results of the research indicate a change in the paradigm is needed from teacher-centered instruction to a learner-centered model. However, recent changes in leadership for several top administrative positions at the institution have started the momentum for a cultural shift. For example, a strategic pillar for the institution of study is now designated specifically for teaching and learning excellence. Included are key ideas for experiential learning, student effort and academic rigor, active and collaborative learning, professional development, and technology. Additional pillars also support potential solutions for the barriers of implementing the recommendations of this project study and committing to continuous improvement in new faculty professional development.

Implementation and Timetable

The results of the NFS program evaluation will be provided to the Vice President of Educational Affairs as an Executive Summary (see Appendix A) upon acceptance of this doctoral study's completion. I will offer to present the recommendations for improvement and provide a summary of the research supporting the implementation to a designated audience of stakeholders. The format for the presentation will include the opportunity for questions. A specific timeline for implementation will be defined based on the resources, roles and responsibilities approved by the Vice President of Educational Affairs to be allocated to the NFS professional development program.

Roles and Responsibilities

The researcher. As the researcher and a full-time faculty member at the college, my role is to present the results of this program evaluation and to provide insights on the recommendations. The acceptance and implementation of the recommendation will be the responsibility of the college's Vice President of Educational Affairs. If deemed appropriate, I will offer to serve as the project lead for communicating the results and coordinating the recommendations for improvement.

Vice President of Educational Affairs. Decisions regarding resource allocations will be the purview of the Vice President of Educational Affairs at the research site. Recommendations for decision making include extending the NFS beyond a one-semester formal professional development program and allocating resources for supporting informal professional development opportunities. Scaffolding professional development acknowledges the institution's commitment to ongoing informal professional learning that advances the mission of the community college (Burgoyne & Chuppa-Cornell, 2018; Czajka & McConnell, 2019). An additional recommendation for resource allocation is investment in a recognition or certification program to reward faculty for participating in ongoing professional development.

Internal program evaluator. The problem that prompted this project study was that for the last 20 years, the NFS has been implemented yearly without a formal evaluation of whether it was meeting the defined program goals. The research site does not have a designated internal program evaluator and program evaluation is not the current role of the TLETC Faculty Development/Instructional Developer. If the faculty

resource provided to the TLETC is not designated to conduct the program evaluation, it is recommended that either an internal or external program evaluator be retained to apply an advanced framework specific to educational institutions. Merchie et al.'s (2018) extended evaluative framework for mapping the effects of professional development initiatives (PDI) is recommended as it uses the analytic features of intervention, teacher quality, teaching behavior, and student results. Also, contextual factors and teachers' and students' personal characteristics are attributes considered included in the evaluation process.

TLETC faculty development/instructional developer/faculty lead. The recommended improvements for the NFS program will take a significant amount of time to implement. The instructional design skills are established in the TLETC staff and support systems. The recommendation is, to begin with, a formative assessment of the current NFS cohort participants to correlate the findings of this program evaluation. The next recommendations would be conducting a needs assessment of the new faculty member cohorts to determine their professional development needs on acclimating to the environment and developing their instructional delivery strategies, revising the NFS program time allocation to include more focus on instructional delivery, redesigning the NFS program processes into pedagogical practices grounded in adult learning theory and establishing a plan for consistent formative and summative evaluation for the NFS program.

Veteran faculty mentors. Connecting with veteran faculty has also proven to support new faculty in learning to navigate the environment (Beane-Katner, 2014;

Waddell et al., 2016) and extend internal rewards for both mentors and mentees (Lynch et al., 2017; MacPhail et al., 2019). Identifying veteran faculty to participate in learning communities and a mentoring model is a recommendation for the TLETC Faculty Development/Instructional Developer to initiate. Upon identification, veteran faculty can establish communities of practice and a mentoring program to support the continued collaborative environment for new faculty members.

Project Implications

Possible Social Change Implications

The roles of the community college are to provide educational services for repurposing the skill sets of community members who are looking for employment in new career fields, bridging the knowledge and skill gap between high school graduates and college-ready students and accommodating a student body that increasingly has diverse student learning needs (Finley & Kinslow, 2016; Romano, 2012). Recently, the advancing agenda to provide a community college education tuition-free to all solidifies the critical role of the community college in the American higher education system in providing the potential for community members to increase their earnings and set a path for change in their lives (Finley & Kinslow, 2016). To meet such an agenda, the community college faculty of today will be expected to understand and adapt to the teaching and learning needs of a diverse student body with varied future goals. The professionalism of teachers is key to organizational growth (Jaramillo-Baquerizo et al., 2019). Implementing faculty professional development with learner-centered strategies to be transferred to the classroom has been shown to have a positive impact on minority and

first-generation student learning (Czajka & McConnell, 2019; Freeman et al., 2014). While research indicates that effectively implemented professional development improves the quality of education (Jaramillo-Baquerizo et al., 2019; Merchie et al., 2018), there is also evidence that it supports faculty retention (Kane et al., 2016; O'Shea Lane, 2018; Scott et al., 2016). Community colleges will soon be experiencing another wave of retiring faculty (Magloire, 2019), which makes it imperative to implement relevant professional development for new faculty members to establish the paradigm shift of learner-centered teaching in the community college and ultimately higher education at large. Hiring, training, and retaining new faculty is a costly investment; implementing effective professional development that retains faculty is "well worth the cost" (Kane et al., 2016, p.10). The results of this program evaluation provide data to add to the body of research related to the professional development needs of new faculty members who teach in the community college environment.

Importance of Project to Key Stakeholders

Implementation of the NFS program evaluation for this project study provides the institution of study with historical data collected and contained in one location at the organization. The collection of files may serve as a reference in the future for program administrators. More importantly, NFS participants' perceptions of the resources and activities generated from this program evaluation provide administrative leadership with the data to assess the return on investment for the program resources expended and to recommend best practices for new tenure-tracked faculty teaching and learning professional development needs. Administrative leadership will also gain insights into

how the outcomes of the NFS program can positively impact the institutional environment, particularly concerning student success. As student success initiatives are not currently linked to the NFS program, knowing the correlation of professional development to student success can support the initiative to collect data for analysis.

Conclusion

In Section 3 I provided the rationale for choosing to implement a program evaluation. Also, I demonstrated a comprehensive review of the literature to examine the program evaluation results and relating recommendations for development. I described the program evaluation, including identifying the supporting key stakeholders, resource allocations, and consequential roles and responsibilities. I applied the logic model to organize the data collection and analysis in Section 2 to demonstrate the implementation of the recommendations. Lastly, I addressed implications for social change and the importance of the program evaluation to the institution of study. In Section 4 I will provide reflections and conclusions as a result of conducting this program evaluation.

Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions

Introduction

This section provides my reflections and conclusions from having produced this project study program evaluation. The strengths and limitations of the project deliverable are discussed and I also present an alternative approach in addressing the problem. This section also defines what I learned through the process of researching scholarship, project development, and leadership and change. My reflection on the importance of the work, as well as implications, applications, and directions for future research conclude the section.

Project Strengths

The primary strength of this project study is that it serves as the first program evaluation conducted on the NFS since its origin in 1999. Without an existing evaluation plan for the NFS, the resources allocated to the program, how the program is implemented, the questions of whether participants are reached as intended, or whether the program is making a difference for the new faculty hires or the institutional environment was unknown until this research project was conducted. As a result of this study, key stakeholders have evaluative data on the described effectiveness of the NFS program to guide decision making for the responsible allocation of resources. Also, this program study provides specific recommendations that are grounded in scholarly research to close the gaps in practice of professional development activities for both new and tenured full-time faculty. For the institution, this program evaluation establishes a framework for on-going and continuous program evaluation to promote ongoing effective faculty-focused professional development. For the students the college serves, this

program evaluation promotes faculty teaching and learning outcomes that will positively impact the learning and skills of students living and working in the community.

Project Limitations

The barriers evident in the program evaluation were in the data collection process. Changing supervision and succession leadership of the NFS program over a more-than-20-year period resulted in data not being available in only one location on campus. Instead, data was distributed across many locations, stored by faculty members or administrators who had varying roles in the organizational structure, and in some cases, held by people outside the institution. However, implementation of the NFS program evaluation for this project study provides the institution of study with a collection of files to serve as a reference in the future for program administrators. The other barrier in the data collection process was the reliability of memory recall of the focus group interview participants in being able to separate whether they had achieved the learning outcome from their participation in the NFS program or via another prong of the college's New Faculty Institute. However, after conducting two focus groups, each with a participant pool that represented a diverse number of years in tenure and teaching focus, the repetition of the responses that developed indicated that data saturation had been achieved.

Recommendations for Alternative Approaches

The barriers presented in this project study did not prove to have a significant impact on achieving the research results. However, the strengths of the project implementation could provide opportunities for alternative approaches for more time-

efficient data collection, analysis, and recommendations. This project study provides a recommendation for collecting formative data during the NFS program implementation. The results from the formative data could then be compared to the summative data to provide a more in-depth understanding of the specific professional development needs of new faculty hires in the cohort for that year. Also, collecting summative data on a timely schedule would strengthen the data results. For example, conducting participant focus group interviews at the end of the program, a year after completion and again after tenure attainment would provide insights on the process of new faculty professional growth as well the specific long-term impact of the NFS program.

The methodology implemented for this program evaluation was appropriately chosen as it established benchmark data for stakeholder decision making which was not available before now. Furthermore, implementing the project established a process by which the institution can continuously research to improve its efforts in meeting the professional development needs of new faculty members, as well as those of tenured faculty.

Scholarship, Project Development, and Leadership and Change

Scholarship. As a first-generation college student, attaining the highest level of academic achievement has been my lifelong goal. Having a passion for teaching and learning, my skills in the act of scholarship are well-practiced both personally and professionally. However, there are two skill sets I have honed in this project that have a significant impact on me as a scholar. First, qualitative research methodologies have evolved and advanced significantly since I obtained my Master's degree. As my

professional endeavors had been primarily based on quantitative methods, my journey for conducting this program evaluation using a qualitative methodology has been challenging. As a result, I have learned an entirely new form of producing dependable and reliable scholarly research. Second, my scholarly writing has substantially improved, which has impacted how I review scholarly literature. My critical thinking skills have been enhanced in evaluating how data results are presented and potential misinterpretations of research outcomes by the reader. Both of these learning outcomes have had a measurable positive impact on my personal and professional development.

Project development. Program evaluation is intended to be continuous and ongoing (McDavid et al., 2012; Mertens & Wilson, 2018; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). The NFS program was developed on the outcomes of a formative assessment conducted in 1998 to provide key stakeholders with information regarding the professional development needs of new faculty members and to assess how well the institution was responding to those needs. As of 2012, the NFS program, which has been implemented since 1999, had not been reviewed for its effectiveness as professional development for new faculty members. Although I have been developing educational programs for most of my professional life, I did not fully comprehend the significant value of "continuous and ongoing" program evaluation until I conducted this research project. Providing program participants with a Likert-scale response form that includes a space for written comment is not a program evaluation, it is merely a formative assessment.

Effective program evaluation is a full-scope assessment of inputs, processes, outcomes, and impacts that must be cyclical and evolving to be deemed effective. Also,

the scope of key stakeholders is much broader than the facilitator and the participants of that program. Most importantly, I learned the results of a program evaluation need to be further researched in the scholarly literature for dependability and reliability to support recommendations. In summary, I now understand that program evaluation is a comprehensive, substantial research endeavor that encompasses far more professional skills than simply years of experience in the field.

Leadership and change. Based on a variety of personal and professional experiences, including scholarly research, I believe that higher education is in a state of crisis. I can choose to accept the problem or I can choose to be a part of the solution. I started the process of attaining this doctorate because I felt the training I had received in becoming an effective adult educator had been inadequate: I was a content expert without the knowledge or experience of effective pedagogy. My research showed that effective programming for faculty professional development is the key to promoting the changes I wish to see in higher education (Guskey, 2009). Through this project study process, I have gained the scholarship of pedagogy and program evaluation to be a leader to promote the change needed for improving teaching and learning practices at the community college. I conclude this doctoral program with the intent to apply my attained knowledge and skills to provide insights on a larger scale for social change by promoting research and recommendations for new faculty training programs that produce high-impact outcomes in how community colleges respond to the national agenda for improved student success.

Reflection on the Importance of the Work

Community colleges are established to provide open access to a multicultural student demographic and focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning. Key stakeholders in higher education are faced with a significant challenge in hiring, developing, and maintaining tenured faculty dedicated to the mission of the community college. To retain teachers in the community college environment, administrators must effectively nurture new faculty members as they transition into their new role. Professional development programs can promote change, however, evaluative data are necessary to guide administrator decision making. This institution values and invests in faculty development programs and has a well-established center for teaching and learning. The professionalism of teachers is key to organizational growth (Jaramillo-Baquerizo et al., 2019). The project derived from this program evaluation provides recommendations for relevant teaching and learning strategies to be implemented for new faculty member program development as well as insights for evolving professional development programs at the institution of study.

Implications, Applications and Directions for Future Research

The roles of the community college are to provide educational services for repurposing the skill sets of community members who are looking for employment in new career fields, bridging the knowledge and skill gap between high school graduates and college-ready students and accommodating a student body that increasingly has diverse student learning needs (Finley & Kinslow, 2016; Romano, 2012). Recently, the advancing agenda to provide a community college education tuition-free to all solidifies

the critical role of the community college in the American higher education system in providing the potential for community members to increase their earnings and set a path for change in their lives (Finley & Kinslow, 2016). To meet such an agenda, the community college faculty of today will be expected to understand and adapt to the teaching and learning needs of a diverse student body with varied future goals. Implementing faculty professional development with learner-centered strategies to be transferred to the classroom has been shown to have a positive impact on minority and first-generation student learning (Czajka & McConnell, 2019; Freeman et al., 2014). A review of the barriers in conducting this program evaluation can be overcome with the recommendations provided to improve future research.

Conclusion

Community colleges will soon be experiencing another wave of retiring faculty (Magloire, 2019), which makes it imperative to implement effective professional development for new faculty members to establish the paradigm shift of learner-centered teaching in the community college and ultimately higher education at large. Hiring, training and retaining new faculty is a costly investment; implementing effective professional development that retains faculty is "well worth the cost" (Kane et al., 2016, p.10). The results of this program evaluation provide data to add to the body of research related to the professional development needs of new faculty members who teach in the community college environment.

References

Abbott, A. D. (2004). *Methods of discovery Heuristics for the Social Sciences.* Norton, W. W. & Company, Inc.

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1987). *Membership roles in field research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2015). *Community colleges past to present*. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages.pasttopresent.aspx.

Banasik, M. J., & Dean, J. L. (2016). Non-tenure track faculty and learning communities: Bridging the divide to enhance teaching quality. *Innovations in Higher Education, 41*(4), 333–342. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-015-9351-6

Banda, R. M., Flowers, A. M., & Robinson, P. (2017). Numbers don't lie: Problematizing faculty diversity at HSIs. *Journal for Multicultural Education, 11*(4), 250–263. https://doi.org/10.1108/JME-05-2016-0033

Barton, C. E., Williams, C. L., Halle, J. S., & McGrew, L. (2018). Graduate and undergraduate faculty collaboration utilizing peer observation to enhance educational opportunities for students and faculty: A case example. *Journal of the*

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 3. https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v18i3.22705

Bazeley, P. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo* (2nd ed.). London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Beane-Katner, L. (2013). Developing the next generation of faculty: Taking a learning community approach. *Journal on Centers for Teaching & Learning, 2013*(5), 91–106. Retrieved from https://openjournal.lib.miamioh.edu/

Beane-Katner, L. (2014). Anchoring a mentorship network in a new faculty development program. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 22*(2), 91–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.902558

Beauchamp, C. (2015). Reflection in teacher education: Issues emerging from a review of current literature. *Reflective Practice, 16*(1), 123–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2014.982525

Bedford, L. (2019). Using social media as a platform for a virtual professional learning community. *Online Learning, 23*(3), 120–136. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v23i3.1538

Bedford, L., & Rossow, K. (2017). Facilitating professional learning communities among higher education faculty: The Walden Junto model. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 20*(2). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer202/bedford_rossow202.html

Behar-Horenstein, L. S., Garvan, C. W., Catalanotto, F. A., Su, Y., & Feng, X. (2016). Assessing faculty development needs among Florida's allied dental

faculty. *Journal of Dental Hygiene, 90*(1), 52–59. Retrieved from https://jdh.adha.org/

Benito, A., & Scott-Milligan, F. (2018). Hearing the voice of faculty: Global recommendations for faculty recognition in higher education institutions. *Higher Learning Research Communications, 8*(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v8i2.433

Bers, T. H., & Head, R. B. (2014). Assessing financial health in community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2014*(168), 103–114. https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc.20124

Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). Member checking: A tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation? *Qualitative Health Research, 26*(13), 1802–1811. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654870

Bjelland, B., Miller, G., & Sprecher, M. (2014). Professional development needs of instructors of online swine science courses. *NACTA Journal, 58*(2), 109–114. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/nactajournal.58.2.109

Blickenstaff, S., Wolf, K., Falk, J., & Foltz, J. (2015). College of agriculture faculty perceptions of student skills, faculty competence in teaching areas and barriers to

improving teaching. *NACTA Journal, 59*(3), 219–226. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/nactajournal.59.3.219

Bosman, L., & Voglewede, P. (2019). How can a faculty community of practice change classroom practices? *College Teaching*, *67*(3), 177–187. https://doi-org/10.1080/87567555.2019.1594149

Botham, K. A. (2018a). The perceived impact on academics' teaching practice of engaging with a higher education institution's CPD scheme. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, *55*(2), 164–175. https://doi-org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1371056

Botham, K. A. (2018b). An analysis of the factors that affect engagement of higher education teachers with an institutional professional development scheme.

Innovations in Education and Teaching International, *55*(2), 176–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1371056

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9* (2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027.

Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities of practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organization Science, 2*(1), 40–57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.40

Bruner, D. W., Dunbar, S., Higgins, M., & Martyn, K. (2016). Benchmarking and gap analysis of faculty mentorship priorities and how well they are met. *Nursing Outlook, 64*(4), 321–331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2016.02.008

Buckley, R., & Caple, J. (2009). *The theory and practice of training* (6th ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Kogan Page Publishers.

Burgoyne, M. B., & Chuppa-Cornell, K. (2018). 'If I tried this idea again: developing faculty professional growth through reflective practice. *Reflective Practice, 19*(6), 818–831. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2018.1539656

Carpenter, R., Sweet, C., & Blythe, H. (2016). The future of faculty development. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 30*(2), 5. Retrieved from https://www.magnapubs.com

Chauvin, S. W., Anderson, W., Mylona, E., Greenburg, R., & Yang, T. (2013). New faculty orientation in North American medical schools. *Teaching and Learning Medicine, 25*(3), 185–190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2013.797345

Condon, W., Iverson, E. R., Manduca, C. A., Rutz, C., & Willett, G. (2016). *Faculty development and student learning: Assessing the connections*. Indiana University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano, C. V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Cunningham, C. M. (2018). Academic labor and two-year institutions. *Review of Communication, 18*(2), 98–111. https://doi-org /10.1080/15358593.2018.1438643

Czajka, C. D., & McConnell, D. (2019). The adoption of student-centered teaching materials as a professional development experience for college faculty. *International Journal of Science Education, 41*(5), 693–711. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1578908

De Rijdt, C., Dochy, F., Bamelis, S., & van der Vleuten, C. (2016). Classification of staff development programmes and effects perceived by teachers. *Innovations in*

Education and Teaching International, *53*(2), 179–190. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.916543

Dey, I. (2016). *Qualitative data analysis: A user-friendly guide for social scientists.* London, UK: Routledge.

Dillard, R. J., & Yu, H. H. (2018). Best practices in student veteran education: Faculty professional development and student veteran success. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *66*(2), 122–128. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Doran, E. E. (2019). Building a community of practice for teaching developmental courses. *Journal of Developmental Education*, *43*(1), 12–19. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/journal/jdeveeduc

Dron, J., & Anderson, T. (2014). *Teaching crowds and social media*. Edmonton, Alberta: AU Press Athabasca University. Retrieved from http://klangable.com/uploads/books/99Z_Dron_Anderson-Teaching_Crowds.pdf

Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (2009). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement.* Moorabbin, Victoria: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Eddy, P. L. (2010). New faculty issues: Fitting in and figuring it out. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2010*(152), 15–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc.423

Elliott, R. W., & Oliver, D. E. (2016). Linking faculty development to community college student achievement: A mixed methods approach. *Community College*

Journal of Research and Practice, 40(2), 85–99. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Engelbrecht, W., & Ankiewicz, P. (2016). Criteria for continuing professional development of technology teachers' professional knowledge: A theoretical perspective. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 26*(2), 259–284. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-015-9309-0

Finley, D. L., & Kinslow, S. L. (2016). *Faculty talk about teaching at the community college*. Oxford Handbooks Online. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935291.013.47

Fleming, S. S., Goldman, A. W., Correll, S. J., & Taylor, C. J. (2016). Settling in: The role of individual and departmental tactics in the development of new faculty networks. *The Journal of Higher Education, 87*(4), 561–572. https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2014.10386abstract

Fredericks, K. A., Deegan, M., & Carman, J. G. (2008). Using system dynamics as an evaluation tool: Experience from a demonstration program. *American Journal of Evaluation, 29*(3), 251–267. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1098214008319446

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *PNAS, 111*(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111

Frye, A. W., & Hemmer, P. A. (2012). Program evaluation models and related theories: Association for Medication Education in Europe (AMEE) guide no. 67. *Medical Teacher, 34*(5), e288–e299. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2012.668637

Gardner, S. S. (2014). From learning to teach to teaching effectiveness: Nurse educators describe their experiences. *Nursing Education Perspectives (National League for Nursing), 35*(2), 106–111. http://dx.doi.org/10.5480/12-821.1

Gast, I., Schildkamp, K., & van der Veen, J. T. (2017). Team-based professional development interventions in higher education: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research, 87*(4), 736–767. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317704306

Gerken, M., Beausaert, S., & Segers, M. (2016). Working on professional development of faculty staff in higher education: Investigating the relationship between social informal learning activities and employability. *Human Resource Development International, 19*(2), 135–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2015.1116241

Gibbs, G. (2018). *Analyzing qualitative data* (2nd ed.). London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Goh, A. Y. S. (2019). Rethinking reflective practice in professional lifelong learning using learning metaphors. *Studies in Continuing Education, 41*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2018.1474867

Green, D. W., & Ciez-Volz, K. (2010). Now hiring: The faculty of the future. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2010*(152), 81–92. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc.430

Gregory, K. H., & Burbage, A. K. (2017). Exploring faculty development identity through self-study: Teaching philosophies, reflective practice, and critical friendship. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research, 12*, 110–124. Retrieved from http://www.ingentaconnect.com

Gresham, J. L. (2014). *The transition experience of second career respiratory faculty: A phenomenological study.* TX: University of North Texas.

Guskey, T. R. (2009). Closing the knowledge gap in effective professional development. *Educational Horizons, 87*(4), 224–233. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ849021.pdf

Haines, S. L., & Popovich, N. G. (2014). Engaging external senior faculty members as faculty mentors. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 78*(5), 1–6. http://dx.doi.org/10.5688/ajpe785101

Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2017). *Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hansen, K. D., & Dawson, D. L. (2019). "We can do better": Community college faculty preparedness for teaching students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000142

Holmes, K. A., & Prieto-Rodriquz, E. (2018). Student and staff perceptions of a learning management system for blended learning in teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(3). https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n3.2

Hord, S. M. (2004). Professional learning communities: An overview. In S. Hord (Ed.), *Learning together, leading together: Changing schools through professional learning communities* (pp. 5–14). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hott, B. L., & Tietjen-Smith, T. (2018). The professional development needs of tenure track faculty at a regional university. *Research in Higher Education, 35*, 1–12. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1194407.pdf

Housel, D. A. (2020). When co-occurring factors impact adult learners: Suggestions for instruction, preservice training, and professional development. *Adult Learning, 31*(1), 6–16. https://doi-org /10.1177/1045159519849910

Jaramillo-Baquerizo, C., Valcke, M., & Vanderlinde, R. (2019). Professional development initiatives for university teachers: Variables that influence the transfer of learning to the workplace. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, *56*(3), 352–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2018.1479283

Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards. (2011). *The program evaluation standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kane, R., Shaw, M., Pang, S., Salley, W., & Snider, J. B. (2016). *Faculty professional development and student satisfaction in online higher education. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 19*(2). Retrieved from

http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer192/kane_shaw_pang_salley_snider192.html

Kapitulik, B. P. (2013). Teaching sociology in community college: Balancing ideals with institutional constraints. *The American Sociologist, 44*(4), 366–377. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-013-9193-6

Knowles, M. S. (1984). *The adult learner*. United States: Gulf Publishing Company

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: the definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2015). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Krutka, D., Carpenter, J., & Trust, T. (2017). Enriching professional learning networks: A framework for identification, reflection, and intention. *Techtrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning, 61*(3), 246–252. https:/doi.org/10.1007/s11528-016-0141-5

Kuh, G. D., Ikenberry, S. O., Jankowski, N. A., Cain, T. R., Ewell, P. T., Hutchings, P., & Kinzie, J. (2015). *Using evidence of student learning to improve higher education*. Jossey-Bass.

Lancaster, J. W., Stein, S. M., MacLean, L. G., Van Amburgh, J., & Persky, A. M. (2014). Faculty development program models to advance teaching and learning within health science programs. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 78*(5), 1–7. http://dx.doi.org/10.5688/ajpe78599

Law, A. V., Jackevicius, C., Murray, W. I., Hess, K., Pham, D. Q., Min, D. I., & Le, J. (2012). Impact of a faculty orientation and development committee. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 76*(1), 1–7. http://dx.doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7613

Lewis, S., & Ewing, C. (2016). Assuring student learning outcomes achievement though faculty development: An online university example. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 16*(4). Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter194/lewis_ewing194.html

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2010). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Louws, M. L., Meirink, J. A., van Veen, K., & van Driel, J. H. (2017). Teachers' self-directed learning and teaching experience: What, how, and why teachers want to learn. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 66,* 171–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.004

Lynch, S., Barrere, C., O'Connor, L., Karosas, L., & Lange, J. (2017). A faculty teaching mentor program: Supporting, engaging, and retaining new faculty. *The Department Chair,* 28(1), 15–16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/dch.30147

MacPhail, A. A. M. I., Ulvik, M., Guberman, A., Czerniawski, G., Oolbekkink-Marchand, H., & Bain, Y. (2019). The professional development of higher education-based teacher educators: needs and realities. *Professional Development in Education, 45*(5), 848–861. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2018.1529610

Magloire, J. (2019). Who wants to teach a diverse student body? Community college missions and the faculty search committee. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *43*(3), 165–172. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Martin, J. B., & Collins, R. A. (2011). Formative and summative evaluation in the assessment of adult learning. In V. Wang (Ed.), *Assessing and evaluating adult learning in career and technical education* (pp. 127–142). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/978-1-61520-745-9.ch008

McAllister, M., Oprescu, F., & Jones, C. (2014). N2E: Envisioning a process to support transition from nurse to educator. *Contemporary Nurse: A Journal for the Australian Nursing Profession, 46*(2), 242–250. https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.2014.46.2.242

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (2012). *Program evaluation and performance measurement: An introduction to practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McKay, L., & Monk, S. (2017). Early career academic learning in the game of Whackadmia. *Higher Education Research & Development, 36*(6), 1251–1263. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1303460

McKee, C. W., Johnson, M., Ritchie, W. F., & Tew, W. M. (2013). Professional development of the faculty: Past and present. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, *2013*(133), 15–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20042

McKee, C. W., & Tew, W. M. (2013). Setting the stage for teaching and learning in American higher education: making the case for faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, *2013*(133), 3–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tl.20041

Meizlish, D. S., Wright, M. C., Howard, J., & Kaplan, M. L. (2017). Measuring the impact of a new faculty program using institutional data. *International Journal for Academic Development, 23*(2), 72–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2017.1364644

Merchie, E., Tuytens, M., Devos, G., & Vanderlinde, R. (2018). Evaluating teachers' professional development initiatives: Towards an extended evaluative framework. *Research Papers in Education*, *33*(2), 143–168. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Merriam, S. B. (2015). Qualitative research: Designing, implementing and publishing a study. In V. Wang (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Scholarly Publishing and Research Methods* (pp. 125–140). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-7409-7.ch007

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2018). *Program evaluation theory and practice: A comprehensive guide* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Mitchell, J. (2014). Academics learning a new language: Developing communities of practice in faculty professional development. *International Journal of Adult, Community & Professional Learning, 21*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00967-0_8

Morest, V. S. (2013). From access to opportunity: The evolving social roles of community colleges. *The American Sociologist, 44*(4), 319–328. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-013-9194-5

Morest, V. S. (2015). Faculty scholarship at community colleges: Culture, institutional structures, and socialization. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2015*(171), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20152

Munday, N., Angel, R., Anik, M., Clay, S., Justice, L., Maea, C.,. . . (2019). Increasing diversity of faculty and administrators in the Virginia community college system. *Inquiry, 22*(1). Retrieved from https://commons.vccs.edu/inquiry/vol22/iss1/4/

Murphy, C., & Lick, D. (2005). *Whole-faculty study groups: Creating professional learning communities that target student learning*, (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Needleman, J., Bowman, C. C., Wyte-Lake, T., & Dobalian, A. (2014). Faculty recruitment and engagement in academic-practice partnerships. *Nursing Education Perspectives (National League for Nursing), 35*(6), 372–379. http://dx.doi.org/10.5480/13-1234

Nick, J. M., Delahoyde, T. M., Prato, D. D., Mitchell, C., Ortiz, J., Ottley, C., . . . (2012). Best practices in academic mentoring: A model for excellence. *Nursing Research & Practice, 2012* 1–9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2012/937906

Nor, M. Z. M. (2019). Faculty development for medical teachers: An effective mechanism to foster professional development. *Education in Medicine Journal*, *11*(3), 63–68. https://doi.org//10.21315/eimj2019.11.3.7

O'Shea Lane, J. (2018). Lived experiences of new faculty: Nine stages of development toward learner-centered practice. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 3. https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v18i3.23373

Owusu-Agyeman, Y., & Fourie-Malherbe, M. (2019). Negotiating co-ownership of learning in higher education: an underexplored practice for adult learning. *Studies in Continuing Education, 41*(1), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2018.1497591

Payne, D. A., Madaus, G. F., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (2012). *Designing educational project and program evaluations: A practical overview based on research and experience*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Peat, J. (2015). Getting down to the nitty-gritty: The trials and tribulations of an institutional professional recognition scheme. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 19*(3), 92–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2015.1029999

Pesce, R. (2015). *Professional development for teaching in higher education: Faculty perceptions and attitudes* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://dlib.bc.edu/islandora/object/bcir:104134

Price, P. D., Schneider, D. K., & Quick, L. A. (2015). Financial challenges in higher education: Community college leadership style and ranking. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 40*(6), 508–522. http://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1069226

Professional and Organizational Development Network Executive Committee. (2016, June). *What is educational development?* Retrieved from http://podnetwork.org/about-us/what-is-educational-development/

Richards, L. (2014). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Roberts, K. (2013). A model for a center for teaching and learning excellence: A catalyst for program improvement in developing institutions. *Excellence in Higher Education, 4*(2), 108–118. http://dx.doi.org/10.5195/EHE.2013.98

Romano, R. M. (2012). Looking behind community college budgets for future policy considerations. *Community College Review, 40*(2), 165-189. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0091552112441824

Saldana, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Samovar, L., Porter, R., & McDaniel, E. (2017). *Communication between cultures* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Saroyan, A., & Trigwell, K. (2015). Higher education teachers' professional learning: Process and outcome. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 46*, 92–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.03.008

Scarparolo, G. E., & Hammond, L. S. (2018). The effect of a professional development model on early childhood educators' direct teaching of beginning reading. *Professional Development in Education*, *44*(4), 492–506. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Schreurs, M., Huveneers, W., & Dolmans, D. (2016). Communities of teaching practice in the workplace: Evaluation of a faculty development programme. *Medical Teacher, 2016*(38), 808–814. http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2015.1112892

Scott, W., Lemus, D., Knotts, G., & Oh, J. (2016). Why learner-centered new faculty orientations matter: Organizational culture and faculty retention. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, *30*(1), 15–22. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1133613

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Soto, M., Gupta, D., Dick, L., & Appelgate, M. (2019). Bridging distances: Professional development for higher education faculty through technology-facilitated lesson study. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *16*(3), 7. Retrieved from https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol16/iss3/7

Spaulding, D. T. (2016). *Program evaluation in practice: Core concepts and examples for discussion and analysis* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Spillett, M. A. (2003). Peer debriefing: Who, what, when, why, how. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 7*(3), 36. Retrieved from http://go.gale.com

Stake, R. E. (2010). *The art of case study research* (5th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stankovska, G., Angelkoska, S., Osmani, F., & Grncarovska, S. P. (2017). *Job motivation and job satisfaction among academic staff in higher education*. Bulgarian Comparative Education Society.

Stewart, C. J., & Cash, W. B., Jr. (2018). *Interviewing: Principles and practices* (15th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Strauss, A. L. (2010). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511557842

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Coryn, C. L. S. (2014). *Evaluation theory, models, & applications* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sullivan, R., Neu, V., & Yang, F. (2018). Faculty development to promote effective instructional technology integration: A qualitative examination of reflections in an online community. *Online Learning, 22*(4). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i4.1373

Thomson, K. (2015). Informal conversations about teaching and their relationship to a formal development program: Learning opportunities for novice and mid-career academics. *International Journal for Academic Development, 20*(2), 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2015

Thurlings, M., & den Brok, P. (2017). Learning outcomes of teacher professional development activities: a meta-study. *Educational Review, 69*(5), 554–576. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2017.1281226

Valle, M., & Fuchs, T. (2015). Teaching and learning communities: empowering adjuncts and ensuring quality. *J Educ Hum Dev*, *4*(1), 1–6. http://dx.doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v4n1a1

van den Bergh, L., Ros, A., & Beijaard, D. (2015). Teacher learning in the context of a continuing professional development programme: A case study. *Teaching and teacher education*, *47*, 142–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.01.002

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

Waddell, J., Martin, J., Schwind, J. K., & Lapum, J. L. (2016). A faculty-based mentorship circle: Positioning new faculty for success. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *46*(4), 60–75. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1128609.pdf

Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Willett, G., Iverson, E. R., Rutz, C., & Manduca, C. A. (2014). Measures matter: Evidence of faculty development effects on faculty and student learning. *Assessing Writing*, *20*, 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.12.001

Wood, J. T. (2016). *Interpersonal communication: Everyday encounters* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Wynants, S., & Dennis, J. (2018). Professional development in an online context: Opportunities and challenges from the voices of college faculty. *Journal of Educators Online, 15*(1), 127–139. https://doi.org/10.9743/JEO2018.15.1.2

Yee, K. (2015). Learner-centered faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *144*, 99–107. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20166

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Zielinski, D. E. (2017). The use of collaboration, authentic learning, linking material to personal knowledge, and technology in the constructivist classroom: Interviews with community college faculty members. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *41*(10), 668–686. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/

Appendix A: The Project

A Program Evaluation of a Community College's New Faculty Seminar

by

Kari M. Proft

Walden University

October 2020

Program Evaluation of the New Faculty Seminar

Overview

The New Faculty Seminar (NFS) is one of a three-pronged training program of the New Faculty Institute that includes (a) an intensive, three-day orientation during Fall Development Week, (b) a one-course release for new faculty members to participate in a one-semester weekly professional development seminar (that is, the New Faculty Seminar [NFS]), and (c) coordination of the new faculty members' attendance at a national teaching and learning conference. The purpose of completing this program evaluation was to explore how faculty describe the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS, and describe the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. This program evaluation serves as the first assessment of the effectiveness of the NFS; the other programs within the New Faculty Institute are not included.

The NFS program evaluation was conducted as a bounded case study research design. A summative approach was used by assessing archived program documents and conducting focus group interviews with participants on their perceptions of NFS program outcomes. A basic logic model framework was used to provide an efficient, graphic depiction of the relationship and systematic thinking of the core components of the NFS inputs, process, outcomes, and impacts. The following questions were the foundation to develop a description of the NFS and an explanation of the program outputs.

RQ1: How do faculty describe the New Faculty Seminar inputs and processes they experienced during their year of participation?

RQ2: How do faculty perceive the outcomes and impact of the New Faculty Seminar on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery?

Methods to collect, analyze, and interpret the data followed scholarly standards for accuracy and trustworthiness. Data collection included retrieving yearly program documentary data and conducting two focus group interviews. Methods to collect, analyze, and interpret the data followed scholarly standards for accuracy and trustworthiness. A semistructured focus group protocol aligned with the research questions for the study was implemented. The data analysis was conducted through several cycles of coding processes to develop themes that accurately represented the data (Saldana, 2016). First, I applied the cycle of *holistic coding* in the analysis of the documentary data. I used the logic model components of inputs and processes as the general categories for the data organization as it related to the defined goals of the NFS program. Second, I applied *in vivo coding* to analyze the data from the focus group interviews to identify and prioritize the participants' statements that described inputs, processes, outputs, and impacts. Last, to synthesize the documentary data and the focus group interview data, I applied an *evaluation coding* strategy to organize all the data for description and comparison (Richards, 2014; Saldana, 2016). A summary of the findings is provided in the next section.

Summary of Findings

I designed the research questions for this project study to identify how participating faculty members described their experiences with the NFS and the outcomes as perceived by faculty participating in the NFS concerning its goals and objectives. Methods to collect, analyze, and interpret the data followed scholarly standards for accuracy and trustworthiness. Data collection included retrieving the yearly program documentary data and conducting two focus group interviews, each with eight participants. I implemented a semistructured focus group protocol aligned with the research questions for the study. I conducted data analysis through several cycles of coding processes to develop themes that accurately represented the data (Saldana, 2016). First, I applied the cycle of *holistic coding* in the analysis of the documentary data. I used the logic model components of inputs and processes as the general categories for the data organization as it related to the defined goals of the NFS program. Second, I applied *in vivo coding* to analyze the data from the focus group interviews to identify and prioritize the participants' statements that described inputs, processes, outputs, and impacts. Last, to synthesize the documentary data and the focus group interview data, I applied an *evaluation coding* strategy to organize all the data for description and comparison (Richards, 2014; Saldana, 2016).

Four themes emerged from the data analysis: (a) inputs are contingent on the individual NFS participants' prior professional experience, (b) processes for NFS pedagogical practices, (c) participant cohort-based relationship outcomes, and (d) participant institutional impacts. A brief explanation of each theme and how the logic

model supported category organization related to the defined goals of the NFS program is described. Additionally, the emergent themes supporting data findings are discussed in addressing the research questions.

Theme 1 explains how new faculty members have unique professional development needs based on their prior academic and professional experience. Depending on whether the new faculty hires had worked in the community college environment defined the logic model input feature for training on acclimating to the environment. However, regardless of teaching experience, new faculty NFS members positively described inputs for developing instructional delivery. Theme 2 explains how new faculty members prefer the NSF supporting sound pedagogical practice for adult learners. The logic model process feature defined the teaching and learning strategies used in the NFS program. Participants negatively described the processes for acclimating to the environment and positively described the processes for developing instructional delivery. Theme 3 explains the logic model outcome feature of the importance of relationship-building for new faculty members with their cohort peers and faculty leads. NFS participants establish lasting collaborative relationships for acclimating to the challenges facing community colleges and developing instructional strategies for student success. Theme 4 explains the logic model impact feature that as a result of participation in the NFS, new faculty members establish a tenured professional expectation for peer engagement and institutional support for collaborative efforts. Influences in the institutional environment have the potential to encourage or discourage NFS participants' descriptions of job satisfaction.

The themes are aligned with the research questions, and each theme provides supporting evidence with an explanation of case discrepancies. Relationship to the literature is also incorporated in the theme development. The logic model core concepts are applied in each theme and in the summary of how the theme addresses the problem that prompted this NFS program evaluation.

Research Question 1: How do faculty describe the New Faculty Seminar inputs and processes they experienced during their year of participation?

To answer the first research question that explored how faculty described the new faculty seminar inputs and processes they experienced during their year of participation, the semistructured focus group protocol addressed their concerns. Additionally, document analysis included seminar schedules, email correspondence between faculty leads about course planning, program syllabi, and curriculum handouts of presenter supplemental materials. Two themes emerged to support the first research question: (1) new faculty members have unique professional development needs based on their prior academic and professional experience, and (2) new faculty members prefer the NSF supporting sound pedagogical practice.

Theme 1: Inputs are contingent on the individual NFS participants' prior professional experience. Human Resources onboarding policies for new tenure track faculty hires indicate mandatory participation in the NFS regardless of prior professional experience at the institution, within higher education, or established teaching experience for any educational institution. As a result, NFS participants have unique professional development needs as input features in acclimating to the environment and developing

instructional delivery. The theme reflects three key findings: (a) input on organization environment was positively described by NFS participants with community college experience, (b) input on organization environment was negatively described by NFS participants without community college experience, and (c) input on instructional delivery was positively described by the NFS participants regardless of prior teaching experience.

First, the data reflected that, regardless of the NFS participant's prior employment experience as an adjunct or administrator at the institution, moving to a full-time faculty member position created a change in their perspective of the environment. As purported by Participant B-5 who had been hired from an adjunct role in the institution for several years: "so as far as instructional ability, I kind of had developed that already. But I really appreciated getting to know more about [how] the college functions, about how things work in administration." Faculty members who were transitioning from an administrative role also supported the benefit of a change in perspective of the environment. As declared by Participant B-8: "As a staff member before I was hired as faculty, I was already acclimated to the environment, but I learned the structural approach from a different perspective by participating in the NFS." Gardner (2014), Pesce (2015), and Saroyan and Trigwell (2015) provided the support that faculty development is critical to all new faculty. In this case study, even though the NFS participants were employees who were not new to the institution, they valued the input features to acclimate to the environment through their new lens as a full-time faculty member.

Second, new faculty members hired who did not have any experience with a community college environment, negatively described the NFS curriculum input features focused on acclimating to the environment. As explained by Participant B-6: “I was too overwhelmed trying to come up to speed and prep everything for teaching. My brain wasn’t ready to be fed all of that information on the college environment so intensively in that first semester.” Hott and Tietjen-Smith (2018) and Meizlish, Wright, Howard, and Kaplan (2017) provided the support that faculty are overwhelmed and the transition of participating in the higher education environment in their new role as an educator. However, the documentary data analysis of the seminar schedules, email correspondence between faculty leads about course planning, program syllabi, and curriculum handouts of presenter supplemental materials defined that two-thirds of the three-hour weekly NFS meeting schedule was allocated to acclimating to the college’s environment.

Third, the data reflected that, regardless of prior teaching experience, NFS participants positively described the input features on developing instructional delivery. While professional development programs are an essential component in supporting all faculty (Bedford, 2019; Lancaster, Stein, MacLean, Van Amburgh, & Persky, 2014; Pesce, 2015; Professional and Organizational Development Network Executive Committee, 2016; Saroyan & Trigwell, 2015); training is even more critical for new faculty members, the majority of who have not been trained to teach (Beane-Katner, 2013; Behar-Horenstein, Garvan, Catalanotto, Su, & Feng, 2016; Gardner, 2014; McKee, Johnson, Ritchie, & Tew, 2013; Pesce, 2015). Relative to the current study, the data analysis indicated that new faculty members who had little to no teaching experience

valued the input features for instructional delivery on a more basic level. Participant B-2 detailed: “I remember that when I started, I had never taught before. I had a number of issues, such as student issues and classroom management but being able to ask fellow faculty members in the NFS who had taught before was valuable to me. Even learning how to develop a syllabus was helpful!”

In summary, theme one represents how new faculty members describe the NFS input features of the program. New faculty hires from within the institution valued the new perspective of learning about the institution environment as they transitioned to the role of full-time faculty members. On the other hand, new faculty members who had been hired from outside of the institution experienced added stress in learning the college’s environment in addition to instructional delivery. At the same time, the data findings and related research indicate that NFS input features to encourage the development of instructional delivery was positively described by participants. Results indicate that the resource allocations for adapting to the environment should be modified based on new faculty point of hire and more input features should be allocated to encourage instructional delivery, which was positively described by participants.

Theme 2: New faculty members prefer the NSF supporting sound pedagogical practice. Theme 2 reflects two key findings: (a) the processes of the meeting logistics regarding the learning environment and defined agenda was negatively described by NFS participants, and (b) the processes for instructional delivery was positively described by the NFS participants regardless of prior teaching experience. First, NFS participants negatively described the pedagogical practice of a self-contained

learning environment for acclimating new faculty to the institutional environment. In my review of the human resource hiring records and NFS schedules integrated with the data from the focus group interviews, I noticed the indication that new faculty members groups grew larger in the number of participants, the NFS began to be held in a classroom or conference room each week. NFS participants from the larger number group size referred to the meeting logistics as a "prison" without windows or a "stagnant place with people rotating in" and not leaving the room during the three hours. Participant B-3 described: "We felt disconnected from experiencing student services as we didn't even know where they were to be able to refer students." McAllister, Oprescu, and Jones (2014) provide the support that social interactions build on the outcomes of new faculty acclimating to the environment as was described by the NFS cohort participants from the earliest years of the program implementation. At the time the NFS program was launched, the new faculty cohorts visited the various administrative offices for student services to meet the office personnel and learn about the available programs. Participant B-2 reflected on the experience in this way: "It was so nice because I got to know the person, I got to know how to get to the office, I got to know the services, and that was so valuable to me."

Also, NFS participants negatively described the pedagogical practice of a rigid meeting agenda. Documentary data identified that the NFS had a set schedule of events for each weekly meeting. Participants who attended the NFS in the first few years of its existence corroborated the document analysis; in that they defined the NFS schedule was "established like a graduate course with texts and assignments." The documentary data

indicated that, in the later years of the NFS program, more than half of the set schedule of events was allocated to presentations given by institution personnel about programs and services. For example, Participant A-6 indicated: “Our NFS faculty leads were very good about planning what was going to happen, and we would say, “No! We want to talk about this today.” However, the time allocation for discussion was limited. Participant B-7 corroborated this finding stating, “Sadly, the guest speakers impacted the rest of the way we spent our time.”

Second, data results defined NFS participants preferred the pedagogical practices for developing instructional delivery to be collaborative with their peers. My data analysis indicated that whether the members of an NFS cohort were experienced teachers or content experts, learning teaching strategies from each other was how they wanted to develop their instructional skills. Participant B-1 clarified this finding best with the statement: “just seeing each other in action through peer observations is important, probably more so than the scholarship of teaching.” The later part of the statement reflecting group learning versus independent learning. Gibbs (2018), Merriam (2015), and Stufflebeam and Coryn (2014) provide the support that the social constructivist approach that engaged the new faculty hires to learn from each other was significant in developing their instructional skills.

In summary, theme 2 represents how new faculty members describe the NFS process features of the program. Dron and Anderson (2014) and Holmes and Prieto-Rodriquz (2018) provide the support that as adult learners, faculty development programs should be implemented in a student-centered format. The NFS teacher-centered learning

strategies of "talking heads" from administrative services and the predefined meeting agenda as processes for acclimating to the environment did not reach participants as intended. Instead, NFS participants positively described the pedagogical practice of "field trips" to departments as more effective in acclimating to the environment. Furthermore, NFS participants positively described the collaborative work of peer teaching activities as best practice for developing instructional delivery. Results in theme 2 indicate that the pedagogical practices for the NFS need to be grounded in adult learning theory regardless of the number of participants in the cohort.

Research Question 2: How do faculty perceive the outcomes and impact of the New Faculty Seminar on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery?

To answer the second research question that explored how faculty described the new faculty seminar outcomes and impact they experienced during their year of participation, the semistructured focus group protocol addressed their concerns. Additionally, document analysis included seminar schedules, a *New Faculty Institute Program Handbook*, program syllabi, and example project assignments such as teaching portfolios and faculty self-evaluations. A third and fourth theme emerged to support the second research question: (3) new faculty members continue their cohort relationships beyond their NFS participation, and (4) new faculty members develop a long-term expectation of the institutional environment as a result of participating in the NFS.

Theme 3: New faculty members continue their cohort relationships beyond their NFS participation. My data analysis reflected that focus group participants

positively described the relationships established within their NFS cohort and with their cohort faculty leads. The theme reflects three key findings: (a) tenured collaborative relationships as cohort peers invested in the community college environment and developing instructional delivery through their tenure, and (b) reliability on the cohort faculty leads in continuously acclimating to the environment. First, NFS participants positively described cohort tenured relationships as an NFS outcome for being invested in the environment and future development of instructional delivery. Participants referred to their cohort as a "family" or a "team" with whom they looked forward to spending time with each week. The shared environment of the NFS forum produced the outcome feature of unity among participants as faculty invested in the community college mission.

Additionally, the outcome of the established NFS cohort relationships was positively described for the continued development of instructional strategies. Krutka, Carpenter, and Trust (2017), Saroyan and Trigwell (2015), and Sullivan, Neu, and Yang (2018) provide the support that applying the social constructivist approach in professional development promotes relationship building which is important to new faculty during the learning process. However, the literature regarding new faculty development does not explicitly reflect how the outcome of peer relationships built within the cohort establishes a benchmark for future behavior. In this case study, the data analysis indicated that the cohort relationships implicitly establish an expectancy of the new faculty member's role in the environment beyond NFS participation. Participants in both focus groups referred to how their cohort peers were "benchmarks" for their role as faculty members in supporting the initiatives of the institution. Participant A-6 detailed: "I gauge what I

should be doing and if I'm doing the job that I should by comparing myself to my esteemed peers from the NFS. These peers keep me working hard." Benchmarks were also established for instructional delivery. Cohort peers connected across disciplines to get different perspectives on a specific teaching curriculum plan or building linked programs across disciplines to have a dual impact on student success.

Second, NFS participants positively described the outcome feature of an established relationship with the cohort faculty leads in acclimating to the environment. Beane-Katner (2014) and Waddell, Martin, Schwind, and Lapum Ga (2016) provide support for the importance of established collegiality with veteran faculty in learning to navigate the environment. The new faculty members described their faculty leads as experienced and trusted mentors who would provide guidance in maneuvering the college processes free of judgment. Focus group participants referred to their faculty leads as being "great," a "go-to person," a "sounding board," a "buffer," and "great role models" beyond the time of their participation in the NFS. During one focus group session, participants described how their faculty leads continued to always make time for them. Participant A-6 discussed: "We knew that if we had a problem, they were there. We could run back to them and they would support us and help us whenever we needed." However, there was a case discrepancy for one NFS cohort year. Participant B-3 declared: "We actually felt that the instruction and leadership of the person facilitating was very poor. And that bonded us together even more." Even when new faculty are not mentored by a faculty lead, they will begin to depend on each other in acclimating to the environment.

In summary, theme 3 reflects how new faculty members describe the NFS outcome features of the program in acclimating to the environment and the development of their instructional delivery. Relationships established between cohort peers extends beyond their year of NFS participation. As a result of their participation in NFS, an outcome is an established cross-discipline peer group to support the community college environment for student-centered teaching and the development of those strategies. Furthermore, the NFS cohorts develop an implicit expectancy of continued achievement in teaching and learning by having an active role in the environment and developing instructional initiatives for student success. However, the NFS outcomes of cohort relationships positively influence acclimating to the environment and developing instructional delivery beyond NFS participation is not a defined goal of the NFS program. Also, the outcome feature of the reliability of the cohort faculty lead beyond the NFS program year is not evident in the logic model input feature of the program evaluation. To maximize the NFS program outcomes, the process features should include best practices for supporting ongoing collaborative efforts for engagement in the environment and ongoing participation in instructional delivery professional development. Also, the NFS input feature should include identifying a job description and expectations for the faculty lead(s) to ensure positive outcomes for continuous acclimating to the environment.

Theme 4: New faculty members establish a tenured professional expectation for peer engagement and institutional support for collaborative efforts based on their NFS participation. My data analysis reflected that focus group participants

negatively described institution circumstances in supporting the teaching and learning environment indoctrinated during their NFS participation. Analysis of the focus group transcripts reflects that the impact feature of a tenured professional expectation for peer engagement and institutional support for collaborative efforts based on their NFS participation.as being negatively influenced by two barriers: (a) increasing workload allocations and, (b) limited opportunities for organic collaboration for instructional development.

First, the tenured NFS participants negatively described how time constraints in the institution were impacting their NFS established expectation in being dedicated to the community college mission of a teaching and learning environment. However, community colleges across the nation are facing financial challenges (Bers & Head, 2014; Price, Schneider, & Quick, 2015). As a result, college-wide budget cuts have resulted in the necessity for full-time faculty members to assume some administrative functions in addition to their existing roles; this was particularly noted by faculty members who teach career programs or serve as department chairs. Additionally, participants in the focus groups expressed concerns that the “silos” were negatively influencing the opportunities to approach institution circumstances collectively. While describing the feeling of being overworked and overwhelmed, faculty members still expressed the need to connect with their peers to feel engaged in the environment and developing instructional delivery strategies.

Second, the impact feature of the members’ participation in the NFS is that the institution will remain constant in providing the planned opportunities for collaboration

on instructional development strategies as a priority. McAllister et al. (2014), and McKay and Monk (2017), and Thomson (2015) provided the support that faculty desire more time to discuss and collaborate on instructional delivery but are now reduced to corridor conversations that minimize the results from the interaction. Research indicates that effective teaching in higher education includes that faculty are invested in their own learning, that institutional factors can either encourage or discourage (Chauvin, Anderson, Mylona, Greenburg, & Yang, 2013; Lewis & Ewing, 2016; Willett, Iverson, Rutz, & Manduca, 2014). In summary, theme 4 represents how new faculty members describe the NFS impact features of the program in acclimating to the environment and the development of their instructional delivery. As a result of participating in the NFS, new faculty members establish a tenured professional expectation for peer engagement and institutional support for collaborative efforts. However, the impact of fiscal uncertainty on faculty members is to assume additional administrative tasks in assessment and learning outcomes (Beane-Katner, 2013; Meizlish et al., 2017). As a result, faculty have experienced constraints in allocating time to the priority of working collaboratively on environment circumstances or instructional development. As faculty dedicated to the community college mission, new faculty members want intentional institutional support continued for engagement in the environment and development of instructional strategies. Results from theme 4 indicate that the impact of the NFS program is tenured faculty invested in a teaching and learning environment. To promote job satisfaction, the institution should be intentional in supporting a collaborative environment regardless of negative economic factors.

Purpose of the NFS Program

The specific purpose of the NFS is to assist new full-time, tenure-track faculty members with the task of learning about the community college environment and encouraging the development of their instructional delivery. The NFS is a weekly, three-hour mandatory meeting coordinated by two veteran faculty members as assigned by the Vice President of Educational Affairs. The program takes place on the main campus in a designated classroom, once a week for three hours. Weekly activities include discussions on concerns, guest presentations from academic and student services, peer observations, and visiting the Grayslake and Southlake campuses. Human Resources onboarding policies for new tenure track faculty hires indicate mandatory participation in the NFS regardless of prior professional experience at the institution, within higher education, or established teaching experience for any educational institution. The NFS continues to be implemented each year, except for the 2016-2017 academic year when there were no new faculty hired. The number of new faculty hires is anticipated to increase in the upcoming years based on the college initiatives in the development of new educational programs to meet the employment needs of the community.

Purpose of the NFS Evaluation

The problem that prompted this project study is that for the last 20 years, the NFS has been implemented yearly without a formal evaluation of whether it is meeting the defined program goals. The absence of a program evaluation has resulted in a lack of data about the inputs, processes, outcomes, and impact for the NFS related to the faculty's understanding of the community college environment and the development of their

instructional delivery. The purpose of this qualitative program evaluation was to explore how faculty described the NFS inputs and processes they experienced during participation in the NFS, and how they perceived the outcomes and impact of the NFS on their understanding of the community college environment and the development of their instructional delivery. This program evaluation provides recommendations relevant to teaching and learning strategies to be implemented for new faculty member program development as well as insights for evolving professional development programs at the institution of study.

Program Evaluation Outcomes

The results of this program evaluation are significant to the key stakeholders at the institution of study for three reasons. First, it provides the first evaluative evidence on the effectiveness of the NFS program. While the initial program goals are being met, additional professional development programs have been identified to enhance the long-term impact of the NFS and faculty member job satisfaction. Second, it provides indications of the gaps in practice in how professional development activities for new full-time, tenure-track faculty members are being implemented. To develop effective instructional skills in an adult learning environment, best practices that reflect adult learning teaching strategies need to be evident in the program delivery. This program evaluation provides a model for a new faculty training program based on adult learning theory. Third, the results of this program evaluation provide administrators at the institution of study with evidence for developing future faculty training programs to enhance its commitment to a teaching and learning environment.

Overview of Recommendations

Community colleges are established to provide open access to a multicultural student demographic and focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning. Key stakeholders in higher education are faced with a significant challenge in hiring, developing, and maintaining tenured faculty dedicated to the mission of the community college. To retain teachers in the community college environment, administrators must effectively nurture new faculty members as they transition into their new role. The purpose of this Executive Summary is to provide college leadership with evaluative data regarding decision making for resource allocation and program implementation for the NFS. The following recommendations are drawn from the scholarly literature for implementing faculty development programs that promote the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Recommendation 1: Establish a consistent plan for program evaluation

Program evaluation is intended to be continuous and ongoing to provide useful feedback for program constituents and stakeholders (McDavid, Huse, & Hawthorn, 2012; Mertens & Wilson, 2018; Spaulding, 2016; Stufflebeam & Coryn, 2014). The problem that prompted this project study is that for the last 20 years, the NFS has been implemented yearly without a formal evaluation of whether it is meeting the defined program goals. If the faculty resources provided for the NFS will not have the responsibility to conduct a yearly program evaluation, it is recommended that either an internal or external program evaluator be attained to build an extended evaluative framework for mapping the effects of professional development initiatives defined by

Merchie, Tuytens, Devos, and Vanderlinde (2018). An ongoing program evaluation process will support data-driven decision making by key stakeholders for improving the onboarding process for new faculty members in acclimating them to the environment and improving their delivery strategies. The evaluative data will also provide insights on how well the NFS is meeting the professional development needs of new faculty members.

Recommendation 2: Implement a needs assessment of new faculty member hires

For professional development to have the greatest impact, it needs to be structured around the needs of the faculty (Dillard & Yu, 2018; MacPhail et al., 2019). To best address the professional development needs for NFS new tenure-track faculty hires, the recommendation is cohort participants to be given a needs assessment to identify what they want to learn, how they want to learn, and why they want to learn (Louws, Meirink, van Veen, & van Driel, 2017; Scarparolo & Hammond, 2018). Adults want to have a role in the learning process and be respected for the knowledge they bring to the learning environment (Owusu-Agyeman & Fourie-Malherbe, 2019; Zielinski, 2017). A needs assessment for each NFS cohort will define the appropriate input resources for learning about the community college and developing instructional delivery. Implementing the input resources based on their professional development needs as individuals and as a cohort co-constructing meaning, allows the NFS participants to take ownership of the learning opportunity (Housel, 2020; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2015; Louws et al., 2017). The social constructivist orientation, derived from Vygotsky's (1978) culturally bound research, advocates that meaning is socially co-constructed through interaction, using symbols and language, with others in the environment. Researching within the

social constructivists' worldview for this project study provided a theoretical paradigm for understanding new faculty members as individuals who have a new role in the academic environment and who are introduced to new symbols and language by skilled members of the tenured faculty members.

Recommendation 3: Establish a clear description for faculty leads

NFS program faculty leads play a vital role in facilitating the transition of the new tenure-track faculty members to their role within the institution. The faculty lead is responsible for contextualizing the professional development and creating co-constructed meaning for the participants regarding their beliefs and practices in instructional delivery. Also, if the NFS processes in the logic model are adapted to adult learning strategies, the role of the faculty lead will include teaching observations, supporting reflective practices, and providing constructive feedback on participant professional development (Botham, 2018a, 2018b; Merchie et al., 2018; Scarparolo & Hammond, 2018)

In assessing the faculty lead as an input feature of the logic model framework, research suggests that choosing the cohort facilitator(s) should be carefully considered "with regards to their level of expertise and understanding of effective coaching practices in educational contexts" (Scarparolo & Hammond, 2018, p. 504) as the role relates to the effectiveness of the program (van den Bergh, Ros, & Beijaard, 2015). In providing constructive feedback the faculty lead is supporting the new faculty member in learning from practice for improvement in performance. As a learner-centered strategy, the coach models reflective practice, involves the learner in outcomes, and is specific to their

professional development; all of which are grounded in sound adult learning theory principles.

Recommendation 4: Implement the NFS activities using adult learning strategies

Effective professional development for educators includes practical demonstrations, modeled by experts, or coaches (i.e. faculty lead) as well as having opportunities to practice and receive constructive feedback from peers (Barton, Williams, Halle, & McGrew, 2018; Scarparolo & Hammond, 2018; Valle & Fuchs, 2015). Knowles (1984), advances the difference between pedagogy and andragogy as educational practice. Pedagogy is a model of teacher-directed learning, in that the teacher has the responsibility of defining and assessing learning outcomes for the student. In contrast, Knowles posits that andragogy is a more appropriate model for adult education. Andragogy considers how adults differ from children in their learning due to the degree of their lived experiences and that the adult learner's self-concept is advanced beyond a dependent personality to that of a self-directed human being. Adult learners want to be actively involved in their learning experience to gain the positive expectation that what they are learning will be valuable to their work (Knowles et al., 2015).

O'Shea Lane (2018) presents the premise that learner-centered new faculty professional development will prompt the paradigm shift away from passive learning practices in higher education, "since this would expose them to a learner-centered model of instruction early in their career (p. 4). The recommendation is for the NFS processes to be realigned with adult theory practices that engage the member participants and promote the immediate application in their work. As an adult learner, new faculty members

benefit from participating in professional development that models sound adult learning practices but also from observing veteran faculty demonstrating learner-centered strategies in the classroom.

Recommendation 5: Establish informal professional development programs for new faculty that include veteran faculty

After completion of the NFS one-semester program, new faculty members' professional development becomes informal in that learning is formed through daily experiences (Gerken, Beausaert, & Segers, 2016). A standard program for building on the formed relationships in the NFS is not currently established as the next phase for professional development. Without a planned action, an opportunity is missed for continued collaborative professional development for new faculty or the recognition of their growth in teaching and learning (Gerken et al., 2016; Scott, Lemus, Knotts, & Oh, 2016). Research conducted by MacPhail et al. (2019) produced results indicating that access to professional colleagues was a preferred means of improving teaching pedagogy and skills. Also, the veteran faculty who participated in providing support to new faculty, found the practice "rewarding and enriching, leading to further professional development" (MacPhail et al., 2019, p. 859). Connecting with veteran faculty has also proven to support new faculty in learning to navigate the environment (Beane-Katner, 2014; Waddell et al., 2016). Also, learning communities have been established as effective professional development for faculty in supporting the importance of shared-meaning, critical reflection, and improving instructional practices (Banasik & Dean, 2016; Beauchamp, 2015; Dillard & Yu, 2018; Gast, Schildkamp, & van der Veen, 2017;

Goh, 2019; Schreurs, Huveneers, & Dolmans, 2016). The recommendation to expand NFS learning outcomes for participants is to establish learning communities and incorporate a mentoring model, which also supports the inclusion needs of new faculty. Inclusivity can build trusted relationships, where members can recognize and be recognized for the impact their professional development has on the success of the institution.

Recommendation 6: Establish an internal recognition plan for ongoing faculty professional development

Institutional support prioritizing informal learning, in addition to formal learning, is essential in faculty motivation and job satisfaction (Gerken et al., 2016; Jaramillo-Baquerizo, Valcke, & Vanderlinde, 2019; Stankovska, Angelkoska, Osmani, & Grncarovska, 2017). Professional development is most effective when connected to the institution's mission and goals (Condon, Iverson, Manduca, Rutz, & Willett, 2016; Stankovska et al., 2017; Wynants & Dennis, 2018). As faculty dedicated to the community college mission, NFS new faculty members want continued engagement in the environment and instructional development, beyond one semester, into their tenure. Furthermore, faculty recognition for their efforts in professional development is a motivation for continued focus on improving teaching and learning skills (Botham, 2018a, 2018b; Gast et al., 2017). Research results support that faculty are primarily motivated by intrinsic factors, such as social relationship building, teaching activities and responsibilities (Doran, 2019; Morest, 2015; Stankovska et al., 2017). Time to participate in professional development though is the strongest barrier (Bjelland, Miller, & Sprecher,

2014; Botham, 2018a, 2018b; Dillard & Yu, 2018; Wynants & Dennis, 2018). Institutional support, such as providing release time, immediate informal recognition, and awarding credentials for involvement is effective (Banasik & Dean, 2016; Benito & Scott-Milligan, 2018; Peat, 2015). Faculty involvement and recognition for quality teaching can further be supported by measuring the impact the professional development has on student success.

Recommendation 7: Implement institutional strategies that promote the correlation between quality instruction and student success

Student success data metrics are one variable that higher education institutions use as a reporting factor in demonstrating viability to key stakeholders, internal and external to the institution. Research indicates a positive correlation between quality instruction and student success (Bedford & Rossow, 2017; Condon et al., 2016; Kane, Shaw, Pang, Salley, & Snider, 2016; Thurlings & den Brok, 2017). Initiatives to build the correlation between quality instruction and student success would include stronger collaboration between administration and faculty in prioritizing and measuring how the organization is meeting the mission of the community college. A recommendation in establishing an NFS evaluation plan would be to identify research strategies to capture the correlation between faculty participation and student success (Condon et al., 2016; Dillard & Yu, 2018; Elliott & Oliver, 2016). Initiatives to build the correlation between quality instruction and student success would also promote stronger collaboration between administration and faculty in prioritizing and measuring how the organization is meeting the mission of the community college.

Applying Fredericks, Deegan, and Carman's (2008) logic model framework provides a conceptual illustration and systematic thinking between the NFS core components for inputs, processes, outcomes, and impacts to address the guiding research questions. Inputs are the resources that go into a program to accomplish its activities such as allocated human resources, financial apportionments, facility accommodations, and program supplies. Process is the use of activities conducted to achieve program outcomes such as events, technology, instruction, and actions that work together to implement the program. Also, the process is influenced by attitudes and relationships, either established or that evolve, of the people involved in the program activities. Outcomes are the effects that occur as a result of the program which can include the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of individuals who participate in the program. Importantly, outcomes are influenced by the quality and quantity of the program inputs and processes. Impacts are the changes influenced by the program on a long-term, broad-scale for the organization, internally or externally. Also, a program's impacts can have intended or unintended effects on the broader community in which the organization exists, as well as on the greater social environment.

Inputs. Inputs are the resources that go into a program to accomplish its activities. These can include allocated human resources, financial apportionments, facility accommodations, and program supplies. In addition to tangible resources, inputs are contextual resources that influence program activities, such as attitudes, policies, time, and organizational culture. The following correlating recommendations are changes to the inputs of the NSF program:

1. Establish a consistent plan for program evaluation.
2. Implement a needs assessment of new faculty member hires.
3. Establish a clear description of faculty leads.

Process. Process is the use of activities conducted to achieve program outcomes. These activities can include events, technology, instruction, and actions that work together to implement the program. Also, the process is influenced by attitudes and relationships, either established or that evolve, of the people involved in the program activities. The following correlating recommendations are changes to the process of the NSF program:

4. Implement NFS activities using adult learning strategies.

Outcomes. Outcomes are the effects that occur as a result of the program. These can include the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of individuals who participate in the program or who immediately receive services as a result of the program implementation. Outcomes are influenced by the quality and quantity of the program inputs and process. The following correlating recommendation is an outcome need of the NSF program:

5. Establish informal professional development programs for new faculty that include veteran faculty.

Impacts. Impacts are the changes influenced by the program on a long-term, broad-scale for the organization. These can include the differences made in products or by the use of services internal or external to the organization. Also, a program's impacts can have intended or unintended effects on the larger community in which the

organization exists, as well as on the greater social environment. The following correlating recommendations are projects to enhance the impact of the NFS program:

6. Establish an internal recognition plan for ongoing faculty professional development.
7. Implement institutional strategies that promote the correlation between quality instruction and student success.

In summary, the recommendations that resulted from the NFS program evaluation provide the opportunity for enhancements through an ongoing, cyclical process that will continue to evolve the program and inform best practices for other professional development implementation. The recommendations ground in scholarly research foster new faculty inclusion and teaching strategies, continuing professional development for veteran faculty, and the institution initiatives that promote student success.

Summary

This executive summary provided an overview of the evaluation program, a summary of the findings, the purpose of the NFS program, the purpose of the NFS evaluation, and an overview of the program evaluation recommendations. Recently, the advancing agenda to provide a community college education tuition-free to all solidifies the critical role of the community college in the American higher education system in providing the potential for community members to increase their earnings and set a path for change in their lives (Finley & Kinslow, 2016). To meet such an agenda, the community college faculty of today will be expected to understand and adapt to the teaching and learning needs of a diverse student body with varied future goals.

The professionalism of teachers is key to organizational growth (Jaramillo-Baquerizo et al., 2019). Implementing faculty professional development with learner-centered strategies to be transferred to the classroom has been shown to have a positive impact on minority and first-generation student learning (Czajka & McConnell, 2019; Freeman, et al., 2014). While research indicates that effectively implemented professional development improves the quality of education (Jaramillo-Baquerizo et al., 2019; Merchie et al., 2018), there is also evidence that it supports faculty retention (Kane et al., 2016; O'Shea Lane, 2018; Scott et al., 2016).

Community colleges will soon be experiencing another wave of retiring faculty (Magloire, 2019) which makes it imperative to implement effective professional development for new faculty members to establish the paradigm shift of learner-centered teaching in the community college and ultimately higher education at large. The results of the NFS program evaluation identifies gaps in practice in meeting the professional development needs of the new faculty members. The recommendations provided in this Executive Summary of the NFS program evaluation provides a model for a new faculty professional development based on adult learning theory. Implementation of the recommendations will enhance the institution's social justice mission and positively impact the economic opportunities for its community constituents.

References

Banasik, M. J., & Dean, J. L. (2016). Non-tenure track faculty and learning communities: Bridging the divide to enhance teaching quality. *Innovations in Higher Education, 41*(4), 333–342. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-015-9351-6

Barton, C. E., Williams, C. L., Halle, J. S., & McGrew, L. (2018). Graduate and undergraduate faculty collaboration utilizing peer observation to enhance educational opportunities for students and faculty: A case example. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 3*. https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v18i3.22705

Beane-Katner, L. (2013). Developing the next generation of faculty: Taking a learning community approach. *Journal on Centers for Teaching & Learning, 2013*(5), 91–106. Retrieved from https://openjournal.lib.miamioh.edu/

Beane-Katner, L. (2014). Anchoring a mentorship network in a new faculty development program. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 22*(2), 91–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2014.902558

Beauchamp, C. (2015). Reflection in teacher education: Issues emerging from a review of current literature. *Reflective Practice*, *16*(1), 123–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2014.982525

Bedford, L. (2019). Using social media as a platform for a virtual professional learning community. *Online Learning, 23*(3), 120–136. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v23i3.1538

Bedford, L., & Rossow, K. (2017). Facilitating professional learning communities among higher education faculty: The Walden Junto model. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 20*(2). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer202/bedford_rossow202.html

Behar-Horenstein, L. S., Garvan, C. W., Catalanotto, F. A., Su, Y., & Feng, X. (2016). Assessing faculty development needs among Florida's allied dental faculty. *Journal of Dental Hygiene*, *90*(1), 52–59. Retrieved from https://jdh.adha.org/

Benito, A., & Scott-Milligan, F. (2018). Hearing the voice of faculty: Global recommendations for faculty recognition in higher education institutions. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, *8*(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v8i2.433

Bers, T. H., & Head, R. B. (2014). Assessing financial health in community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2014*(168), 103–114. https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc.20124

Bjelland, B., Miller, G., & Sprecher, M. (2014). Professional development needs of instructors of online swine science courses. *NACTA Journal, 58*(2), 109–114. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/nactajournal.58.2.109

Botham, K. A. (2018a). The perceived impact on academics' teaching practice of engaging with a higher education institution's CPD scheme. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, *55*(2), 164–175. https://doi-org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1371056

Botham, K. A. (2018b). An analysis of the factors that affect engagement of higher education teachers with an institutional professional development scheme. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *55*(2), 176–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1371056

Chauvin, S. W., Anderson, W., Mylona, E., Greenburg, R., & Yang, T. (2013). New faculty orientation in North American medical schools. *Teaching and Learning Medicine*, *25*(3), 185–190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2013.797345

Condon, W., Iverson, E. R., Manduca, C. A., Rutz, C., & Willett, G. (2016). *Faculty development and student learning: Assessing the connections*. Indiana University Press.

Czajka, C. D., & McConnell, D. (2019). The adoption of student-centered teaching materials as a professional development experience for college faculty. *International Journal of Science Education, 41*(5), 693–711. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1578908

Dillard, R. J., & Yu, H. H. (2018). Best practices in student veteran education: Faculty professional development and student veteran success. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *66*(2), 122–128. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Doran, E. E. (2019). Building a community of practice for teaching developmental courses. *Journal of Developmental Education*, *43*(1), 12–19. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/journal/jdeveeduc

Dron, J., & Anderson, T. (2014). *Teaching crowds and social media*. Edmonton, Alberta: AU Press Athabasca University. Retrieved from http://klangable.com/uploads/books/99Z_Dron_Anderson-Teaching_Crowds.pdf

Elliott, R. W., & Oliver, D. E. (2016). Linking faculty development to community college student achievement: A mixed methods approach. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 40*(2), 85–99. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Finley, D. L., & Kinslow, S. L. (2016). *Faculty talk about teaching at the community college*. Oxford Handbooks Online. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935291.013.47

Fredericks, K. A., Deegan, M., & Carman, J. G. (2008). Using system dynamics as an evaluation tool: Experience from a demonstration program. *American Journal of Evaluation, 29*(3), 251–267. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1098214008319446

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *PNAS, 111*(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111

Gardner, S. S. (2014). From learning to teach to teaching effectiveness: Nurse educators describe their experiences. *Nursing Education Perspectives (National League for Nursing), 35*(2), 106–111. http://dx.doi.org/10.5480/12-821.1

Gast, I., Schildkamp, K., & van der Veen, J. T. (2017). Team-based professional development interventions in higher education: A systematic review. *Review of*

Educational Research, 87(4), 736–767. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317704306

Gerken, M., Beausaert, S., & Segers, M. (2016). Working on professional development of faculty staff in higher education: Investigating the relationship between social informal learning activities and employability. *Human Resource Development International, 19*(2), 135–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2015.1116241

Gibbs, G. (2018). *Analyzing qualitative data* (2nd ed.). London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Goh, A. Y. S. (2019). Rethinking reflective practice in professional lifelong learning using learning metaphors. *Studies in Continuing Education, 41*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2018.1474867

Holmes, K. A., & Prieto-Rodriquz, E. (2018). Student and staff perceptions of a learning management system for blended learning in teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(3). https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n3.2

Hott, B. L., & Tietjen-Smith, T. (2018). The professional development needs of tenure track faculty at a regional university. *Research in Higher Education, 35*, 1–12. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1194407.pdf

Housel, D. A. (2020). When co-occurring factors impact adult learners: Suggestions for instruction, preservice training, and professional development. *Adult Learning, 31*(1), 6–16. https://doi-org /10.1177/1045159519849910

Jaramillo-Baquerizo, C., Valcke, M., & Vanderlinde, R. (2019). Professional development initiatives for university teachers: Variables that influence the transfer of learning to the workplace. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, *56*(3), 352–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2018.1479283

Kane, R., Shaw, M., Pang, S., Salley, W., & Snider, J. B. (2016). *Faculty professional development and student satisfaction in online higher education. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 19*(2). Retrieved from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer192/kane_shaw_pang_salley_snider192.html

Knowles, M. S. (1984). *The adult learner*. United States: Gulf Publishing Company

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: the definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

Krutka, D., Carpenter, J., & Trust, T. (2017). Enriching professional learning networks: A framework for identification, reflection, and intention. *Techtrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, *61*(3), 246–252. https:/doi.org/10.1007/s11528-016-0141-5

Lancaster, J. W., Stein, S. M., MacLean, L. G., Van Amburgh, J., & Persky, A. M. (2014). Faculty development program models to advance teaching and learning within health science programs. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 78*(5), 1–7. http://dx.doi.org/10.5688/ajpe78599

Lewis, S., & Ewing, C. (2016). Assuring student learning outcomes achievement though faculty development: An online university example. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 16*(4). Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter194/lewis_ewing194.html

Louws, M. L., Meirink, J. A., van Veen, K., & van Driel, J. H. (2017). Teachers' self-directed learning and teaching experience: What, how, and why teachers want to learn. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 66*, 171–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.004

MacPhail, A. A. M. I., Ulvik, M., Guberman, A., Czerniawski, G., Oolbekkink-Marchand, H., & Bain, Y. (2019). The professional development of higher education-based teacher educators: needs and realities. *Professional Development in Education*, *45*(5), 848–861. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2018.1529610

Magloire, J. (2019). Who wants to teach a diverse student body? Community college missions and the faculty search committee. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *43*(3), 165–172. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

McAllister, M., Oprescu, F., & Jones, C. (2014). N2E: Envisioning a process to support transition from nurse to educator. *Contemporary Nurse: A Journal for the Australian Nursing Profession, 46*(2), 242–250. https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.2014.46.2.242

McDavid, J. C., Huse, I., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (2012). *Program evaluation and performance measurement: An introduction to practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McKay, L., & Monk, S. (2017). Early career academic learning in the game of Whackadmia. *Higher Education Research & Development, 36*(6), 1251–1263. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1303460

McKee, C. W., Johnson, M., Ritchie, W. F., & Tew, W. M. (2013). Professional development of the faculty: Past and present. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, *2013*(133), 15–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20042

Meizlish, D. S., Wright, M. C., Howard, J., & Kaplan, M. L. (2017). Measuring the impact of a new faculty program using institutional data. *International Journal for Academic Development, 23*(2), 72–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2017.1364644

Merchie, E., Tuytens, M., Devos, G., & Vanderlinde, R. (2018). Evaluating teachers' professional development initiatives: Towards an extended evaluative framework. *Research Papers in Education, 33*(2), 143–168. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Merriam, S. B. (2015). Qualitative research: Designing, implementing and publishing a study. In V. Wang (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Scholarly Publishing and Research Methods* (pp. 125–140). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-7409-7.ch007

Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2018). *Program evaluation theory and practice: A comprehensive guide* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Morest, V. S. (2015). Faculty scholarship at community colleges: Culture, institutional structures, and socialization. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2015*(171), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20152

O'Shea Lane, J. (2018). Lived experiences of new faculty: Nine stages of development toward learner-centered practice. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 3. https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v18i3.23373

Owusu-Agyeman, Y., & Fourie-Malherbe, M. (2019). Negotiating co-ownership of learning in higher education: an underexplored practice for adult learning. *Studies in Continuing Education, 41*(1), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2018.1497591

Peat, J. (2015). Getting down to the nitty-gritty: The trials and tribulations of an institutional professional recognition scheme. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 19*(3), 92–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2015.1029999

Pesce, R. (2015). *Professional development for teaching in higher education: Faculty perceptions and attitudes* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://dlib.bc.edu/islandora/object/bcir:104134

Price, P. D., Schneider, D. K., & Quick, L. A. (2015). Financial challenges in higher education: Community college leadership style and ranking. *Community College*

Journal of Research and Practice, 40(6), 508–522. http://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1069226

Professional and Organizational Development Network Executive Committee. (2016, June). *What is educational development?* Retrieved from http://podnetwork.org/about-us/what-is-educational-development/

Richards, L. (2014). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Saldana, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Saroyan, A., & Trigwell, K. (2015). Higher education teachers' professional learning: Process and outcome. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 46,* 92–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.03.008

Scarparolo, G. E., & Hammond, L. S. (2018). The effect of a professional development model on early childhood educators' direct teaching of beginning reading. *Professional Development in Education*, *44*(4), 492–506. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Schreurs, M., Huveneers, W., & Dolmans, D. (2016). Communities of teaching practice in the workplace: Evaluation of a faculty development programme. *Medical Teacher*, *2016*(38), 808–814. http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2015.1112892

Scott, W., Lemus, D., Knotts, G., & Oh, J. (2016). Why learner-centered new faculty orientations matter: Organizational culture and faculty retention. *The Journal of*

Faculty Development, *30*(1), 15–22. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1133613

Spaulding, D. T. (2016). *Program evaluation in practice: Core concepts and examples for discussion and analysis* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stankovska, G., Angelkoska, S., Osmani, F., & Grncarovska, S. P. (2017). *Job motivation and job satisfaction among academic staff in higher education*. Bulgarian Comparative Education Society.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Coryn, C. L. S. (2014). *Evaluation theory, models, & applications* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sullivan, R., Neu, V., & Yang, F. (2018). Faculty development to promote effective instructional technology integration: A qualitative examination of reflections in an online community. *Online Learning*, *22*(4). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v22i4.1373

Thomson, K. (2015). Informal conversations about teaching and their relationship to a formal development program: Learning opportunities for novice and mid-career academics. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *20*(2), 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2015

Thurlings, M., & den Brok, P. (2017). Learning outcomes of teacher professional development activities: a meta-study. *Educational Review*, *69*(5), 554–576. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2017.1281226

Valle, M., & Fuchs, T. (2015). Teaching and learning communities: empowering adjuncts and ensuring quality. *J Educ Hum Dev*, *4*(1), 1–6. http://dx.doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v4n1a1

van den Bergh, L., Ros, A., & Beijaard, D. (2015). Teacher learning in the context of a continuing professional development programme: A case study. *Teaching and teacher education*, *47*, 142–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.01.002

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

Waddell, J., Martin, J., Schwind, J. K., & Lapum, J. L. (2016). A faculty-based mentorship circle: Positioning new faculty for success. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *46*(4), 60–75. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1128609.pdf

Willett, G., Iverson, E. R., Rutz, C., & Manduca, C. A. (2014). Measures matter: Evidence of faculty development effects on faculty and student learning. *Assessing Writing*, *20*, 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.12.001

Wynants, S., & Dennis, J. (2018). Professional development in an online context: Opportunities and challenges from the voices of college faculty. *Journal of Educators Online*, *15*(1), 127–139. https://doi.org/10.9743/JEO2018.15.1.2

Zielinski, D. E. (2017). The use of collaboration, authentic learning, linking material to personal knowledge, and technology in the constructivist classroom: Interviews with community college faculty members. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *41*(10), 668–686. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com

Appendix B: Focus Group Protocol

Focus Group Protocol

Date: _____ Location: _____ Number of Participants: _____

Group Facilitator: _____ Group Observer: _____

Group Number: _____ Start Time: _____ End Time: _____

Opening: The NFS was created in 1999 as one prong of a three-pronged approach, on the basis of the results of a formative assessment that defined two primary professional development needs for new tenure track faculty hires: (1) learning the culture of the community college environment and (2) developing instructional delivery skills to improve student academic achievement.

Primary Question: Reflecting on these two objectives, who benefited from the NFS program?

Secondary Questions:

A. Who was involved with providing information in your NFS program? At what level of involvement (or to what degree of value was this use of human resources in regards to time and information)?
B. Who should have been participating/contributing (or not) to the NFS, and why?
C. Were NFS "inputs" duplicated or repetitive unnecessarily (for example, time, and information – verbal and written)?

D. Were the NFS objectives relevant then, compared with now, and how were the objectives relevant? (Basically, why did the NFS exist? Play "devil's advocate" to generate responses.)

Transition: Now, let's move on to the program activities of the New Faculty Seminar (NFS).

Opening: Fundamentally, the goal of the NFS was to provide professional development based on the needs of new tenure track faculty hires, which was to include but not necessarily be limited to, culture adaptation and teaching skills.

Primary question: What are your perceptions of your experience with the NFS?

Secondary questions:

A. How was the learning format/environment (that is, mandatory, every week for a whole semester, one three hour sitting in a basic classroom with no break) conducive, or not?
B. What program activities (for example, visiting other campuses, name games, guest lectures, peer observations) were used as teaching and learning strategies? (Which were the most/least effective?)
C. Did the NFS program duplicate information already known, or other training efforts of the institution? (Effectively, or not?) (Repeat question to confirm

accuracy in prior question. Resource allocation is important to this institution, so it is very important to confirm resource allocation data.)

D. How would you envision the "perfect" NFS experience for new faculty hires?

Transition: Now, let's finish up with reflection on the outcomes and impact of the New Faculty Seminar (NFS).

Opening: The original imperative that prompted the formative assessment conducted in the mid- to late 1990s was the anticipated turnover rates due to anticipated faculty retirements and the college administrators' intention to cost-effectively hire and retain quality faculty members.

Primary question: What are your perceptions of the impact that the NFS has had on your role as a faculty member?

Secondary questions:

A. What do you do differently as a result of your NFS participation? (What do you wish you could have learned to do differently as a result of your NFS participation?)
B. How were your professional development needs aligned with the goals and objectives of the NFS program? (How well did the NFS respond to those needs, or not?)

C. What do you see possible for the evolution of the NFS program to meet faculty training needs on the basis of the current institutional circumstances?

Closing: Thank you for your time and information. Once the raw data from the interview are transcribed, you will be offered the opportunity to check the transcript for accuracy.