

8-2015

Canadian Community College Faculty and Teaching and Learning Professional Development

Carol Ann Samhaber
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Community College Leadership Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Carol Ann Samhaber

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. William Shecket, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty

Dr. Tom Cavanagh, Committee Member, Education Faculty

Dr. Karen Hunt, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2015

Abstract

Canadian Community College Faculty and Teaching and Learning Professional

Development

by

Carol Ann Samhaber

MS, Walden University, 2012

BA, Carleton University, 1995

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

August 2015

Abstract

Many colleges have faced the challenge of engaging faculty in teaching and learning professional development. The purpose of this project study was to investigate why full-time school of business faculty at a small community college in Canada do not frequently complete college course design and student assessment training. Faculty members are urged to complete these trainings in order to implement their courses to successfully prepare students to graduate from college and launch professional careers. The research questions in this study focused on faculty perceptions regarding factors that have prevented their completion of this college's course design and student assessment professional development. The conceptual framework for this study was the Attention, Relevance, Confidence, and Satisfaction (ARCS) model of motivation developed by Keller. A bounded case study design using purposeful sampling was adopted and 12 faculty members from the department agreed to participate in the study. Data collection included interviews that were coded and analyzed for common themes. The key findings suggested that faculty would be interested in having input in mandated professional development so that sessions were more closely aligned with their learning needs and performance plans. The project, a white paper, included recommendations based on findings that may be used by the college to establish a faculty professional development policy that is connected to performance and refine the faculty professional development offerings to accommodate faculty learning needs. Student graduates of the college might benefit from this research as faculty, through professional development, become better able to address the knowledge and skills they require to be positioned to contribute effectively to their communities and the Canadian economy.

Canadian Community College Faculty and Teaching and Learning Professional
Development

by

Carol Ann Samhaber

MS, Walden University, 2012

BA, Carleton University, 1995

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Walden University

August 2015

Dedication

This project is dedicated to Roy for his support as I complete this journey.

Acknowledgments

Thank you Roy for your endless support and patience as I work toward this life goal. I also sincerely thank Dr. Shecket for his kindness and expert guidance. A special thank you to Rob Harvey as he continually agreed to discuss and beta test my research with me; his involvement was invaluable. Thank you as well to my Students' Community College friends and colleagues for their tremendous support, especially Amanda Hudson.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Section 1: The Problem..... | 1 |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Definition of the Problem | 1 |
| Rationale | 2 |
| Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level..... | 2 |
| Evidence of the Problem from the Professional Literature..... | 3 |
| Definitions..... | 5 |
| Significance..... | 6 |
| Guiding/Research Question | 7 |
| Review of the Literature | 8 |
| Conceptual Framework..... | 9 |
| Historical Perspective | 9 |
| Why Faculty Professional Development Matters | 10 |
| Potential Human Resources Policy Outcomes..... | 12 |
| Possible Faculty Development Strategies and Solutions to this Problem..... | 14 |
| Implications..... | 20 |
| Summary..... | 20 |
| Section 2: The Methodology..... | 22 |
| Introduction..... | 22 |
| Selection of Participants | 22 |
| Data Collection Methods: Interviews | 24 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Data Analysis Methods | 25 |
| Research Findings | 27 |
| Conclusion | 32 |
| Section 3: The Project | 34 |
| Introduction | 34 |
| Description and Goals | 34 |
| Rationale | 34 |
| Review of the Literature | 34 |
| Conceptual Framework | 35 |
| Historical Perspective | 35 |
| Why Faculty Professional Development Matters | 36 |
| Potential Human Resources Policy Outcomes | 37 |
| Possible Faculty Development Strategies and Solutions to this Problem | 40 |
| Implementation | 44 |
| Potential Resources and Existing Supports | 45 |
| Potential Barriers | 45 |
| Proposal for Implementation and Timetable | 45 |
| Roles and Responsibilities of Students and Others | 47 |
| Project Evaluation | 47 |
| Implications Including Social Change | 48 |
| Local Community | 48 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Far-Reaching..... | 49 |
| Conclusion | 50 |
| Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions..... | 51 |
| Introduction..... | 51 |
| Project Strengths | 51 |
| Recommendations for Remediation of Limitations..... | 51 |
| Scholarship..... | 52 |
| Project Development and Evaluation..... | 52 |
| Leadership and Change..... | 52 |
| Analysis of Self as Scholar | 53 |
| Analysis of Self as Practitioner..... | 53 |
| Analysis of Self as Project Developer | 53 |
| The Project’s Potential Impact on Social Change..... | 54 |
| Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research..... | 55 |
| Conclusion | 55 |
| References..... | 56 |
| Appendix A..... | 72 |
| White Paper: Human Resources Policy and Faculty Professional Development | 72 |
| Background of Existing Problem..... | 72 |
| Summary of Findings from the Literature and Research Project | 73 |
| Historical Perspective | 73 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Institutional Gains from Faculty Professional Development..... | 75 |
| Faculty Member Gains from Professional Development..... | 76 |
| Recommended Human Resources Faculty Development Policy..... | 78 |
| Welcome To Teaching Certificate | 81 |
| Intermediate Teaching and Learning Certificate | 82 |
| Professional Development and Performance Management Plan | 83 |
| Recommended Faculty Development Strategies | 84 |
| Corporate Development Practices..... | 85 |
| Just-in-Time Training | 85 |
| Online Learning | 86 |
| One Day Workshops | 87 |
| Faculty Learning Communities..... | 87 |
| Learning Strategists | 88 |
| Potential Resources and Existing Supports..... | 88 |
| Potential Barriers | 89 |
| Proposed Implementation and Timetable | 89 |
| Roles and Responsibilities of Students and Others..... | 91 |
| Conclusion | 92 |
| Appendix B | 93 |
| Consent Form | 93 |
| Appendix C | 95 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Certificate of Completion | 95 |
| Appendix D..... | 96 |
| Interview Questions | 96 |

Section 1: The Problem

Introduction

It is essential to understand why fulltime School of Business community college faculty at Students' Community College, a pseudonym, frequently do not complete professional development in course design and student assessment. These findings may be used to establish a respective faculty professional development policy and refine the faculty professional development offerings at the college.

Definition of the Problem

The setting for this study was one department in Students' Community College. The department was Management and Marketing Studies within the School of Business. This department offers diplomas, applied degrees, and graduate certificates. The students in this department are a diverse population largely studying fulltime (Students' Community College, 2014). Numerous researchers have found that faculty have course design and student assessment training needs (Hahn & Lester, 2012; Wallin & Smith, 2005). Students' Community College fulltime business faculty are not frequently completing course design and student assessment professional development workshops and courses.

The research participants were fulltime business faculty. These faculty are subject matter experts in the areas of International Studies, Management, Materials and Operations, Marketing, Sports Management, and Supply Chain. These faculty most often completed subject matter training off campus, by way of conferences, seminars, and workshops (Administrator II, personal communication, July 18, 2014).

A gap in practice was evident from three expert sources. The organizational learning manager confirmed that the college offered teaching and learning professional development in-house. Notably, these business faculty completed a total of 146 professional development offerings of a possible 2,116 offerings (Administrator I, personal communication May 2, 2014). The School of Business dean (Administrator II, personal communication March 17, 2014) stated that “very few faculty” were completing this teaching and learning preparation. The vice president human resources confirmed the college is interested in faculty completing this preparation and ideally building a faculty development policy to support this learning (Administrator III, personal communication May 26, 2014).

This local problem needed to be addressed with potential establishment of a policy that will encourage fulltime business faculty to complete this teaching and learning preparation and revision of the existing faculty professional development offerings. Enhancing course design and student assessment preparation is expected to support student learning, retention, and graduation.

Rationale

Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level

Evidence that this local problem exists was documented by administrator I, the organizational learning manager (personal communication May 2, 2014). Administrator I confirmed that the College offered 2,116 distinct teaching and learning professional development in-house workshops, seminars, and courses. Most often these workshops, seminars, and courses were one to three hours each. Of the 2,116 offerings, business

faculty completed only 146 of these. Additionally, the School of Business dean (personal communication March 17, 2014) stated, “despite increasing funds available for faculty professional development, few faculty were completing this teaching and learning preparation.” The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of why fulltime School of Business marketing and management community college faculty at Students’ Community College frequently do not complete professional development in course design and student assessment.

Evidence of the Problem from the Professional Literature

While faculty possess the subject matter expertise in their teaching area, they often do not have the teaching and learning expertise to bring into their professional practice. Durso (2011) explained how a professor’s teaching and professional development experiences were enhanced. This professor had no previous teaching expertise, credentials, or professional development. Through self-directed development, she began reading and practicing best teaching practices. Her work suggests that many faculty lack teaching credentials, and yet if they are self-directed, they can advance their teaching knowledge and skills.

Further researchers documented faculty professional development needs of college faculty. Hahn and Lester (2012) outlined professional development needs in the areas of orientation, mentoring, and instructional development. Their participants reported needing teaching and learning professional development and sabbatical opportunities.

An additional study surveyed community college faculty to understand their perceptions of the importance of specific professional development needs and their competencies in these areas (Wallin & Smith, 2005). The survey confirmed that the faculty needed professional development in the areas of technology, student support, instruction, curriculum design, and discipline knowledge.

Adams (2009) confirmed the need for faculty professional development. This research was designed to understand faculty perspectives towards teaching. These faculty reported they required immediate and practical tools that could be adopted for teaching. They also valued a peer support group to plan for teaching and to address teaching issues. These faculty also reported the need for institutional support, compensation, and release time to build up their teaching expertise.

Smith and Valentine (2012) studied the most commonly adopted instructional practices of community college faculty to achieve improved student learning. They concluded that faculty who did not complete instructional professional development primarily taught with lectures, group discussions, texts, and multimedia rather than student-centered strategies. Student-centered teaching strategies include faculty facilitating student learning (Sadler, 2012). Further, student learning is socially constructed or learned with others. Ultimately, student-centered learning fosters students' own understanding of the course learning goals (Sadler, 2012). The importance of these studies is the confirmation that faculty are often subject matter experts yet may not possess advanced teaching and learning knowledge and skills.

Definitions

Professional development: commonly refers to learning and remaining current with the body of knowledge and skills within the span of a career (Phu, Vien, Lan, & Cepero, 2014). Faculty professional development may pertain to in-house workshops, seminars, conferences, or formal courses offered at a postsecondary institution.

Self-directed learning: may be defined as an individual being motivated to identify their own learning needs and pursuing the acquisition of knowledge and skills without direction from others (Kvedaraitė, Jasnauskaitė, Geležinienė, & Strazdienė, 2013).

Student-centered learning: refers to faculty who understand the attributes of the student. Students are understood in terms of the academic and personal backgrounds and their learning needs (Mckenna, 2013).

Student-centered teaching: focuses on faculty and student interaction that is collaborative, and applied learning (Maloy & LaRoche, 2010). Further, student assessment within student-centered teaching is performance based or students demonstrating their knowledge and skills (Maloy & LaRoche, 2010). Student-centered learning may support the development of student critical thinking and decision-making skills (Maloy & LaRoche, 2010).

Teaching practices: denotes the development of teaching skills (Hussain, Javed, Lin Siew, & Mohammed, 2013). Teaching practices are applied learning opportunities to develop teaching knowledge and skills. Skilled teaching experts often observe and give

feedback to the instructors as a means to advance their teaching skills (Hussain et al., 2013).

Significance

In this research I aimed to address this local problem to possibly write a faculty professional development policy and revise the existing faculty professional development offerings. The change in offerings and policy would ideally move fulltime business faculty to complete this teaching and learning preparation. This research is significant because faculty professional development is essential in 21st century education (Meacham & Ludwig, 2001). Furthermore, faculty teaching and learning professional development may support student learning. For students to successfully achieve their learning goals, instructors must not only possess subject matter expertise but also understand how students learn (Balan et al., 2011).

In particular, Rutz, Condon, Iverson, Manduca, and Willett (2012) studied student learning outcomes at Carleton College and confirmed that students who were taught by faculty who had completed teaching and learning professional development in the areas of course design and student assessment achieved higher academic performance. These students achieved great knowledge of the course content, improved their writing skills, and advanced their critical thinking skills. Additionally, Loes, Saichaie, Padgett, and Pascarella (2012) confirmed that clarity of the course and challenge of assessments designed by faculty who had completed teaching and learning professional development supported college students' lifelong learning motivation and intellectual development.

Similarly, faculty at Arizona State University who completed course design and student assessment workshops related to incorporating social media into their courses confirmed a number of positive outcomes (Archambault, Wetzel, Foulger, & Williams, 2010). Upon completion of this training, these faculty members reported teaching in a more student-centered strategy, with increased student academic achievement, and more frequent student assessments. Furthermore, these faculty members stated they practiced more formative student assessments, communicated with students more frequently, and more effectively supported student learning.

Guiding/Research Question

Students' Community College marketing and management faculty currently complete limited teaching and learning professional development. The guiding question that helped to determine the project direction was: How do faculty describe the issues concerning course design and student assessment professional development? Past research on the topic documented that while these development opportunities exist, they are seldom completed as an elective opportunity. Locally, there are considerable resources and opportunities for teaching and learning professional development, yet few faculty complete this training in the School of Business marketing and management department at Students' Community College. This qualitative study was designed in attempt case to fully understand and address this local problem.

Some questions explored were:

- What elements of professional development for course design and assessing students do faculty perceive as relevant for their own practice?

- What motivates faculty to complete course design and student assessment professional development?
- What would make course design and student assessment professional development satisfying for faculty?
- What student engagement and learning benefits do faculty perceive in practice from completing course design and student assessment professional development?
- What role does the College administration such as the department chair play in faculty completing course design and student assessment professional development?
- What benefits for practice do faculty believe they could gain from course design and student assessment professional development?

These broad, open-ended research questions were posed in order to focus the study and at the same time remain open to what emerged from the data (Bogden & Biklen, 2007). As the data were collected and analyzed the research questions did not need to be refined and modified and additional questions were not necessary to frame the data (Stake, 1995).

Review of the Literature

This review of literature included searches within ERIC, Sage, and Education Complete. Peer reviewed and year of publication of 2009-2014 were search limitors. Search key words included *teachers, instructors, professors, college, community college,*

training, in-service training, professional development, policy, social change, and social justice.

Conceptual Framework

The theoretical base of this problem was the attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction (ARCS) model of motivation proposed by Keller (Colakoglu & Akdemir 2010). Attention refers to capturing learners' attention to sustain their engagement in the learning; relevance refers to the course learning goals having meaning and importance to the learners; confidence refers to the learners' belief in their success in learning; and satisfaction refers to the learners' positive feelings towards their learning.

The foundation of the ARCS motivation theory is based upon on behavioral, cognitive, and affective learning theories. These theories emphasize the importance of building learner motivational factors into course design (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010; Huett et al., 2008). This study examined the business faculty perspectives towards their course design and student assessment preparation within the ARCS model of motivation.

Historical Perspective

Faculty teaching and learning professional development has its origins post-World War II (Manathunga, 2011). In the 1950s academic institutions became concerned about student retention which drove further focus toward faculty professional development (2011). Faculty professional development became student focused in the 1970s as student protests highlighted inferior teaching practices (2011). This drove professional development in the areas of curriculum design and assessment practices (2011).

Today, there are many faculty teaching and learning opportunities, particularly in the province of Ontario (Contact North, 2014). Additionally, the *Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Association* was founded in Canada to support postsecondary educators' professional development. Yet, unlike the K-12 Ontario education system which operates under the 1990 Ontario Education Act and has mandated professional development, there are no mandated community college faculty development requirements (Hardy, 2009). Wallin (personal communication, August 25, 2014) suggested there are numerous reasons that mandated college faculty teaching professional development has not come about including a lack of centralized college administration, the uniqueness of each college, and limited sharing of best practices among colleges.

Why Faculty Professional Development Matters

While community college faculty are often subject matter experts, they are less often teaching experts (Onsman, 2011). As such, college faculty often lack the course design and student assessment knowledge and skills to take into the classroom (Wallin & Smith, 2005). It is essential for college faculty to possess both subject matter and teaching expertise (Persellin & Goodrick, 2010). Furthermore, students experience tremendous gains in engagement and learning when they are taught by faculty who possess advanced course design and assessment knowledge and skills (Thomas, 2009).

Fallahi et al. (2009) reported on their individual experiences in college course design and student assessment. Each instructor stated that they knew their courses required redevelopment yet did not know how to complete this process. Furthermore,

most of the instructors recognized that their student assessment strategies needed to be revised. Each instructor adopted Fink's integrated course design model as they revised their course designs and student assessments. The meta-analysis of these changes confirmed that student learning was improved in the areas of foundational knowledge, application, human dimension, and learning skills.

A case study completed by Offerdahl and Tomanek (2011) confirmed that instructors viewed student assessment as a summative tool to assign student grades. However, once faculty were coached on the utilization of formative assessments, they appreciated the value of these assessments to student learning. Consequently, each instructor in the study considered changes that could be made to their course design to more effectively teach and assess students.

Students have reported that their faculty did not often give meaningful or useful feedback (Thomas, 2009). In an effort to understand how formative assessment impacted student learning Keefe and Eplion (2012) studied first year business students at an American university. These students were given lecture notes, slide decks, and formative quizzes to each be completed before class. Their analysis confirmed that students who completed formative assessments performed statistically significantly higher on their final examinations. However as noted by Keefe and Eplion, few instructors understand how to design student assessments and understand the benefits to students in conducting formative assessments in their courses. Further, Jones (2009) confirmed that faculty require professional development in the areas of student-centered course design and assessment, specifically in the design of rubrics for student assessment.

In addition to the significant gains afforded to students with well-prepared instructors, academic institutions have a vested interest in a skilled workforce. The faculty are central to academic institutions achieving their strategic and operational goals and as such are a key resource. Further, supporting and engaging in teaching and learning professional development may contribute to a culture of continuous learning (Balan, Manko, & Phillips, 2011). Therefore, academic institutions are best to devise faculty professional offerings and a development policy as part of their responsibility to develop and manage this resource (Larkin & Neumann, 2009). In so doing, colleges may ensure students are well-taught, which is not only an institutional goal but also a societal responsibility.

Potential Human Resources Policy Outcomes

Professional development policy must be designed with the institutional context of learners, faculty, and institutional goals (Guskey, 2009). Guskey outlined that effective professional development policy must feature a student focus, be evidence-based, collaborative, problem-solving orientation, and administrator support.

Zaki, Rashidi, and Hussain Kazmi (2013) recommended a two part faculty professional development policy. First, faculty should be required to complete instructional process training that includes the course design, teaching, and student assessment practices. This development is then coupled with ongoing reflective practice.

Kanuka (2010) recommended a more robust faculty professional development policy than that proposed by Zaki et al. (2013). Kanuka proposed this policy be developed with faculty and senior administrator support in line with the institutional

culture. Further, multiple training offerings based on empirical evidence via various delivery modes should be developed and communicated with the college community. As well, this policy should have a faculty awards mechanism built in and the facilitators must be highly skilled and respected.

Wallin (personal communication, August 25, 2014) suggested a college faculty professional development model that included faculty release time for this training. In addition it tied to the faculty compensation model, and was designed collaboratively by faculty and administrators. She believes this model may support greater faculty “buy-in of the professional development.”

Finally, Miller, Bai Kang, and Newman (2014) recommended that sabbaticals be offered for faculty with well-defined parameters. These parameters should include a policy that specifies sabbatical activities that are tied to faculty performance requirements and measurements, sabbatical selection criteria must be clear, sabbatical mentors should be assigned to faculty approved for sabbaticals, and sabbaticals should be considered as activities to rejuvenate faculty.

The existing research on faculty development policies is sparse. Potential college faculty professional development policy could be developed in line with the findings of this project. The policy options could be proposed to the college administration, faculty, and local union. Notably, the faculty collective agreement does permit the colleges to require ten days of annual faculty professional development. Further, faculty sabbaticals are also available for faculty (Students’ Community College, 2014).

Possible Faculty Development Strategies and Solutions to this Problem

There is considerable evidence pointing to research-based teaching and learning strategies that could be implemented to address this problem of faculty requiring course design and student assessment training. Alsofyani, bin Aris, Eynon, and Abdul Majid, (2012) concluded that faculty preferred professional development in course design that incorporated adult learning principles. This included training that was interactive, relevant, and practical. Specifically, the professional development was most satisfying when it was provided in a rich and safe environment with support, guidance, and feedback for the faculty.

Dobozy (2012) proposed faculty professional development move away from the traditional information transmission model to a collaborative model built around social constructivism. Faculty should support students' learning as students, "facilitate to explore, make sense of the given problems, and arrive at conceptual understanding and solutions through their experiences" (Ilyas, Rawat, Bhatti, & Malik, 2013, p.153). Further, Balan et al, (2011) recommended that faculty teaching and learning professional development stay focused on curriculum development, instruction, and student assessment.

Sandford, Dainty, Belcher, and Frisbee (2011) studied the teaching and learning professional development needs of college faculty. The research results indicated that participants were willing to complete teaching and learning professional development once per year, in the fall semester, and in the evening. This study authors then provided a research-based logistical map to offering this development for faculty.

Persellin and Goodrick, (2010) studied the long term impact to teaching of college faculty who completed the Associated Colleges of the South Summer Teaching and Learning Workshop. Study participants reported summer teaching and learning workshops offered a lasting impact on their awareness of teaching, willingness to take risks, and a lasting impact on their teaching. Yet, there were numerous faculty who did not participate in faculty development workshops.

One strategy to address the lack of faculty participation in teaching and learning professional development is the adoption of corporate development practices in academic institutions (Minter, 2009). The Minter (2009) concluded that corporate professional development programs were more substantive and measurable than those of academic institutions. Thus, colleges could adopt the best practices of corporate training. The corporate training best practices that could be adopted include a faculty development center. A further adoption could include mandated development plans for all community college professors. These plans could be built with their academic chairs and linked to annual performance reviews.

One community college adopted a faculty professional development program that was completed in-class and online. The learning goals of this program included understanding students, student services, community education, developmental education, and transfer education to ultimately improve student success (Bendickson & Griffin, 2010). Faculty self-reports included a new appreciation for students as they navigate college services.

Likewise, a mixed-method study revealed that short, online courses were well-supported by faculty (Marrero, Woodruff, Schuster, & Riccio, 2010). These short courses were designed within the social constructivist theoretical framework. Each course consisted of four to six one-hour live online sessions. Faculty in each session participated in discussions and completed quizzes. Through analysis of surveys, essays, communications, and field notes, these researchers discovered that the faculty who participated appreciated the flexibility and structure of these courses and were applying this new knowledge to their courses.

In line with these two studies, Russell, Carey, Kleiman, and Venable (2009) compared online and face-to-face faculty professional development. Their students revealed that faculty achieved the same learning objectives in both delivery formats however faculty reported being more willing to complete future teaching and learning professional development if it was offered in an online format.

A research-based strategy to address this problem could be a faculty learning community. In this learning community, faculty could meet to discuss their teaching related readings and experiences (Grierson et al., 2012). This research confirmed that faculty valued a learning community and reported that participation in this community advanced their teaching expertise, communication skills, and teaching network. Faculty learning communities also increased faculty awareness of students, engagement with the college, collaboration with peers, completion rates of teaching professional development, and improved relationships with students (Jackson, Stebleton, & Laanan, 2013).

Stewart (2014) proposed that learning communities must begin with a faculty needs assessment, coaching on team dynamics, and have ongoing interaction. Furthermore, learning communities must focus on student learning, instructional design, and student assessment. Importantly, learning communities must be aligned with the institutional goals, be supported by empirical data, and continually require faculty evaluation and reflection.

A faculty professional development model to address lack of participation in teaching and learning professional development could include: field experiences, reflection, and peer observations (Estepp, Roberts, & Carter, 2012). Qualitative data collected from faculty by Hickson and Wilson (2009) indicated that field experiences, peer observations, reflection, and application exercises all enhanced their teaching skills and engagement. Moreover, Brazeau and Woodward (2012) propose faculty teaching and learning professional development be centered on each faculty member's career stage rather than standardized training. This career-based development could include reflection, critical thought, and be purpose driven.

Faculty engagement with learning strategists could also be an approach to positively impact course design and assessment of student knowledge and skills. The learning strategists in this study were faculty who possessed advanced college teaching and learning expertise. Those faculty who engaged with these learning strategists acquired further teaching and learning knowledge and skills minimally engaged faculty were more teacher-focused whereas engaged faculty were most likely to adopt student-centered teaching strategies (McKenna, Yalvac, & Light, 2009).

An additional strategy to address this problem could be a series of one day workshops of teaching knowledge and skills. One such workshop was designed to improve faculty lecture planning and active learning techniques in the classroom (Stein, Fujisaki, Davis, & MacLean, 2012). Their results indicated the teaching skills, communication practices, and networks of the participants all improved after completing this workshop.

Similarly, a case study at an African university confirmed that faculty benefited from collaborative course design workshops (Nihuka & Voogt, 2012). Faculty who participated in a series of 10 course design workshops reported increasing their expertise and confidence in their course design knowledge and skills. Furthermore, these faculty reported they appreciated the collaborative opportunities gained from these workshops.

The faculty professional development proposed in a report by Balan et al. (2011) recommended this training be based on empirical studies, led by transformational leaders, being ongoing in nature, and be evaluated for effectiveness. The implementation of training within these recommendations may best lead to faculty that are empowered and motivated to teach, a culture of learning, and students experiencing academic gains in the classroom. Wallin (personal communication, August 25, 2014) also suggested that community college faculty professional development initiatives should be scheduled on a regular and frequent basis.

One of the models proposed by Balan et al. (2011) is the instructional process model. This faculty development model included 12 steps including assessing the development needs, building individualized training plans for faculty, and continual

reassessment. Their second proposed model is the seven-step instructional learning orbit model. This model aligned teaching goals with student abilities and learning styles coupled with faculty reflective activities. Finally, the professional development for instructional improvement model was recommended as a faculty development program. This model is led by the institutional leaders who create an urgency for change and learning throughout the organization.

An additional research-based strategy to address the problem of course design and student assessment professional development needs of community college faculty could be simultaneous professional development. Simultaneous development focuses on the concurrent rather than consecutive learning goals of subject matter expertise and pedagogy (Stover & Veres, 2013). Specifically, this faculty professional development could consist of subject matter content, pedagogy, and technology to improve student achievement of learning outcomes. These findings indicated that faculty learning from concurrent professional development increased learning in all three areas.

An alternative professional development model includes just-in-time training (Onsman, 2011). Just-in-time training refers to faculty training when they need this learning for their teaching rather than pre-planned or scheduled training. Just-in-time training has been suggested as a means to equip instructors with the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively teach at the postsecondary level. Broad faculty professional development recommendations suggest that this training be offered as an ongoing activity for up to one year (Jones, 2009).

A limited number of countries, namely the United Kingdom and Australia, mandate or recommend faculty complete a graduate certificate in teaching. However it is important to note there is no evidence this graduate certificate translated into faculty who possess more advanced teaching and learning knowledge and skills (Onsman, 2011). This faculty development should be supported by learning communities and be institution wide.

Implications

Lack of faculty engagement in course design and student assessment training needed to be addressed. This project could help to establish a formal faculty professional development policy and enhance the existing professional development offerings at the college that will encourage fulltime business faculty to participate. Enhancing this course design and student assessment preparation is expected to support student learning, retention, and graduation.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of why fulltime School of Business marketing and management community college faculty at Students' Community College frequently do not complete professional development in course design and student assessment. This study was framed within the theoretical base of the ARCS model of motivation including attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction as proposed by Keller (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010). This problem was explored by way of a case study with the participants drawn from School of Business marketing and management fulltime faculty. The sampling techniques were purposeful, random, and

snowball or networking (Lodico et al., 2010). Data were collected via interviews and analyzed. While it is recognized that college faculty often require teaching and learning professional development, it is important to consider the design of these offerings and the policy development to support this training. Well-trained college faculty are best positioned to support student learning and success.

Section 2: The Methodology

Introduction

This project may explain why faculty are not completing professional development in course design and student assessment. The qualitative design to answer the research questions was an inductive case study (Arghode, 2012; Lodico et al., 2010). This research took place in a Canadian community college setting. This approach could provide a practical rather than theoretical solution that could be deployed in this college (Sallee & Flood, 2012).

Study participants selected were fulltime business faculty. The case study design allowed for the interaction between the researcher and selected participants to develop a holistic understanding of the problem (Sallee & Flood, 2012). The data collection method involved in depth interviews. Data analysis entailed coding and development of themes. This design provided a thick description of the reasons why faculty do not complete college-offered teaching and learning training (Lodico et al., 2010).

Selection of Participants

The participants were drawn from Students' Community College School of Business marketing and management fulltime faculty. The sampling technique was purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002). Purposeful sampling is most commonly utilized in qualitative research as it offers the most robust and relevant data to the research questions.

The sample size was 12 participants in line with most qualitative studies (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Therefore, with 22 fulltime faculty in this department, the sample size

was 54% of the department faculty. Twelve study participants allowed for a robust sample size to achieve data saturation and redundancy.

Once informed consent was received from all participants, I interviewed the participants using foreshadowing questions to understand why they did not frequently participate in course design and student assessment professional development (Arghode, 2012; Lodico et al., 2010). Participants were later asked to provide feedback concerning the study findings by way of member checking. Member checking included nine of the 12 or 75% of the marketing and management faculty members who participated in the research. Each of these participants reviewed their interview data for accuracy and discussed the findings with the researcher. The data was collected, recorded, organized, and analyzed to understand faculty perspectives and experiences with teaching and learning professional development in the areas of course design and student assessment.

Central to the success of this case study was the researcher working to establish a trusting and respectful relationship with each participant (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The researcher-participant relationship was collegial. I am a faculty peer, and not in a supervisory role, and I am aware of the college culture. Because this relationship was familiar, it enabled me to build trust in an expedient manner.

Students' Community College and Walden University institutional review board (IRB) approvals were obtained before commencing this case study. The IRB afforded both the researcher, the institutions, and the participants, protection against unethical research practices (Laureate Education, Inc., 2014). The IRB ensured provincial and national regulatory compliance with ethical guidelines and legislation and supplied all of

the required documentation and processes required for ethical review. After IRB approvals, I then approached the college administrators to seek permission to access the faculty to complete this case study. The participants in this case study were protected by a signed consent (see Appendix B). This consent assured their voluntary participation, their ability to withdraw from the research at any time, the secure storage of the research data, and their protection from inappropriate researcher demeanor (Lodico et al., 2010). The final results of this case study project were shared with the research participants (Creswell, 2012).

Data Collection Methods: Interviews

Data collection included in-person, open ended interviews similar to purposeful conversations in order to fully understand participant attitudes towards professional development (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Please see Appendix D for the interview questions. Interviews were completed with 12 fulltime marketing and management School of Business faculty. There were four female and eight male participants. All interviews were held in my office behind a closed door. The interviews took 35-55 minutes each. After the initial small talk, I reminded each participant of the voluntary nature of their participation in this research, they could withdraw at any time, and all findings would be held in confidence, and reported in aggregate form. I actively listened, was respectful, and sought clarification of any participants' comments that were not clear. This data collection method yielded thick descriptions of faculty attitudes towards professional development with examples and interviewer notes (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Lodico et al., 2010).

The data was organized by interview notes and audio recordings (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2012). The interview notes were scanned, transcribed, and stored as an electronic Word file behind a strong password. The procedures to keep track of the data included photocopies of the interview notes stored in a secure cabinet in my campus office to ensure confidentiality. The audio recordings were duplicated and backed-up as well.

Data Analysis Methods

Interview notes and tape recordings that were collected were analyzed to yield thick descriptions of the problem and then expanded to relevant themes and possible solutions (Sallee & Flood, 2012). I transcribed each of the recordings each evening after the interview to ensure accurate transcriptions (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Transcriptions included margins for notes, space for interviewer comments, bolding of interviewer questions, and use of headers (Creswell, 2012).

Analytical strategies included coding the qualitative data, description of the data, and construction of the themes to describe the major findings. Research findings became apparent from the themes that emerged (Lodico et al., 2010). The credibility and trustworthiness of the data was then checked by way of member checking and a peer reviewer to confirm or reject the findings (2010). Member checking included nine of the 12 or 75% of the marketing and management faculty members who participated in the research. Each of these participants reviewed their interview data for accuracy and discussed the findings with the researcher.

A peer reviewer who was a fulltime School of Business faculty member not within marketing and management, was invited to review the interview data for logical development of themes and findings. The peer reviewer was required to sign a confidentiality agreement.

The data was interpreted by way of the bottom-up approach shortly after completion of the data collection (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2012). The bottom-up analysis began with the development of a general understanding of the data and then progressed to coding of themes around the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2012). In line with typological analysis, the data was divided into categories based on predetermined and logical typologies (Hatch, 2002) in line with the ARCS theoretical base of this problem (Colakoglu & Akdemir 2010). Categories included faculty attention to sustain their engagement in this learning, the relevance of this professional development to their course design and student assessment activities, and satisfaction faculty gain from this professional development.

A preliminary exploratory analysis of this data was completed by reading the data numerous times to understand the broad landscape of the findings and identify patterns (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2012). I then coded the data by way of an inductive process (Creswell, 2012). First, each of detailed data interview and audio transcripts were coded and then set into general themes. Care was practiced to ensure duplicate and irrelevant data was discarded. Specifically, lean coding or only a few codes were initially assigned to the text that best describes the meaning of that text. The codes were then combined into common themes.

The strategies that were used to establish credibility and accuracy of the findings and speak to issues of fairness were member checking and use of a peer debriefer (Creswell, 2012). Member checking was adopted by asking nine participants to review and discuss their interview data and my preliminary findings.

Research Findings

Throughout the interviews, I noted that each participant appeared very relaxed and unhurried. Each participant appeared eager to discuss faculty course design and student assessment professional development. I also noted that all participants spoke with great candor and passion during the interviews. I felt tremendous respect and appreciation for each research participant.

Each interview was audio recorded and I took notes. After each interview I transcribed the interview. I then stepped away from the data to obtain a more fulsome perspective of the data. Once all interviews were complete, I then coded each interview file for units of data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Situational codes were assigned in line with each participant's perceptions of this training (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This mechanical handling of the data yielded 38 major codes. These codes included lack of professor role clarity, quality of professional development, role of the college leadership, college culture, student assessment, and union relationship.

Again, I stepped back from the data to later return to assign themes from the codes. In this process I generated eight themes that represent the major codes. These themes include:

1. Quality of current college course design and student assessment professional development.
2. Lack of professor role clarity.
3. College leadership.
4. Suggested professional development strategies.
5. Student learning while at college and future career preparation.
6. Motivators to complete this training.
7. A productive faculty performance management system.
8. Reward mechanisms for completing this training.

Data results suggested very specific answers to the research questions. Data are reported in a holistic manner as the individual participants are not identified due to the Students' Community College institutional review board conditions of approval to conduct this research.

The first theme was the participants' overwhelming concerns with *the quality of current college course design and student assessment professional development offerings*. Specifically, the participants reported that the current offerings were not current, not specific to their needs, not in-depth enough, and not delivered in a time and method that was conducive to completing this training. There was not one participant who identified the current training as beneficial to their course design and student assessment strategies. Moreover, there were faculty who were not at all familiar with the college course design and student assessment professional development offerings. This theme is congruent with ARCS theory as this training is not capturing the faculty attention to sustain their

engagement in the learning nor are these offerings relevant or important to the faculty (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010).

The second theme of *lack of professor role clarity* for the professor became evident across the findings. The majority, however not all participants, stated the course design, student assessment, and professional development expectations of the professor needed to be clarified. All participants agreed that this professional development is a very important faculty requisite.

College leadership emerged as the third central theme in these findings.

Participants outlined that the college needs to offer appropriate training, assign time to complete this training, and encourage this training to be completed. Importantly, some of the participants perceived that the college administrators did not value course design and student assessment knowledge and skills. Further, all research participants confirmed that the college leadership did not impact their motivation to complete this training. Faculty also acknowledged that is training is in line with the collective agreement.

Theme four captured numerous *suggested professional development strategies*. Among the suggested development options were aligned with current theories and best practices and be applied and practical in design. Precisely, these faculty suggested one-on-one training from a curriculum expert, small group learning, peer-based training, course and program specific training, e-based training, just-in-time training, and learning communities. Faculty clearly voiced that this training must have sizable gains to their course design and student assessment strategies. These participants also suggested that

this training be customized to each faculty members' professional development needs and available on an ongoing basis throughout the year.

The faculty expressed their concerns for *student learning while at college and future career preparation*. This fifth theme was evident as the participants discussed why this training was important to them personally and professionally. Faculty reported they felt directly responsible for student learning. Additionally, the participants also stated that as a community college faculty member, their role of student career preparation was the central focus of their professional practice. Additionally, some of the research participants stated they believed students would appreciate clear and accurate assessments and also would be more engaged in their courses if the courses were well designed. The research participants further stated that becoming a course design and student assessment expert would be expected to positively support student learning, grades, and future career prospects. As well, these faculty anticipated fewer grade challenges from students if their courses and assessments were well designed. Faculty identified positive feelings towards completing this learning. This theme aligned with the ARCS concept of learner satisfaction (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010).

Central to the findings was theme six, the *motivators to complete this training*. All faculty stated they felt intrinsic motivation to complete this training and that their peers and administrators did not inspire them to complete course design and student assessment professional development. Moreover, some participants believed that the

college culture did not value nor inspire them to achieve course design and student assessment knowledge and skills.

Of importance is nearly all participants in this study reported that a mandated professional development policy was favored. Precisely, the participants stated that if this development was mandated, they would anticipate the college administration to apply the required resources, refine the training offered, assign faculty time to training, and ensure all faculty possessed these knowledge and skills. Some research participants also outlined that a mandated professional development program of this nature would level the course design and student assessment expertise among faculty as expertise and practice in these areas vary widely. This theme further ties to the faculty perception of the attention and relevance of this training which is in line with the ARCS theory of the importance of faculty perception to their professional practice (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010).

However, this theme tied directly to theme seven of a *productive performance management system*. Faculty identified the need for this training to be directly linked to their performance management to then build a personalized and dynamic development plan. In particular, faculty wanted a performance management system that was structured, goal-oriented, and tied directly to their professional performance and development. Moreover, these research participants also confirmed that they envisioned a collaborative performance management system whereby college administrators and faculty jointly supported the continuous development of faculty knowledge and skills.

The final theme was a *rewards mechanism for completing this training*. The participants overwhelmingly reported that financial rewards were not sought after. These faculty stated that they felt adequately compensated and that further financial rewards were not meaningful. Rather, they sought professional accolades and additional training opportunities as meaningful rewards for completing this training. The suggested professional accolades could include peer recognition, a letter of endorsement in their human resources file, or being noted as an expert within the college community. Numerous faculty members indicated they did not want sabbaticals to complete this training but would rather complete this training concurrent with their teaching responsibilities. This theme is central to building faculty motivational factors into course design within ARCS theory (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010; Huett et al., 2008).

Conclusion

The problem of community college faculty not completing course design and student assessment professional development was explored by way of an inductive case study. The data collection included interviews which were analyzed and coded into themes. Next, this local problem was discussed within the ARCS theory as proposed by Keller (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010). The local problem was then presented in terms of the implementation, resources, and barriers to this project.

The project includes a human resources faculty professional development policy (see Appendix A). This policy specifies the rationale, training requirements, frequency, and timeframe of faculty course design and student assessment professional development. This project was linked to the faculty performance management process. This project

also includes recommendations to revise the existing teaching and learning professional development offerings at this college. Finally, project communications and launch plans were developed.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

The project goal of understanding why faculty are not frequently completing course design and student assessment professional development will be discussed within the context of the literature.

Description and Goals

The purpose of this project is to understand this local problem to achieve the goal of potentially establish a policy and revise the existing faculty professional development offerings and that will encourage fulltime business faculty to complete this teaching and learning preparation. The target audience is fulltime community college faculty. The specific learning goals include fulltime community college faculty to be able to design a course and accurately assess student academic performance.

Rationale

Enhancing this course design and student assessment preparation is expected to support student learning. The goal of this project was to address this problem with the empirical evidence to then use to effectively write a policy and modify the faculty professional development offerings and from an informed stance. A case study may best yield an answer to the research questions.

Review of the Literature

This review of literature included searches within ERIC, Sage, and Education Complete. Peer reviewed and year of publication of 2010-2015 were search limitors. Search key words *included teachers, instructors, professors, college, community college,*

training, in-service training, professional development, policy, social change, and social justice.

Conceptual Framework

The theoretical base of this problem is the ARCS model of motivation proposed by Keller (2010). Attention refers to capturing learners' attention to sustain their engagement in the learning; relevance refers to the course learning goals having meaning and importance to the learners; confidence refers to the learners' belief in their success in learning; and satisfaction refers to the learners' positive feelings towards their learning (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010).

The foundation of the ARCS motivation theory is based upon on behavioral, cognitive, and affective learning theories. These theories emphasize the importance of building learner motivational factors into course design (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010; Huett et al., 2008). Therefore, the research questions of this study will examine the business faculty perspectives towards their course design and student assessment preparation within the ARCS model of motivation.

Historical Perspective

It is essential to recognize that postsecondary education has a long standing history of not strategically or operationally supporting teaching and learning professional development. As noted by Timpson (2009) there are a limited number of colleges that provide teaching and learning training that positively impacts faculty knowledge and skills and students' learning. He further stated that college leaders often do not appreciate the importance of this training. Correspondingly, only 58% of American

colleges offer faculty teaching and learning professional development (McKee, Johnson, Ritchie, & Tew, 2013). Yet, colleges are distinctively positioned to prepare students to participate in their future careers and civic communities with faculty who have well designed courses and students assessments, “Administrators, student affairs professionals, and faculty all have unique roles to play in building communities, fostering academic integrity, and modeling civic responsibility for students” (Biswas, 2014, p. 22).

Why Faculty Professional Development Matters

When asked, chief academic officers confirmed that faculty teaching and learning professional development improved academic programs, student learning, and faculty competency (McKee et al., 2013). Moreover, chief academic officers reported ineffective teaching contributes to poor student learning and ineffective graduates (Lancaster, Stein, Garrelts MacLean, Van Amburgh, & Persky, 2014).

Hudson (2013) reported that the Promised Neighborhood Initiative confirmed that colleges that relate their mission to teaching, teacher training, and community development are best positioned to be active members of their respective communities. Colleges with policies and practices that support teacher training are more often institutional anchors of their communities. Further, faculty who are able to effectively teach students have advanced course design and evaluation knowledge and skills (Daisley, 2011).

Important is research that reported that teaching and learning is sustainable and practiced in the classroom (Behar-Horenstein, Schneider Childs, & Graff, 2010). Behar-Horenstein et al. (2010) studied 12 dental faculty members who completed professional development in teaching and student assessment. One year after the faculty completed this

training, they were observed while teaching and interviewed concerning their teaching experiences. These findings confirmed that the skills these faculty learned remained as a part of their professional practice the following year. A second study confirmed teaching and learning professional development offered knowledge and skills that remained with the faculty two years after this training was completed (Lancaster et al., 2014). Further, California college faculty reported that professional development and growth were intrinsic motivators within their career landscape (Marston, 2010).

Faculty continually reported the need for course design and student assessment knowledge and skills (Jenkins & Yoshimura, 2010). Faculty who completed universal course design (UDL) training reported student course completion rate rose to 95% (Borgemenke, Holt, & Fish, 2013). Additionally, one study of college marketing students confirmed student engagement and academic performance improved when faculty moved away from traditional lecture and examinations course design and student assessments to more experiential and participative course design and student assessment (Black, Daughtrey, & Lewis, 2014). Moreover, students reported that effective faculty have well designed courses with clearly defined expectations (Läänemets, Kalamees-Ruubel, & Sepp, 2012). Further, one study of college biology students confirmed student performance improved when the assessments were designed in line with the course learning goals (Romeo & Posey, 2013).

Potential Human Resources Policy Outcomes

Central to the development of a human resources policy pertaining to faculty course design and student assessment professional development were college presidents

who actively raise the importance of this development to all college stakeholders (Honan, Westmoreland, & Tew, 2013). These same college presidents believed the quantum changes required to bring focus to the critical nature of this development requires disruption to, “the model of our classroom, and our model of teaching” (Honan, Westmoreland, & Tew, 2013, p. 35).

There are several pillars central to a human resources policy pertaining to faculty course design and student assessment professional development. First, academic institutions must provide faculty clear expectations and feedback concerning their teaching practices, secondly they must make a commitment to continuous teaching and learning professional development for faculty, and then they must reward teaching excellence (Gubbins, 2014).

Lancaster et al. (2014) mapped out ten steps to build a faculty development program. These steps included building stakeholder support, effective program leaders, faculty ownership, administration support, guiding principles, clear goals, strategic placement of this professional development with the college organizational structure, offering a variety of development opportunities, and faculty recognition and rewards. Further these researchers listed the faculty professional development that highlights course design, rubric design, and student grading strategies.

Runhaar and Runhaar (2012) proposed a human resources policy for college faculty that requires faculty professional development, managerial support and guidance of this policy, and available professional development opportunities. Important in these findings is the faculty acceptance of this policy as a recognized tool to drive professional

development. Further, managers must be trained to guide their faculty through the development, performance management, and rewards mechanisms. Finally, once the human resources policy is in place, the organizational culture should focus on teaching excellence and the importance of student learning. Important to note is faculty perception of a breach in their psychological contract with their respective college if the professional policy is put into place and not operationalized. Operational commitment must be demonstrated such as ensuring the required resources for this professional development is made available (Peirce et al., 2012).

A further study demonstrated that organizational culture, person-department fit, and available professional development resources all fostered faculty engagement in professional development activities (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014). In line with this research, Lattuca, Bergom, and Knight (2014) confirmed that a department culture and faculty reward system to support faculty teaching professional development are indispensable to develop student-centered teaching practices.

Colleges must be cognizant of potential barriers to faculty completing this professional development. These barriers included the time and effort for the college administration and faculty to complete this training, insufficient teaching and learning mentors, and inadequate funds committed to this faculty development (Gubbins, 2014). It is vital that the college align the institutional strategy and values with this faculty training for completion and adoption of this training to occur (Gubbins, 2014).

Possible Faculty Development Strategies and Solutions to this Problem

Jenkins and Yoshimura (2010) proposed a faculty professional development model that included five steps that yielded an effective and comprehensive training program. These steps include increasing institutional awareness for the necessity of this training, building the training plan collaboratively with faculty, ongoing training rather than one-shot training, providing ongoing support for faculty after the training, and continually evaluate the effectiveness of the training.

Perry and Hart (2012) completed a qualitative research study of the teaching and learning professional development needs of adult English Second Language instructors. Their research question centered on how prepared faculty believed they were to teach adults. Data collection consisted of surveys, interviews, and observations of 10 instructors. Their findings point out that these faculty overwhelmingly stated they felt underprepared to design courses, lesson plans, and assess students. These participants suggested that their professional development should include training, people resources, and support for training. This training could be structured as on-the-job training, apprentice opportunities, in-service training, mentoring, and social networking. It is important to note that each of the research participants suggested that this training be ongoing and targeted to their individual learning needs.

One faculty course design and student assessment training initiative that proved successful for both college faculty and students was the Universal Design for Learning framework (UDL). This research is supported by brain research that confirmed there is great diversity among student learning and the brain stem may support learning with

multiple sensory opportunities (Schreiner, Rothenberger, & Sholtz, 2013). Scott, McGuire, and Shaw (2001) pioneered UDL as the course design and student assessment principles included simple and clear course design, an appealing course outline, varied course activities, a welcoming and supportive course environment, and the adoption of multiple and varied student assessment methods. One study of pharmacy students confirmed that varied student assessments within the UDL course design and student assessment model did improve student academic performance (Hughes et al., 2014). The UDL framework provides faculty with a practical plan to develop courses and assess students. Central to this course design and assessment strategy were multiple representations of the course material, multiple and varied opportunities for students to demonstrate their knowledge and skills, and learner variation is anticipated (Smith, 2012).

A further professional development solution was faculty co-designing courses and student assessments. Brown, Eaton, Jacobsen, Roy, and Friesen, 2013 studied Canadian university faculty who were assigned to co-develop a course and the student assessments. These faculty co-developed courses and assessments with the adoption of backward instructional design and shared selection of digital course tools to design course learning tasks. These faculty reported that while this method of course design required a greater time investment yet it offered ongoing professional development, peer support, and a course that students reported included meaningful rubrics.

A further innovative faculty professional develop strategy was the use of the site visit model (Hanna, Salzman, Reynolds, & Fergus, 2010). Within this model education

experts arrange to visit the classroom with both the faculty and students in attendance. Within this visit, the expert modeled courses designed from various models with the students and faculty afforded the opportunity discuss the successes and shortcomings of each model. Interestingly, this model addressed the opportunity for successful application of a course design with real time role modeling and feedback. Similarly, faculty reported bringing a subject matter expert in house for teaching and learning guidance was a preferred training method (McKee et al., 2013).

The practical issues surrounding faculty professional development may be addressed with online training. Kokoc, Ozlu, Cimer, & Karal (2011) studied 13 faculty who completed online in-service professional development. The findings of this study confirmed that the professional development restrictors including time, place, transportation, and accommodation were all removed with online in-service training. Pruett and Pollard (2013) proposed that colleges considering online faculty teaching and learning professional development consider these three factors: (a) the faculty define their guiding principles for the training, (b) that faculty are afforded the opportunity to frequently interact in the course learning management system to build trust to learn together, and (c) the training be asynchronous with live training events interspersed throughout the training.

One study by Jarosewich et al. (2010) confirmed that faculty who participated in online discussion boards as a platform for their professional development gained insights into their professional practices. They indicated they intended to change their teaching strategies as a result of the learning that occurred on the discussion boards with their

peers. Similarly, Penick et al. (2014) researched faculty professional development delivered via a social media platform that included peer mentoring, skills development, and constructive feedback. Their findings confirmed that while this was a non-traditional training method, the research participants stated this method afforded them the opportunity to connect and learn from their peers in a both a meaningful and productive manner.

Learning communities are a promising faculty professional development model. Ying (2013) reported that professional learning communities were effective to provide a supportive faculty driven training to offered participants the opportunities for collaborative learning for the participants, share their teaching experiences to then design course from their broader knowledge and skills. Further, this professional development strategy reduced faculty feelings of isolation and presented mentoring opportunities. Likewise, Le Cornu (2010) reported that Australian colleges have experienced success with faculty learning communities. These communities were becoming relevant due to the restricted resources and time for faculty professional development. Essential to the success of these communities was reciprocal and authentic relationships among the community members.

Lancaster et al. (2014) suggested two types of learning communities—cohort or topic-based. Cohort based would include a community that addressed faculty teaching and learning needs. Whereas topic-based learning communities would feature training for a specific faculty need. Essential to both learning communities is the goal of a safe and positive environment for all faculty.

A further solution to this research problem is the development of a faculty development committee. This committee would be tasked with directing the faculty professional development plans and allocating development funds for the entire college faculty (Lancaster et al, 2014). Essential to the success of this committee is clear goals and faculty participation.

Implementation

There are six key steps upon completion of this project. First, the researcher must meet with the stakeholders to share the outcomes of the research project. The stakeholders include marketing and management faculty, the department chair and dean, human resources, and the organizational learning centre manager.

Next, the researcher will need to work with human resources to build a cross-disciplinary team to implement the proposed faculty professional development policy. This team would include faculty, chairs, union representation, and human resources practitioners. Once the policy was drafted it would need to be approved and adopted by the college administration. The third step of this implementation will be to ensure all required resources are available. These resources include faculty and chair training, required technology, and faculty release time. Next a communications plan must be designed and launched to inform all stakeholders of this policy. The training offerings must then be designed, beta-tested, and delivered. The final step of this project implementation is the evaluation of this plan by way of data collection. This will occur by interviewing a number of faculty that complete this training and getting their feedback.

Potential Resources and Existing Supports

There are ample resources and supports for this project. First, the college administration is interested and invested in the outcomes of this project. Next, there is an Organizational Learning Centre already in place to support faculty professional development. Finally, the faculty collective agreement allows for 10 days of professional development per year.

Potential Barriers

There are two central barriers to this project. One barrier is the college administration who would be tasked with going beyond stated support and building this professional development into the operational plans and budget. Notably, this would be in line with the strategic plan which speaks to ongoing employee development (Student's Community College, 2012). A second barrier would be faculty resistance to this professional development policy. This barrier could be offset with a communication strategy, changes agents, and reference to the collective agreement.

Proposal for Implementation and Timetable

I will work with Human Resources to build a cross-disciplinary team to implement the proposed faculty professional development policy beginning Fall 2015. This team would include faculty, chairs, union representation, and human resources practitioners. Drafting the policy would be anticipated to take all of the Fall 2015 semester. Once the policy was drafted it would need to be approved and adopted by the college administration. The college approval process would be expected to take the Spring 2016 semester.

The third step of this implementation will be to ensure all required resources are available. These resources include faculty and chair training, required technology, and faculty release time. This planning would be required to be completed as soon as the policy was approved in order to be reflected in the 2016-2017 budget.

Summer 2016 would see the cross-disciplinary team build a communications plan to be launched Fall 2016 to inform all stakeholders of this policy. Communications would include the college management team, college intranet, employee portal, and email.

The training offerings must then be redesigned, beta-tested. As the trainings are largely developed and would need refinement, these changes would be expected to be completed across Fall 2016. These changes would be completed by the organizational learning department. These revised offerings would then be beta-tested Winter 2017.

Next in the implementation is the live delivery of these course design and student assessment professional development offerings. These offerings would include e-based courses, face-to-face quick training sessions, one-on-one coaching, and the formation of learning communities. The learning communities would be hosted on our college portal.

The final step of this project implementation is the evaluation. The researcher, Human Resources and Organizational Learning departments would evaluate this plan by way of data collection from a number of faculty completing this training. Feedback would include faculty perspectives of the training format, scheduling, learning goals, and relevance to their course design and student assessment practices.

Roles and Responsibilities of Students and Others

There are limited responsibilities of students in this project. Students would only be tasked with completing course evaluation at the end of each course to provide feedback on the quality of course design and student assessments. Faculty would be responsible to complete this professional development. Academic chairs would be responsible to become familiar with the development offerings, meet with faculty to plan for the completion of this training, ensure this training was documented to their standard workload agreement within the collective agreement, and link this training to the faculty performance management system. Human Resources would be responsible for maintaining the human resources records for faculty in terms of the professional development they completed. A sizable responsibility would lie with the Organizational Learning Centre. This department would be tasked with the redesign and delivery of this faculty training.

Project Evaluation

It is important to complete both immediate and ongoing evaluation of this project to determine the successful elements and areas of improvement. This project will be initially be evaluated by way of a formative analysis. The evaluation will involve polling each of the stakeholders, including faculty, the academic chair, dean, Organizational Learning Centre manager, and human resources manager. Each stakeholder will be asked questions pertaining to the training being delivered and any changes required to the faculty development policy. This evaluation method was selected as it allows for current

and ongoing feedback to then change or refine the faculty professional development offerings or policy as required.

The overall goal of the project is to increase the marketing and management faculty course design and student assessment knowledge and skills via professional development. With an outcomes-based evaluation, marketing and management faculty course design and student assessment professional development annual registration rates will be collected to determine if the participation rate increased year over year. Pivotal to the evaluation of this project is the faculty and student feedback. Namely, how this training has impacted their course design and student assessment practices.

Implications Including Social Change

Local Community

This project addressed the needs of learners in the local community by possibly contributing to the redesign of college faculty training offerings and the policy pertaining to faculty teaching and learning professional development. In turn, this policy will then move faculty to regularly complete course design and student assessment training and to then bring their new skills into their teaching. Ideally, faculty will then be more engaged in their teaching and experience a fulfilling and meaningful career. It would seem reasonable to aspire that these faculty would contribute to an institutional culture that was student-centered and focused on teaching excellence. Further, college administrators may gain the best utilization of the institutional resources, be able to demonstrate resource and financial accountability, and strategic goal attainment from the outcomes of this project (Hardy et al., 2010).

This training may then position faculty to effectively teach and assess students to maximize their educational outcomes. Maximizing students' college experiences will make best value of their educational expense and position students for future career success and community engagement (Zaki et al., 2013). Wallin (personal communication August 25, 2014) emphasized the importance of building a culture focused on student academic achievement to prepare them for productive careers and community engagement.

This educational preparation is of particular significance in the context of the rapid economic and political change requiring a changing and diverse skill set required of graduates (Zaki et al., 2013). In turn, community partners will gain a skilled workforce from a reliable educational partner.

Far-Reaching

This project may be important as education and the broader community are closely linked. Education may be a vehicle for social change (McArthur, 2010). Education may be viewed as a means to provide social justice—of which college faculty assume a central role (Ness, George, Turner, & Bolgatz, 2010). Furthermore, faculty who participate in teaching and learning professional development develop a heightened awareness and commitment to build social justice principles into the courses they teach (Ness et al., 2010). In the larger context, well trained college graduates may more effectively contribute to the Canadian economy (Hardy et al., 2010). With a skilled workforce, a vibrant Canadian economy will best position Canada to be competitive in an

ever-changing global economy and be a contributing member to the broader international community.

Conclusion

This project addresses the needs of learners in the local community by contributing to the redesign of college faculty training offerings and the policy pertaining to faculty teaching and learning professional development. Trained college faculty will then be positioned to best prepare learners to achieve their academic and professional goals. From a broader view, better-trained graduates are more able to assume meaningful roles in society and actively contribute to their communities. It is necessary though to consider this project through the lens of its strengths, limitations, and researcher reflection.

Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions

Introduction

The project must be examined through the lens of its strengths, limitations, and researcher reflection. Researcher reflections include the viewpoints of scholarship, leadership, and potential for social change.

Project Strengths

The strengths of this project are the adoption of the practices of qualitative research to best answer the research questions. A further strength is that the findings can be directly adopted. Additionally, the project may provide data on policy and practice to improve teaching and student outcomes at this college (Gottfried et al. 2011). Finally, this project is timely as there is increased focus on college faculty teaching and learning knowledge and skills as a substantive resource tied to student learning and institutional goal attainment (Kanuka, 2010).

Recommendations for Remediation of Limitations

There were project limitations in addressing the problem. These include limited resources to redesign the faculty professional development offerings. A further limitation was the reluctance of the stakeholders to adopt the revised faculty professional development policy. These limitations may be offset by increasing the awareness of the possible gains for all stakeholders from effective course design and student assessment. This problem could be addressed differently by not modifying the professional development offerings and policy but rather changing college faculty practice through a

cultural shift. This shift to a learning culture would be a slow process and may not wholly address the problem.

Scholarship

This project reinforced the necessary rigor and formal processes of scholarship. These standards of practice bring credibility, consistency, and value to empirical research. The contribution of new knowledge to the profession of teaching allows faculty practitioners to have dependable points of reference to apply to their daily practice which are in line with the scholarship of teaching and learning (Bernstein, 2010).

Project Development and Evaluation

I learned project development is largely a tactical process. Once the research question has been identified and the research method defined, project development becomes a methodical and meticulous process of combining all of the information in a meaningful fashion.

Leadership and Change

In the context of leadership and change I discovered that change often does not always arise from leaders. Rather, practitioners such as college faculty can identify a need for change and gain momentum to create change. In so doing they assume the roles of unofficial leaders and change agents. These change agents may then move the sanctioned leadership toward the support that is required to align the strategic direction, create a need for change, and supply resources for change (Laureate Education, 2013c).

Analysis of Self as Scholar

The most significant outcome in the analysis of myself as a scholar comes as a result of the investment in my own teaching and learning professional development. As a result of this investment, I have completed doctoral research and contributed to the evolving body of professional pedagogy. These are truly humbling and honorable goals to have achieved and I believe I will continue to contribute to educational knowledge with my commitment to continued ongoing growth and reflection.

Analysis of Self as Practitioner

This project proposal confirmed my investment in teaching and learning theories and best practices to then bring into the classroom. It is not sufficient to continue with past practices only. Rather, it is important for me as practitioner to continually review the teaching and learning literature to then adopt new ideas into my teaching practices.

Analysis of Self as Project Developer

This project proposal reaffirmed the skills required as a project developer. First, the project developer had a broad sense of the project purpose and design. This broad overview then guided the tactical elements of the project proposal. As a project developer I was constantly required to remain organized. This organizational skill set was essential during the literature search, data collection, analysis, and writing. Lastly, as a project developer it was important to continually refer to the available resources including Walden tutorials, library, and professional resources. These invaluable resources also included the rubrics, templates, and strategies provided by the research chairs.

The Project's Potential Impact on Social Change

It is essential that community college professors complete course design and student assessment professional development. With the knowledge and skills acquired from this development, faculty would be better positioned to effectively teach and assess students. Skilled educators can engage students, equip them with vocational skills, critical thinking and problem solving skills, and provide them with self-management and reflection opportunities (Johnston, 2011).

This project is important as students who are taught and assessed within these “best practices” would seem to be more likely to learn the course materials and complete their programs of study. Students taught by skilled educators would be prepared with the knowledge and skills to achieve their personal and professional goals (Ellis, 1993). The knowledge and skills acquired from skilled educators has become even more critical in a fast-changing global context (Manathunga, 2011). From this informed stance, graduates could affect social change in their local and national communities (Johnston, 2011).

Colleges are uniquely positioned to positively impact social change by way of the institutional mission that is aligned with well-designed adult education to offer a democratic vehicle for social change (Atkinson, 2013). Specifically, college professors are exceptionally positioned to both promote and cultivate social justice as they design and deliver courses (Funge, 2011). Faculty professional development is a vehicle to support a nation's global competitiveness (DeZure et al., 2012).

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research

The most important application of this research was the new understanding of why Canadian community college faculty do not often complete course design and student assessment professional development. This knowledge could be used by college administrators to offer programs that faculty are motivated to complete and possibly revise the faculty development policy.

One direction for future research could include deeper understanding of the association between faculty who possess advanced course design and student assessment knowledge and skills and student learning and graduation rates. A further research direction could be how completing this professional development impacts faculty job satisfaction. Taken further, this research could help colleges build a culture of learning with the professional development offerings. Finally, it would be important to research how this professional development impacts community colleges' ability to achieve performance and strategic goals.

Conclusion

Faculty professional development in the areas of course design and student assessment would be anticipated to better prepare students to become fulfilled and contributing members of their communities. Social action and change would be expected from college graduates that become engaged community members. And it will be important to explore how this development does impact student learning, graduation rates, faculty professional satisfaction, and community college goal attainment.

References

- Adams, P. (2009). The role of scholarship of teaching in faculty development: Exploring an inquiry-based model. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 3(1), 1-22.
- Alsofyani, M., bin Aris, B., Eynon, R., & Abdul Majid, N. (2012). A preliminary evaluation of short blended online training workshop for TPACK development using technology acceptance model. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 11(3), 20-32.
- Archambault, L., Wetzel, K., Foulger, T. S., & Williams, M. (2010). Professional development 2.0: Transforming teacher education pedagogy with 21st century tools. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 27(1), 4-11.
- Arghode, V. (2012). Qualitative and quantitative research: Paradigmatic differences. *Global Education Journal*, 2012 (4), 155-163.
- Atkinson, T. (2013). Knowledge, power, hope: Activism, research, and social justice. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education*, 2013 (139), 5-14.
- Balan, R., Manko, T., & Phillips, K. (2011). Instructional improvement through professional development. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 5(2), 1-18.
- Behar-Horenstein, L., Schneider Childs, G., & Graff, R.A. (2010). Observation and assessment of faculty development learning outcomes. *Journal of Dental Education* 74(11), 1245-1254.

- Bendickson, M., & Griffin, K. (2010). An approach to a faculty professional development seminar. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 152*, 25-32.
- Bernstein, D. (2010). Finding your place in the scholarship of teaching and learning. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, 4*(2), 1-6.
- Bishop-Clark, C., & Dietz-Uhler, B. (2012). *Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning: A guide to the process, and how to develop a project from start to finish*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Biswas, A. E. (2014). Lessons in citizenship: Using collaboration in the classroom to build community, foster academic integrity, and model civic responsibility. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 25*(1), 9-25.
- Black, G. S., Daughtrey, C. L., & Lewis, J. S. (2014). The importance of course design on classroom performance of marketing students. *Marketing Education Review, 24*(3), 213-226.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Borgemenke, A. J., Holt, W. C., & Fish, W. W. (2013). Universal course shell template design and implementation to enhance student outcomes in online coursework. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 14*(1), 17-23.
- Brazeau, G. A., & Woodward, J. B. (2012). Rethinking faculty career development strategies. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 76*(6), 1-2.

- Brown, B., Eaton, S. E., Jacobsen, D. M., Roy, S., & Friesen, S. (2013). Instructional design collaboration: A professional learning and growth experience. *Journal of Online Learning & Teaching*, 9(3), 439-452.
- Campbell, C., & O'Meara, K. (2014). Faculty agency: Departmental contexts that matter in faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 55(1), 49-74.
- Chi Yan, L. (2014). Lessons learned in conceptualizing teaching assistant training programs from their evaluations. Transformative dialogues: *Teaching & Learning Journal*, 7(2), 1-8.
- Colakoglu, O. M., & Akdemir, O. (2010). Motivational measure of the instruction compared: Instruction based on the ARCS motivation theory v.s. traditional instruction in blended courses. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, 11(2), 73-89.
- Contact North. (2014). Ontario online learning portal for faculty and instructors. Retrieved from <http://contactnorth.ca/training-opportunities/ontario-faculty-instructor-training>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (Laureate custom ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Daisley, R. J. (2011). Considering personality type in adult learning: Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in instructor preparation at PricewaterhouseCoopers. *Performance Improvement*, 50(2), 15-24.

- DeZure, D., Van Note Chism, N., Deane Sorcinelli, M., Cheong, G., Ellozy, A. R., Holley, M., & Atrushi, D. (2012). Building international faculty-development collaborations: The evolving role of American teaching centers. *Change, 44*(3), 24-33.
- Dobozy, E. (2012). Learning in higher education symposia: A new professional development model for university educators. *Issues in Educational Research, 22*(3), 228-245.
- Durso, M. C. (2011). Reflections from an adjunct: How the scholarship of teaching and learning empowers the part-time instructor. *Insight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 6*37-42.
- Ellis, P. (1993). Training for democracy: Adult education practices. *Convergence, 26*(1), 23.
- Estep, C. M., Roberts, T., & Carter, H. S. (2012). An experiential learning model of faculty development to improve teaching. *NACTA Journal, 56*(1), 79-86.
- Fallahi, C. R., Levine, L. E., Nicoll-Senft, J. M., Tessier, J. T., Watson, C. L., & Wood, R. M. (2009). Using Fink's integrated course design: How a book changed our students' learning, our university, and ourselves. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning, 2009* (119), 43-52.
- Funge, S. P. (2011). Promoting the social justice orientation of students: The role of the educator. *Journal of Social Work Education, 47*(1), 73-90.
- Gottfried, M. A., Ikemoto, G. S., Orr, N., Lemke, C., & Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic. (2011). What four states are doing to support local data-driven

decision-making: Policies, practices, and programs. Issues & answers. REL 2012-
No. 118. *Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic*.

Grierson, A. L., Tessaro, M., Grant, C., Cantalini-Williams, M., Denton, R., Quigg, K., &
Bumstead, J. (2012). The bricks and mortar of our foundation for faculty
development: Book-study within a self-study professional learning community.
*Studying Teacher Education: Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education
Practices*, 8(1), 87-104.

Gubbins, P. O. (2014). The scholarship of teaching and learning: An opportunity for
clinical faculty members in academic pharmacy and other health professions to
develop a program of scholarship. *International Journal for the Scholarship of
Teaching & Learning*, 8(1), 1-16.

Gurung, R. A. R., & Schwartz, B. M. (2013). *Optimizing teaching and learning:
Practicing pedagogical research*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Guskey, T. R. (2009). Closing the knowledge gap on effective professional
development. *Educational Horizons*, 87(4), 224-233.

Hahn, T. B., & Lester, J. (2012). Faculty needs and preferences for professional
development. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 53(2),
82-97.

Han, Y., Hu, M., & Li, L. (2013). Formative evaluation of the no-fee teacher education
program from the students' standpoint. *Chinese Education & Society*, 46(2/3),
100-118.

- Hanna, M. B., Salzman, J. A., Reynolds, S. L., & Fergus, K. B. (2010). Engaging teachers as learners: Modeling professional development for adult literacy providers. *Adult Basic Education and Literacy Journal*, 4(3), 173-177.
- Hardy, I. (2009). Teacher professional development: A sociological study of senior educators' PD priorities in Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 32(3), 509-532.
- Hardy, I., Ronnerman, K., Furu, E., Salo, P., & Forsman, L. (2010). Professional development policy and politics across international contexts: From mutuality to measurability? *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 18(1), 81-92.
- Hatch, J.A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hickson, C., & Wilson, M. (2009). Engaging new faculty in the scholarship of teaching. *International Journal of Learning*, 16(5), 263-269.
- Honan, J. P., Westmoreland, A., & Tew, W. M. (2013). Creating a culture of appreciation for faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 2013(133), 33-45.
- Hudson, E. (2013). Educating for community change: Higher education's proposed role in community transformation through the Federal Promise Neighborhood Policy. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 17(3), 109-138.

- Huett, J., Young, J., Huett, K., Moller, L., & Bray, M. (2008). Supporting the distant student: The effect of ARCS-based strategies on confidence and performance. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 9(2), 113-126.
- Hughes, G. J., Cassagnol, M., Wenchen, W., Howland, M. A., Sym, D., El-Chaar, G. M., & Smith, C. J. (2014). Modification of a pharmacokinetics course design to improve student performance. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 78(5), 1-5.
- Hussain, I., Javed, M., Lin Siew, E., & Mohammed, A. (2013). Reflection of prospective teachers on the nature of teaching practice. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(3), 531-538.
- Ilyas, B., Rawat, K., Bhatti, M., & Malik, N. (2013). Effect of teaching of algebra through social constructivist approach on 7th graders' learning outcomes in Sindh (Pakistan). *International Journal of Instruction*, 6(1), 151-164.
- Jackson, D., Stebleton, M. J., & Laanan, F. (2013). The experience of community college faculty involved in a learning community program. *Community College Review*, 41(1), 3-19.
- Jarosewich, T., Vargo, L., Salzman, J., Lenhart, L., Krosnick, L., Vance, K., & Roskos, K. (2010). Say what? The quality of discussion board postings in online professional development. *New Horizons in Education*, 58(3), 118-132.
- Jenkins, A. A., & Yoshimura, J. (2010). Not another inservice! *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 42(5), 36-43.

- Johnston, S. (2011). A golden age for adult education: The collective disorienting dilemma. *College Quarterly*, 14(4),
- Jones, E. A. (2009). Expanding professional development opportunities to enhance the assessment process. *Assessment Update*, 21(3), 3-4.
- Kanuka, H. (2010). Characteristics of effective and sustainable teaching development programmes for quality teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 22(2).
- Keefe, T., & Eplion, D. (2012). Motivational impacts of formative assessment: Evidence from a college classroom. *Global Education Journal*, 2012 (2), 58-91.
- Kokoc, M., Ozlu, A., Cimer, A., & Karal, H. (2011). Teachers' views on the potential use of online in-service education and training activities. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, 12(4), 68-87.
- Kvedaraitė, N., Jasnauskaitė, R., Geležinienė, R., & Strazdienė, G. (2013). Forms of educational activities that enhance self-directed learning of adults. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 56, 74-85.
- Läänemets, U., Kalamees-Ruubel, K., & Sepp, A. (2012). What makes a good teacher? Voices of Estonian students. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 79(1), 27-31.
- Lancaster, J. W., Stein, S. M., Garrelts MacLean, L., 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.

- Larkin, J., & Neumann, R. (2009). Older academics and career management: An interdisciplinary discussion. *Australian Journal of Career Development, 18*(3), 29-39.
- Lattuca, L. R., Bergom, I., & Knight, D. B. (2014). Professional development, departmental contexts, and use of instructional strategies. *Journal of Engineering Education, 103*(4), 549-572
- Laureate Education (Producer). (2013c). *Dr. Tony Bates: Overcoming resistance to technological change and sustaining change*. Retrieved from <https://class.waldenu.edu>
- Laureate Education (Producer). (2013c). *Overcoming challenges of pedagogical research*. Retrieved from <https://class.waldenu.edu>
- Le Cornu, R. (2010). Changing roles, relationships and responsibilities in changing times. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(3), 195-206.
- Lisle, J. (2013). Exploring the value of integrated findings in a multiphase mixed methods evaluation of the continuous assessment program in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches, 7*(1), 27-49.
- Lodico, M., Spaulding, D., & Voegtle, K. (2010). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Loes, C. N., Saichaie, K., Padgett, R. D., & Pascarella, E. T. (2012). The effects of teacher behaviors on students' inclination to inquire and lifelong

- learning. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 6(2), 1-20.
- Maloy, R. W., & LaRoche, I. (2010). Student-centered teaching methods in the history classroom: Ideas, issues, and insights for new teachers. *Social Studies Research & Practice*, 5(3), 46-61.
- Manathunga, C. (2011). The field of educational development: Histories and critical questions. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 33(3), 347-362.
- Marrero, M. E., Woodruff, K. A., Schuster, G. S., & Riccio, J. (2010). Live, online short-courses: A case study of innovative teacher professional development. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning*, 11(1), 81-95.
- Marston, S. H. (2010). Why do they teach? A comparison of elementary, high school, and college teachers. *Education*, 131(2), 437-454.
- McArthur, J. (2010). Achieving social justice within and through higher education: the challenge for critical pedagogy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(5), 493-504.
- 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.
- McKenna, S. (2013). The dangers of student-centered learning - A caution about blind spots in the scholarship of teaching and learning. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 7(2), 1-5.

- McKenna, A. F., Yalvac, B., & Light, G. J. (2009). The role of collaborative reflection on shaping engineering faculty teaching approaches. *Journal of Engineering Education, 98*(1), 17-26.
- Meacham, J. & Ludwig, J. (2001). Faculty and students at the center: Faculty development for general education courses. *The Journal of General Education, 50*(4), 254-269.
- Minter, R. L., (2009). The paradox of faculty development. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 2*(4), 65-70.
- Murray, R. (2008). Writing for publication about teaching and learning in higher education. In R. Murray (Ed.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 128–138). Berkshire, Great Britain: Open University Press.
- Ness, M. K., George, M. A., Turner, K., & Bolgatz, J. (2010). The growth of higher educators for social justice: Collaborative professional development in higher education. *Insight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 588-105*.
- Newman, F., Couturier, L., & Scurry J. (2004). *The future of higher education: rhetoric, reality, and the risks of the market*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Nihuka, K. A., & Voogt, J. (2012). Collaborative e-learning course design: Impacts on instructors in the open University of Tanzania. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 28*(2), 232-248.
- Offerdahl, E. G., & Tomanek, D. (2011). Changes in instructors' assessment thinking related to experimentation with new strategies. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36*(7), 781-795.

- Onsman, A. (2011). Proving the pudding: Optimising the structure of academic development. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33(5), 485-496.
- Peirce, G. L., Desselle, S. P., Draugalis, J. R., Spies, A. R., Davis, T. S., & Bolino, M. (2012). Identifying psychological contract breaches to guide improvements in faculty recruitment, retention, and development. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 76(6), 1-8.
- Penick Brock, T., Assemi, M., Corelli, R. L., El-Ibiary, S. Y., Kavookjian, J., Martin, B. A., & Suchanek Hudmon, K. (2014). A nontraditional faculty development initiative using a social media platform. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 78(5), 1-5.
- Perry, K. H., & Hart, S. J. (2012). 'I'm just kind of winging it': Preparing and supporting educators of adult refugee learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(2), 110-122.
- Persellin, D., & Goodrick, T. (2010). Faculty development in higher education: Long-term impact of a summer teaching and learning workshop. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 10(1), 1-13.
- Phu, V., Vien, C., Lan, V., & Cepero, J. (2014). Factors driving learner success in online professional development. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning*, 15(3), 120-139.

- Poth, C. (2012). Exploring the role of the mixed methods practitioner within educational research teams: A cross-case comparison of the research planning process. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 6(3), 314-331.
- Pruett, C. D., & Pollard, T. (2013). Virtual space (E-Learning) faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 2013(133), 61-69.
- Rocca, S. J. (2010). Determining the professional development needs of faculty in a college of agriculture. *NACTA Journal*, 54(1), 69-75.
- Romeo, P., & Posey, F. (2013). Assessment: Can it lead to a better course design? *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 43(1), 30-35.
- Rossman G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2010). Everyday ethics: Reflections on practice. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(4), 379–391.
- Runhaar, P., & Runhaar, H. (2012). HR policies and practices in vocational education and training institutions: understanding the implementation gap through the lens of discourses. *Human Resource Development International*, 15(5), 609-625.
- Russell, M., Carey, R., Kleiman, G., & Venable, J. (2009). Face-to-face and online professional development for mathematics teachers: A comparative study. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 13(2), 71-87.
- Rutz, C., Condon, W., Iverson, E. R., Manduca, C. A., & Willett, G. (2012). Faculty professional development and student learning: What is the relationship? *Change*, 44(3), 40-47.

- Sadler, I. (2012). The challenges for new academics in adopting student-centred approaches to teaching. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*(6), 731-745.
- Sallee, M. W., & Flood, J. T. (2012). Using qualitative research to bridge research, policy, and practice. *Theory into Practice, 51*(2), 137-144.
- Sandford, B. A., Dainty, J. D., Belcher, G. G., & Frisbee, R. L. (2011). Perceptions of the willingness of part-time instructors in community colleges in the U.S. to engage in professional development opportunities and the best method(s) of delivering these experiences. *Journal of Career and Technical Education, 26*(1), 48-61.
- Schreiner, M. B., Rothenberger, C. D., & Sholtz, A. (2013). Using brain research to drive college teaching: Innovations in universal course design. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 24*(3), 29-50.
- Scott, S, McGuire, J., & Shaw, S. (2001). *Principles of Universal Course Design for instruction*. Storrs, CT: Center on Postsecondary Education and Disability, University of Connecticut.
- Skerratt, S. (2008a). Combining qualitative and quantitative: Mixed-methods in small-scale research. In R. Murray (Ed.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 122–127). Berkshire, Great Britain: Open University Press.
- Smith, D. J., & Valentine, T. (2012). The use and perceived effectiveness of instructional practices in two-year technical colleges. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 23*(1), 133-161.

- Smith, F. G. (2012). Analyzing a college course that adheres to the universal design for learning (UDL) framework. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 12(3), 31-61.
- Stake, R.E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stein, S. M., Fujisaki, B. S., Davis, S. E., & MacLean, L. (2012). A 1-day course to improve the teaching effectiveness of health professions faculty members. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 76(1), 1-9.
- Stewart, C. (2014). Transforming professional development to professional learning. *MPAEA Journal of Adult Education*, 43(1), 28-33.
- Stover, S., & Veres, M. (2013). TPACK in higher education: Using the TPACK framework for professional development. *Global Education Journal*, 1, 93-110.
- Students' Community College. (2014). Fast facts.
- Students' Community College. (2012). Strategic plan 2012-2017.
- Timpson, W. M. (2009). Improve your teaching and your students' learning. *Academe*, 95(1), 34-35.
- Thomas, R. (2009). The role of feedback from assessors in student-centred learning. *International Journal of Learning*, 16(5), 511-524.
- Vinogradov, P. (2012). You just get a deeper understanding of things by talking: Study circles for teachers of ESL emergent readers. *Journal of Research and Practice for Adult Literacy, Secondary, and Basic Education*, 1(1), 30-43.

- Wallin, D. L., & Smith, C. L. (2005). Professional development needs of fulltime faculty in technical colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29(2), 87-108.
- Williams, K. F. (2009). 'Guilty knowledge': Ethical aporia emergent in the research practice of educational development practitioners. *London Review of Education*, 7(3), 211–221.
- Yawkey, T. D., Jackson, S., Wang, L., & Chuang, C. (2003). Examining program impacts in the training of inservice graduate-level teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 5(4), 31-37.
- Ying, Z. (2013). Professional learning community and college English teachers' professional development. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 4(6), 1365-1370.
- Zaki, S., Rashidi, Z., & Hussain Kazmi, H. (2013). Improving instructional practices: Where to begin? *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education (JRRE)*, 7(1), 65-76.

Appendix A

White Paper: Human Resources Policy and Faculty Professional Development

Background of Existing Problem

The local problem of why fulltime business community college faculty are not frequently completing course design and student assessment professional development will be discussed within the context of the literature, research findings, and recommended policy. The purpose of this project is to address this local problem with the goal to potentially establish a policy and revise the existing faculty professional development offerings and that will encourage fulltime business faculty to complete this teaching and learning preparation.

The setting for this study is one department in Students' Community College. The department is Management and Marketing Studies within the School of Business. The research participants were fulltime business faculty. These faculty are subject matter experts in the areas of International Studies, Management, Materials and Operations, Marketing, Sports Management, and Supply Chain. These faculty complete subject matter training most often off campus, by way of conferences, seminars, and workshops (Administrator II, personal communication, July 18, 2014).

A gap in practice is evident from three expert sources. The Organizational Learning Centre manager confirmed that the college offered teaching and learning professional development in-house. Notably, these business faculty completed a total of 146 professional development offerings of a possible 2,116 offerings (Administrator I, personal communication, May 2, 2014). The School of Business dean (Administrator II,

personal communication March 17, 2014) stated that “very few faculty” are completing this teaching and learning preparation. The vice president human resources confirmed the college is interested in faculty completing this preparation and ideally building a faculty development policy to support this learning (Administrator III, personal communication May 26, 2014).

Summary of Findings from the Literature and Research Project

This project is grounded in the theoretical base of the attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction (ARCS) model of motivation proposed by Keller (Colakoglu & Akdemir 2010). Attention refers to capturing learners’ attention to sustain their engagement in the learning; relevance refers to the course learning goals having meaning and importance to the learners; confidence refers to the learners’ belief in their success in learning; and satisfaction refers to the learners’ positive feelings towards their learning.

The foundation of the ARCS motivation theory is based upon on behavioral, cognitive, and affective learning theories. These theories emphasize the importance of building learner motivational factors into course design (Colakoglu & Akdemir, 2010; Huett et al., 2008). This study examined the business faculty perspectives towards their course design and student assessment preparation within the ARCS model of motivation.

Historical Perspective

Faculty teaching and learning professional development has its origins post World War II (Manathunga, 2011). In the 1950s academic institutions became concerned about student retention which drove further focus toward faculty professional development (2011). Faculty professional development became student focused in the 1970s as

student protests highlighted inferior teaching practices (2011). This drove professional development in the areas of curriculum design and assessment practices (2011).

It is essential to recognize that postsecondary education has a long standing history of not strategically or operationally supporting teaching and learning professional development. As noted by Timpson (2009) there are a limited number of colleges that provide teaching and learning training that positively impacts faculty knowledge and skills and students' learning. He further stated that college leaders often do not appreciate the importance of this training. Correspondingly, only 58% of American colleges offer faculty teaching and learning professional development (McKee, Johnson, Ritchie, & Tew, 2013). Yet, colleges are distinctively positioned to prepare students to participate in their future careers and civic communities with faculty who have well designed courses and students assessments, "Administrators, student affairs professionals, and faculty all have unique roles to play in building communities, fostering academic integrity, and modeling civic responsibility for students" (Biswas, 2014, p. 22).

Today, there are ample faculty teaching and learning opportunities, particularly in the province of Ontario (Contact North, 2014). Additionally, the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Association was founded in Canada to support postsecondary educators' professional development. Yet, unlike the K-12 Ontario education system which operates under the 1990 Ontario Education Act and has mandated professional development, there are no mandated community college faculty development requirements (Hardy, 2009). Wallin (personal communication August 25, 2014) suggested there are numerous reasons that mandated college faculty teaching

professional development has not come about including a lack of centralized college administration, the uniqueness of each college, and limited sharing of best practices among colleges.

Institutional Gains from Faculty Professional Development

In addition to the significant gains afforded to students with well-prepared instructors, academic institutions have a vested interest in a skilled workforce. The faculty are central to academic institutions achieving their strategic and operational goals and as such are a key resource. Further, supporting and engaging in teaching and learning professional development may contribute to a culture of continuous learning (Balan, Manko, & Phillips, 2011). Therefore, academic institutions are best to devise a faculty development policy and professional development offerings as part of their responsibility to develop and manage this resource (Larkin & Neumann, 2009). In so doing, colleges may ensure students are well-taught, which is not only an institutional goal but also a societal responsibility.

When asked, chief academic officers confirmed that faculty teaching and learning professional development improved academic programs, student learning, and faculty competency (McKee et al., 2013). Moreover, chief academic officers reported ineffective teaching contributes to poor student learning and ineffective graduates (Lancaster, Stein, Garrelts MacLean, Van Amburgh, & Persky, 2014).

Hudson (2013) reported that the Promised Neighborhood Initiative confirmed that colleges that relate their mission to teaching, teacher training, and community development are best positioned to be active members of their respective communities.

Colleges with policies and practices that support teacher training are more often institutional anchors of their communities.

Faculty Member Gains from Professional Development

While community college faculty are often subject matter experts, they are less often teaching experts (Onsman, 2011). As such, college faculty often lack the course design and student assessment knowledge and skills to take into the classroom (Wallin & Smith, 2005). It is essential for college faculty to possess both subject matter and teaching expertise (Persellin & Goodrick, 2010). Furthermore, students experience tremendous gains in engagement and learning when they are taught by faculty who possess advanced course design and assessment knowledge and skills (Thomas, 2009). These findings concur with those of this research project whereby faculty stated they did not feel adequately prepared to design courses or student assessments.

Fallahi et al. (2009) reported on their individual experiences in college course design and student assessment. Each instructor stated that they knew their courses required redevelopment yet did not know how to complete this process. Furthermore, most of the instructors recognized that their student assessment strategies needed to be revised. This sentiment was also echoed in this research project from these participants. Each instructor adopted Fink's integrated course design model as they revised their course designs and student assessments. The meta-analysis of these changes confirmed that student learning was improved in the areas of foundational knowledge, application, human dimension, and learning skills. This was also an anticipated outcome these research participants outlined in the interviews.

A case study completed by Offerdahl and Tomanek (2011) confirmed that instructors viewed student assessment as a summative tool to assign student grades. However, once faculty were coached on the utilization of formative assessments, they appreciated the value of these assessments to student learning. Consequently, each instructor in the study considered changes that could be made to their course design to more effectively teach and assess students.

Important is research that reported that teaching and learning is sustainable and practiced in the classroom (Behar-Horenstein et al., 2010). Behar-Horenstein et al. studied 12 dental faculty members who completed professional development in teaching and student assessment. One year after the faculty completed this training, they were observed while teaching and interviewed concerning their teaching experiences. These findings confirmed that the skills these faculty learned remained as a part of their professional practice the following year. A second study confirmed teaching and learning professional development offered knowledge and skills that remained with the faculty two years after this training was completed (Lancaster et al., 2014). Further, California college faculty reported that professional development and growth were intrinsic motivators within their career landscape (Marston, 2010). This reflection is entirely congruent with the statements of these research participants.

Faculty continually report the need for course design and student assessment knowledge and skills (Jenkins & Yoshimura, 2010). Faculty who completed universal course design (UDL) training reported student course completion rate rose to 95% (Borgemenke, Holt, & Fish, 2013). Additionally, one study of college marketing

students confirmed student engagement and academic performance improved when faculty moved away from traditional lecture and examinations course design and student assessments to more experiential and participative course design and student assessment (Black, Daughtrey, & Lewis, 2014). Moreover, students reported that effective faculty have well designed courses with clearly defined expectations (Läänemets, Kalamees-Ruubel, & Sepp, 2012). Further, one study of college biology students confirmed student performance improved when the assessments were designed in line with the course learning goals (Romeo & Posey, 2013).

Students have reported that their faculty did not often give meaningful or useful feedback (Thomas, 2009). In an effort to understand how formative assessment impacted student learning Keefe and Eplion (2012) studied first year business students at an American university. These students were given lecture notes, slide decks, and formative quizzes to each be completed before class. Their analysis confirmed that students who completed formative assessments performed statistically significantly higher on their final examinations. However as noted by Keefe and Eplion, few instructors understand how to design student assessments and understand the benefits to students in conducting formative assessments in their courses. Further, Jones (2009) confirmed that faculty require professional development in the areas of student-centered course design and assessment, specifically in the design of rubrics for student assessment.

Recommended Human Resources Faculty Development Policy

Lancaster et al. (2014) mapped out ten steps to build a faculty development program. These steps include building stakeholder support, effective program leaders,

faculty ownership, administration support, guiding principles, clear goals, strategic placement of this professional development with the college organizational structure, offering a variety of development opportunities, and faculty recognition and rewards. Further these researchers listed the faculty professional development that highlights course design, rubric design, and student grading strategies. These steps are recommended to be included in this recommended human resources faculty development policy.

In line with our strategic plan, it is essential that our college faculty possess the knowledge and skills to be advanced college professors (Students' Community College, 2012). Further, this policy is developed in accordance with the OPSEU collective agreement pertaining to full professors and the professional development requirements of articles 11.1 H1, 11.1 H2, and 11.1 H3 (Students' Community College, 2012). Yet it is principal to note there is not currently a fulltime faculty professional development policy.

Professional development policy must be designed with the institutional context of learners, faculty, and institutional goals (Guskey, 2009). Central to the development of a human resources policy pertaining to faculty course design and student assessment professional development are college presidents who actively raise the importance of this development to all college stakeholders (Honan, Westmoreland, & Tew, 2013). These same college presidents believed the quantum changes required to bring focus to the critical nature of this development requires disruption to, "the model of our classroom, and our model of teaching" (p. 35). Finally, college leaders who ensure operational commitment such as ensuring the required resources for this professional development is

made available (Peirce et al., 2012). This leadership stance is essential to offset the Students' Community College faculty view that college administration does not value course design and student assessment professional development.

Importantly, organizational culture, person-department fit, and available professional development resources all fostered faculty engagement in professional development activities (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014). In line with this research, Lattuca, Bergom, and Knight (2014) confirmed that a department culture and faculty reward system to support faculty teaching professional development are indispensable to develop student-centered teaching practices. This is a paramount correction needed as Students' Community College faculty in this study believed the college culture did not support nor value course design and student assessment training.

This recommended policy supports the strategic goal as it outlines the faculty professional development requirements, frequency, and timeframe of faculty course design and student assessment professional development. As noted by Wallin (personal communication August 25, 2014) faculty professional development must be aligned with the institutional strategy to ensure adequate resources are made available.

Finally, within the college and OPSEU collective agreement ten days per calendar year may be assigned by college administrators to faculty standard workload agreements (SWFs) (Students' Community College, 2012). To that end, all faculty professional development will be documented to the SWFs.

Welcome To Teaching Certificate

The first phase of this recommended policy includes that all faculty upon initial hire as a full professor will be required to complete *Welcome to Teaching* training within the first year of their commencement of employment. This training will be hosted at Students' Community College via the Organizational Learning Centre. This training will be documented to the faculty SWFs. The learning goals of this program included understanding students, student services, community education, developmental education, and transfer education to ultimately improve student success (Bendickson & Griffin, 2010). Successful completion of this training will be confirmed by the *Welcome to Teaching* training certificate. In one study, faculty self-reports included a new appreciation for students as they navigate college services (Bendickson & Griffin, 2010). Similarly, a case study at an African university confirmed that faculty benefited from collaborative course design workshops (Nihuka & Voogt, 2012). Faculty who participated in a series of 10 course design workshops reported increasing their expertise and confidence in their course design knowledge and skills. Furthermore, the faculty within this research project confirmed they endorsed mandated professional development. Further, they reported they appreciated the collaborative opportunities gained from these workshops.

This certificate will be documented to the faculty human resources file. This is designed in accordance with Zaki, Rashidi, and Hussain Kazmi (2013) who recommended a two part faculty professional development policy. First, faculty should be required to complete initial instructional process training that includes the course

design, teaching, and student assessment practices. A limited number of countries, namely the United Kingdom and Australia, mandate or recommend faculty complete a graduate certificate in teaching. However it is important to note there is no evidence this graduate certificate translated into faculty who possess more advanced teaching and learning knowledge and skills (Onsman, 2011).

Intermediate Teaching and Learning Certificate

Second, all full faculty will be required to complete *Intermediate Teaching and Learning* training within their second year of full employment with the college. This training will also be hosted by Students' Community College Organizational Learning Centre. This training will be documented to the faculty SWFs. Wallin (personal communication August 25, 2014) suggested a college faculty professional development model should include faculty release time for this training, as she believes this model may support greater faculty "buy-in of the professional development". The faculty in this study also clearly stated that they too expected this professional development to be documented to their SWFs.

This training will build from the previous *Welcome to Teaching* training with course design learning goals including hybrid course design, online course design, technology in courses, and student assessment strategies. Guskey (2009) outlined that effective professional development policy must feature a student focus, be evidence-based, collaborative, and problem-solving orientation. The participants of this research clearly indicated their professional development preference was training that was practical and relevant to their faculty responsibilities. Successful completion of this

training will be confirmed by the *Intermediate Teaching and Learning* training certificate. This certificate will also be documented to the faculty human resources file.

Professional Development and Performance Management Plan

Third, on an annual basis every year after the second year of employment, faculty will be required to meet with their academic chair to build a Professional Development Plan that anchors this development to faculty performance and reward mechanisms (Brazeau & Woodward; 2012; Lattuca et al., 2014). Runhaar and Runhaar (2012) proposed a human resources policy for college faculty that requires faculty professional development, managerial support and guidance of this policy, and available professional development opportunities. These research participants strongly endorsed a professional development plan that was customized and linked to a performance management system.

This plan must include each of the following learning goals: course design, instruction, student assessment, and subject matter expertise. A minimum of five days of professional development must be completed each calendar year. The course design, instruction, and student assessment learning goals must be completed within the college Organizational Learning Centre. Moreover, Brazeau and Woodward (2012) proposed faculty teaching and learning professional development be centered on each faculty member's career stage rather than standardized training. This is congruent with the recommendation from the faculty of this study.

All completed professional development will be documented to the faculty human resources file. Further, follow up to this training will occur at the performance management meeting. As such, academic institutions must provide faculty clear

expectations and feedback concerning their teaching practices, secondly they must make a commitment to continuous teaching and learning professional development for faculty, and then they must reward teaching excellence (Gubbins, 2014). Likewise, the participants of this research study requested their professional development and teaching and learning successes be noted in their college file.

Recommended Faculty Development Strategies

Following are six faculty professional development recommendations that are aligned with the considerable evidence pointing to research-based teaching and learning strategies that could be implemented to address this problem of faculty requiring course design and student assessment training. Framing each of the recommended faculty develop strategies are several research-based strategies.

Alsofyani, bin Aris, Eynon, & Abdul Majid, (2012) concluded that faculty preferred professional development in course design that incorporated adult learning principles. This included training that was interactive, relevant, and practical. Specifically, the professional development was most satisfying when it was provided in a rich and safe environment with support, guidance, and feedback for the faculty.

A further strategy was proposed by Dobozy (2012) who suggested faculty professional development move away from the traditional information transmission model to a collaborative model built around social constructivism. Faculty should support students' learning as students, "facilitate to explore, make sense of the given problems, and arrive at conceptual understanding and solutions through their experiences" (Ilyas, Rawat, Bhatti, & Malik, 2013, p.153). Further, it is recommended

that faculty teaching and learning professional development stay focused on curriculum development, instruction, and student assessment (Balan et al., 2011).

The faculty professional development proposed in a report by Balan et al. (2011) recommended this training be based on empirical studies, led by transformational leaders, being ongoing in nature, and be evaluated for effectiveness. The implementation of training within these recommendations may best lead to faculty that are empowered and motivated to teach, a culture of learning, and students experiencing academic gains in the classroom. Wallin (personal communication August 25, 2014) also suggested that community college faculty professional development initiatives should be scheduled on a regular and frequent basis.

Corporate Development Practices

The first recommended strategy to address the lack of faculty participation in teaching and learning professional development is the adoption of corporate development practices in academic institutions (Minter, 2009). The conclusion drawn from Minter's research was that corporate professional development programs were more substantive and measurable than those of academic institutions. Thus, colleges could adopt the best practices of corporate training. The Students' Community College Organizational Learning Centre could adopt the corporate training best practices.

Just-in-Time Training

A second recommended faculty training model includes just-in-time training (Onsman, 2011). Just-in-time training refers to faculty training when they need this learning for their teaching rather than pre-planned or scheduled training. Just-in-time

training has been suggested as a means to equip instructors with the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively teach at the postsecondary level. This training strategy is aligned with the findings of this research project whereby faculty requested training when it was needed.

Online Learning

Third, the faculty professional development program is recommended to be completed in-class and online. Likewise, a mixed-method study revealed that short, online courses were well-supported by faculty (Marrero, Woodruff, Schuster, & Riccio, 2010). These short courses were designed within the social constructivist theoretical framework. Each course consisted of four to six one hour live online sessions. Faculty in each session participated in discussions and completed quizzes. Through analysis of surveys, essays, communications, and field notes, these researchers discovered that the faculty who participated appreciated the flexibility and structure of these courses and were applying this new knowledge to their courses.

In line with these two studies, Russell, Carey, Kleiman, and Venable (2009) compared online and face-to-face faculty professional development. Their students revealed that faculty achieved the same learning objectives in both delivery formats however faculty reported being more willing to complete future teaching and learning professional development if it was offered in an online format. This finding is in accordance with the findings of this research study as well.

One Day Workshops

The fourth strategy to address this problem is a series of one day workshops of teaching knowledge and skills. One such workshop was designed to improve faculty lecture planning and active learning techniques in the classroom (Stein, Fujisaki, Davis, & MacLean, 2012). Their results indicated the teaching skills, communication practices, and networks of the participants all improved after completing this workshop. The research participants of this study also suggested practical, hands-on course design and student assessment training that could be bundled into one day workshops.

Faculty Learning Communities

The fifth recommended development strategy are faculty learning communities. In these learning communities, faculty could meet to discuss their teaching related readings and experiences (Grierson et al., 2012). This research confirmed that faculty valued a learning community and reported that participation in this community advanced their teaching expertise, communication skills, and teaching network. Faculty learning communities also increased faculty awareness of students, engagement with the college, collaboration with peers, completion rates of teaching professional development, and improved relationships with students (Jackson, Stebleton, & Laanan, 2013).

Stewart (2014) proposed that learning communities must begin with a faculty needs assessment, coaching on team dynamics, and have ongoing interaction. Furthermore, learning communities must focus on student learning, instructional design, and student assessment. Importantly, learning communities must be aligned with the

institutional goals, be supported by empirical data, and continually require faculty evaluation and reflection.

The learning communities will be hosted by the Organizational Learning Centre. The learning communities would afford the faculty an opportunity to share best practices, coach their peers, and ask questions (Grierson et al., 2012). Faculty members who have been identified by their peers and academic chair as subject matter experts will host the learning communities. Research participants in this study identified interests in working with their peers and developing recognized expert status to advance course design and student assessment strategies.

Learning Strategists

The sixth recommended development component is faculty engagement with learning strategists. Faculty who engaged with these learning strategists acquired further teaching and learning knowledge and skills than minimally engaged faculty (McKenna, Yalvac, & Light, 2009). Additionally, minimally engaged faculty were more teacher-focused whereas engaged faculty were most likely to adopt student-centered teaching strategies. This recommended development component is in accordance with this research whereby the participants requested one-on-one training from an expert.

Potential Resources and Existing Supports

There are ample resources and supports for this project. First, the college administration is interested and invested in the outcomes of this project. Next, there is an Organizational Learning Centre already in place to support faculty professional

development. Finally, the faculty collective agreement allows for 10 days of professional development per year.

Potential Barriers

Colleges must be cognizant of potential barriers to faculty completing this professional development. These barriers include the time and effort for the college administration and faculty to complete this training, insufficient teaching and learning mentors, and inadequate funds committed to this faculty development (Gubbins, 2014). There are two central barriers to this project. One barrier is the college administration who would be tasked with going beyond stated support and building this professional development into the operational plans and budget. Notably, this would be in line with the strategic plan which speaks to ongoing employee development (Students' Community College, 2012). A second barrier would be faculty resistance to this professional development policy. This barrier could be offset with a communication strategy, changes agents, and reference to the collective agreement.

Proposed Implementation and Timetable

There are six key steps upon completion of this project. First, the researcher must meet with the stakeholders to share the outcomes of the research project. The stakeholders include marketing and management faculty, the department chair and dean, human resources, and the Organizational Learning Centre manager.

Next, the researcher will need to work with Human Resources to build a cross-disciplinary team to implement the proposed faculty professional development policy beginning Fall 2015. This team would include faculty, chairs, union representation, and

human resources practitioners. Drafting the policy would be anticipated to take all of the Fall 2015 semester. Once the policy was drafted it would need to be approved and adopted by the college administration. The college approval process would be expected to take the Spring 2016 semester.

The third step of this implementation will be to ensure all required resources are available. These resources include faculty and chair training, required technology, and faculty release time. This planning would be required to be completed as soon as the policy was approved in order to be reflected in the 2016-2017 budget. This is pivotal to the implementation of this policy and offerings as these research participants referenced the need for release time allocated to the SWFs to complete this training.

Next a communications plan must be designed and launched to inform all stakeholders of this policy. Summer 2016 would see the cross-disciplinary team build a communications plan to be launched Fall 2016 to inform all stakeholders of this policy. Communications would include the college management team, college intranet, employee portal, and email. This communications step is central to offsetting the research participants' lack of awareness of the current college development offerings.

The training offerings must then be designed and beta-tested with a random sample of the Students' Community College full time faculty. As the trainings are largely developed and would need refinement, these changes would be expected to be completed across Fall 2016. These changes would be completed by the organizational learning department. These revised offerings would then be beta-tested Winter 2017.

That would then prepare for the launch of the live delivery of these course design and student assessment professional development offerings.

The final step of this project implementation is the evaluation. The researcher, Human Resources and Organizational Learning Centre departments would evaluate this plan by way of data collection from the faculty who completed this training. Feedback would include faculty perspectives of the training format, scheduling, learning goals, and relevance to their course design and student assessment practices to then correct any program deficiencies and modify the training (Chi Yan, 2014).

Roles and Responsibilities of Students and Others

There are limited responsibilities of students in this project. Students would only be tasked with completing course evaluation at the end of each course to provide feedback on the quality of course design and student assessments (Chi Yan, 2014). Faculty would be responsible to complete this professional development. Academic chairs would be responsible to become familiar with the development offerings, meet with faculty to plan for the completion of this training, ensure this training was documented to their SWFs within the collective agreement, and link this training to the faculty performance management system. Human Resources would be responsible for maintaining the human resources files for faculty in terms of the professional development completed. A sizable responsibility would lie with the Organizational Learning Centre. This department would be tasked with the re-design and delivery of this faculty training.

Conclusion

This project may be important as education and the broader community are closely linked. Education may be a vehicle for social change (McArthur, 2010). Education may be viewed as a means to provide social justice—of which college faculty assume a central role (Ness, George, Turner, & Bolgatz, 2010). Furthermore, faculty who participate in teaching and learning professional development develop a heightened awareness and commitment to build social justice principles into the courses they teach (Ness et al., 2010). In the larger context, well trained college graduates may more effectively contribute to the Canadian economy (Hardy et al., 2010). With a skilled workforce, a vibrant Canadian economy will best position Canada to be competitive in an ever-changing global economy and be a contributing member to the broader international community.

Appendix B

Consent Form

You are invited to take part in a study of community college faculty participation in teaching and learning professional development practices. This form is part of a process called “informed consent” to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

This study entitled, Ontario Community College Faculty and Teaching and Learning Professional Development is being conducted by a researcher named Carol Ann Samhaber, as part of her doctoral project at Walden University. You may already know Ms. Samhaber as a [REDACTED], but this study is separate from that role.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to understand community college faculty participation in teaching and learning professional development practices. Interviews will be done by Carol Ann Samhaber who will record them and then analyze and interpret the data.

Procedures:

School of Business fulltime marketing and management faculty are invited to participate in this research as they are anticipated to offer insights to the research questions. This research will include interviews with faculty, lasting about 45-60 minutes. These interviews will be audio recorded. Also each participant will be asked to provide feedback to the researcher concerning their own findings, taking about 15-20 minutes.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to answer some open-ended questions. Here are some sample questions:

1. What motivates faculty to complete course design and student assessment professional development?
2. What would make course design and student assessment professional development satisfying for faculty?
3. What factors impact faculty decisions to complete professional development?

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This study is voluntary. No one will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to participate now, you can still change your mind during or after the study. You may stop at any time.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Being in this type of study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as stress or becoming upset. However, being in this study would not pose risk to your safety or well-being. The study’s potential benefit is an

increased understanding of faculty perspectives concerning teaching and learning professional development.

Payment:

There will be no payment, thank you gifts, or reimbursements provided to participants in this study.

Privacy:

Any information you provide will be kept confidential. The researcher will not use your personal information for any purposes outside of this research project. Also, the researcher will not include your name or anything else that could identify you in the study reports.

Data will be kept secure by coded interview responses in a password-protected electronic database. Data will be kept for a period of at least five years, as required by the university. The data will be shared with college administrators in aggregate form only with no names, identifiers, or direct quotes.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher via email at carolann.samhaber@waldenu.edu.

As well, you may contact the Principal Investigator Dr. William Shecket at 206-718-5539 or William.shecket@waldenu.edu.

If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call Dr. Leilani Endicott. She is the Walden University representative who can discuss this with you. Her phone number is 1-800-925-3368, extension 1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is **02-03-15-0288166 and it expires on February 2, 2016.**

You may also talk privately about your rights as a participant with the [REDACTED] Research Ethics Board [REDACTED]

Please print or save this consent form for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. By replying to this email with the words "I consent," I understand that I am agreeing to the terms described above.

Appendix C

Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that Carol Ann Samhaber successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course “Protecting Human Research Participants”.

Date of completion: 02/19/2014

Certification Number: 1408574

Appendix D

Interview Questions

1. How would you describe the issues concerning course design and student assessment professional development?

Please explain how these issues keep you from completing this training?

How could these issues be addressed so you would complete this training?

2. What relevance to your professional practice do you perceive to completing course design and student assessment professional development?

How could this training be made more relevant to your course design?

How could this training be made more relevant to your student assessments?

3. What motivates you to complete course design and student assessment professional development?

How do your students influence your motivation to complete this training?

How do your faculty peers influence your motivation to complete this training?

How does your department chair influence your motivation to complete this training?

Explain how a human resources policy would influence your motivation to complete this training.

Please explain how the performance management process influences your motivation to complete this training?

Please explain your accountability to complete this professional development?

4. What would make course design and student assessment professional development satisfying for you?

Please explain why or why not professional growth gained from completing professional development is satisfying for you?

How is the peer recognition gained from completing professional development satisfying for you?

How would a college reward mechanism for completing professional development be satisfying for you?

5. What are the positive gains you perceive for student engagement and learning from completing course design and student assessment professional development?

Explain how you could envision students being more engaged in your courses if you completed this training?

How could you foresee students' learning and their grades improving in your courses if you completed this training?

Why or why not could you foresee fewer student queries or challenges of their assessment grades in your courses if you completed this training?

6. What role does the College administration such as the department chair play in your decision to complete course design and student assessment professional development?

Please explain how you would you build an individualized training program with your department chair?

Please explain how you would perceive a mandated professional development plan?

7. Please how these factors impact your decision to complete professional development?