

## **Professional Development: Designing Initiatives to Meet the Needs of Online Faculty**

Marquita Elliott, Grand Canyon University, Phoenix, Arizona, USA

Nicole Rhoades, Grand Canyon University, Phoenix, Arizona, USA

Christina M. Jackson, University of Nebraska, Kearney, Nebraska, USA

B. Jean Mandernach, Grand Canyon University, Phoenix, Arizona, USA

### **Abstract**

The increasing prevalence of online courses mandates an examination of the similarities – and differences – in the faculty training and development needs of those teaching online. With institutions facing increasingly limited resources, there is a need to prioritize faculty development initiatives that will encourage faculty participation. An examination of interest, attendance and completion rates of faculty development initiatives targeting online faculty revealed no distinct preferences in relation to the focus or format of programs offered. The authors recommend offering flexibility and diversity in faculty development initiatives to accommodate the disparate needs of a remote, heterogeneous faculty population; as such, a sample needs assessment is offered to help guide faculty development programming to support online teaching.

**Keywords:** Professional development, training and development, faculty development initiatives, faculty participation in teaching online, faculty online teaching preferences

### **INTRODUCTION**

The integration of faculty development programming within higher education is

imperative to enhance faculty-teaching strategies with the ultimate goal of fostering increased student learning. The value of professional development is intensified at the postsecondary level as most faculty have extensive training in their academic discipline, but have little – or no – preparatory training on the relevant pedagogical or andragogical approaches necessary to effectively teach their content expertise. The increasing prevalence of online courses mandates an examination of the similarities – and differences – in the needs of faculty teaching online compared to their face-to-face counterparts.

Although there is considerable research examining the impact of various types of professional development programming across the K-12, community college, and university level, research on attendance and participation for these faculty development initiatives is scarce. Faced with budget cuts and shrinking support for professional development, it is imperative that institutions invest their limited resources in the faculty development initiatives that will produce the greatest gains. The purpose of this study is to examine preferences for faculty teaching online courses to engage in optional faculty development initiatives as a function of the focus and format of programming.

### **Faculty Development Literature**

Faculty development programming is prevalent at most colleges and universities. Generally, initiatives offered are in a face-to-face format as optional events for faculty to self-register at their own discretion (Calderon, Ginsberg & Ciabocchi, 2012; Daly & Dee, 2009; Grant, 2004; Hixon, Barczyk, Buckenmeyer & Feldman, 2011; Hornum & Asprakis, 2007; Kane, 2003; Kukulska-Hulme, 2012; Lackey, 2011; Meyer, 2014; Meyer & Murrell, 2014; Ragan, Bigatel, Kennan & Dillon, 2012; Vaill & Testori, 2012). Since faculty cannot benefit from programs that they do not attend, it is imperative for institutions to dedicate limited

resources toward the development and implementation of initiatives that are most likely to draw a faculty audience. Faculty development initiatives can be classified according to two broad dimensions: 1) the format of the initiative; and 2) the focus of the programming. The format of faculty development initiatives ranges from formal events (i.e., workshops or panel discussions) to informal collaboration opportunities (i.e., meetings to share questions, concerns, and problem solving techniques within their perspective teaching fields) (Hornum & Asprakis, 2007). The format can be further delineated by the mode (i.e., face-to-face, online, synchronous, asynchronous, one-time, recurring, etc.) in which the programming is offered. Complementing the variety of programming formats, there is a wide range of potential topics relevant to faculty development. Programming may focus on: 1) disciplinary content (e.g., critical thinking in psychology); 2) practical pedagogical/andragogical techniques (e.g., flipped classroom); 3) theoretical approaches (e.g., transformative learning); 4) institutional expectations (e.g., LMS training); or 5) specific faculty populations (e.g., new faculty). This diversity in programming format and focus combine to produce a countless range of possibilities for faculty development initiatives. Recognizing most faculty development organizations have limited funding and resources, it is essential to carefully determine both the focus and format of faculty development programming to ensure that faculty will be interested in, and able to attend, the limited number of initiatives that will be offered.

Interestingly, despite the cost-benefit implications involved in planning, creating and coordinating faculty development activities, research rarely provides a metric of the attendance statistics. While attendance alone does not provide an indicator of the effectiveness of the faculty development initiative, it is clear that faculty receive no benefit from faculty development initiatives that they elect not to attend. A faculty member's choice to attend (or not attend)

optional professional development programming is driven by two primary issues: 1) interest in the topic; and 2) scheduling availability. First, and foremost, faculty members have to be interested in the topic of the programming. If interest is established, then the choice to participate becomes a matter of scheduling. Offering initiatives at a time and format amenable to faculty schedules will increase participation as scheduling or format barriers limit participation. As such, both the focus and format are necessary, but not independently sufficient, components of designing effective faculty development initiatives.

### **Focus of Faculty Development Programming**

For faculty development to be effective, it must “address the principles and practices of teaching at the individual, departmental, curricular, and institutional levels, facilitating communication within and across departments” (Hill, Soo La, & Lageux, 2007, p. 17). This broad scope presents a plethora of potential topics amenable to professional development initiatives. Within this range, the focus of professional development topics can be grouped according to three broad purposes: theoretical, applied, or institutional. Theoretical initiatives explore trends in higher education or a generalized understanding of postsecondary teaching. Applied programming goes further to emphasize practical teaching strategies or pedagogical approaches. Institutional initiatives highlight university policies, procedures guidelines and expectations.

Ideally, faculty development programming would include initiatives targeting each of these focus levels, but the reality of restricted budgets and limited resources mandates selective inclusion of programming that is most likely to be successful. Research highlights that faculty are more likely to value initiatives that they can actively apply in their classrooms (Steinert, McLeod, Boillat, Meterissian, Elizov, & Macdona, 2009), but provide little further guidance

beyond this applied emphasis. As explained by Steinert, et al., (2010), faculty desire professional development workshops which “enables personal and professional growth; learning and self-improvement are valued; workshop topics are viewed as relevant to teachers’ needs; the opportunity to network with colleagues is appreciated” (p. 900).

### **Format of Faculty Development Programming**

If professional development programming is going to attract participants, the focus must, first and foremost, be of interest to the faculty member. Beyond ensuring a relevant focus, research highlights the pivotal role of format in the success of any given faculty development initiative. As explained by Steinert et al. (2009) “logistical issues appeared to be greater deterrents to participation than faculty development goals, content or strategies” (p. 42). Even if a faculty member is interested and invested in the focus of programming, lack of time and scheduling constraints present barriers to participation (Amburgey, 2006; Thomas, Karr, Kelly, & McBane, 2012).

When examining the literature on the effectiveness of faculty development initiatives, it is important to note that the vast majority of studies focus exclusively on programming geared at campus-based faculty. Thus, it is not surprising that the limited available research finds a preferences for face-to-face programming (Felder & Brent, 2010) and face-to-face faculty development initiatives include conferences, workshops, seminars, teleconferences, electronic media, mini-courses, mentoring programs and mentorships, sabbaticals, and consultations (Boucher, et al., 2006). Within these traditional approaches, Felder and Brent (2010) indicate that success of professional development initiatives is dependent upon faculty involvement and group collaboration using the ‘practice what they preach’ model that promotes interactive exploration and creates opportunities for discussion. Furthermore, when faculty development workshops

promote hands-on exploration and problem solving, there is a higher likelihood of faculty implementing these practices into their classrooms (Felder & Brent, 2010). These findings were echoed by Carbonaro, Snart, and Goodale (2002) who add that in addition to being relevant and interactive, the effective professional development initiatives offer opportunities for follow-up and individualized tutoring.

The potential for interactive, collaborative development programming is not limited exclusively to face-to-face settings as modern interactive technologies (i.e., video conferencing, webinars, etc.) allow for synchronous interaction and discussion of geographically-dispersed faculty. Furthermore, there is a range of web-based approaches (i.e., e-learning, online self-paced workshops, web-based tutorials, online discussion, blogs, recorded discussions, debates, and written material) that foster interactive learning in an asynchronous format. Thus, while research has established that applied, collaborative engagement is essential to the success of faculty development programming; there is little information to guide the format in which collaborative programming should be offered – face-to-face or online.

Research suggests that although faculty may prefer synchronous development programs, they are more likely to select asynchronous development opportunities due to scheduling constraints associated with face-to-face traditional faculty initiatives (Dailey-Hebert, Mandernach, Donnelly-Sallee & Norris, 2014; Nellis, Hosman, King & Armstead, 2002). Reflecting this concern, faculty report a lack of time is one of the greatest barriers to participating in faculty development initiatives (Dailey-Hebert, Mandernach, Donnelly-Sallee & Norris, 2014; Steinert, McLeod, Boillat, Meterissian, Elizov, & Macdona, 2009). Likewise, the most successful programs are flexible and allow faculty to complete development activities at

their own pace and schedule (Dailey-Hebert, Mandernach, Donnelly-Sallee & Norris, 2014; Horunum & Asprakis, 2007).

### **The Needs of Online Faculty**

Although there are many professional development topics that benefit both face-to-face and online faculty, online faculty have additional needs and face unique challenges. Professional development initiatives need to reflect the diverse needs of online faculty. By delivering online professional development to online teachers, best practices can be explored and modeled in the online classroom to improve levels of engagement, and student satisfaction. If online instructors do not use the methodologies learned through professional development to better meet the needs of online learners, this can have negative implications within the classroom environment, which can cause a decrease of student satisfaction (Barczyk, et al., 2011).

When examining the literature regarding professional development for online faculty, much of the literature focuses on format. Format differs from institution to institution. Various formats included: training that could be delivered via CD or online (Donelli, Mandernach & Dailey, 2007); using Blackboard for new faculty orientation, giving faculty the opportunity to use the LMS from the students' perspective (House Clayton, 2007) or using online forums to establish online faculty support and mentoring through communities of practice (CoPs) (Brooks, 2010). Programs where faculty, trained in instructional design principles, train other faculty may also be used (Barczyk, Buckenmeyer, Feldman & Hixon, 2011).

Institutions must consider best practices in online instruction when creating professional development activities. Best practices utilized by Syracuse University's School of Information Studies as presented by Lorenzetti (2009) include:

- A “playground” where faculty members can explore and become familiarized with the institution’s learning management system.
- Access to distance learning courses that are considered to be successful by the institution
- A new faculty orientation
- Asynchronous training
- Mentoring from experienced faculty members
- Virtual brown bag seminars, and
- A knowledge base with access to answers to frequently asked questions

Whatever format or best practice used, it must foster an environment where faculty feel supported; administrative policies, organizational structure and institutional zeitgeist must be such that online adjunct faculty feel they are integral, respected member of the academic community. Faculty needs change over time; as such, institutional faculty development initiatives must shift focus in response to maturing faculty needs (Orr, Williams & Pennington, 2009).

Another consideration in offering professional development online is the growing number of adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty have training in their professional field, but may lack the experience or expertise to effectively teach online. Providing training and support specifically geared towards adjunct faculty benefits both the individual and institution (Lorenzetti, 2007; Offerman, 2010). In addition, adjunct faculty may require training in the mission and values of the institution to ensure their teaching adequately represents and conveys that university’s mission (Dailey-Hebert, Mandernach, Donnelly-Sallee & Norris, 2014).



## **Prioritizing Faculty Development Resources**

In an era of limited funding and increasing accountability, institutions must allocate limited resources to the faculty development initiatives that are most likely to be successful. Recognizing that participation in faculty development initiatives fosters faculty confidence, cohesiveness, and instructional quality (Haviland, Shin, & Turley, 2010); it is essential that the focus and format of programming encourage widespread faculty participation (Thomas et al., 2012). As such, the purpose of this study is to examine online faculty preferences for participating in optional faculty development initiatives as a function of the focus and format of programming.

## **METHODS**

An analysis of faculty development programming targeting online faculty was conducted to examine online faculty preferences for the mode of professional development programming. All faculty development programming offered online over a single year was included in the analysis. We examined interest rates, attendance ratios, and completion rates as a function of the topic of the programming (theoretical, applied, or institutional) and the format of programming (open, non-facilitated or time-limited, facilitated). Prior to analysis, the study was approved via an expedited IRB review.

The target institution has a centralized faculty development department that provides training and support for fulltime and adjunct faculty teaching in face-to-face, online and blended formats. The institution has a medium-sized campus student population led by a traditional face-to-face faculty body as well as a large online student population. Online courses are taught by fulltime online faculty (who teach from a centralized campus location) as well as a large proportion of adjunct faculty who work remotely. All initial training to teach online is conducted

via asynchronous workshops; faculty development programming designed as ongoing support for faculty teaching online is conducted in both synchronous and asynchronous formats.

A between-groups analysis was conducted on thirty-seven different professional development workshops that were offered in an online format over a single academic year (including fall and spring semesters). Faculty development initiatives by focus and format are listed in Table 1. All faculty development events were advertised via regular email announcements. In addition, a complete schedule of events was available on the university professional development website. Attendances at all events were optional and voluntary with no external incentives for attendance.

Table 1

*Number of Online Faculty Development Initiatives by Focus and Format*

		Format		
		Open, Non-Facilitated	Time-limited, Facilitated	Total
Focus	Theoretical	4	2	6
	Applied	9	14	23
	Institutional	6	2	8
	Total	19	18	37

## Procedure

Each faculty development program or workshop was categorized according to its primary focus and format of delivery. The final content of each workshop was analyzed to determine key focus. Categorizations were adapted from the primary faculty development focuses identified by Dailey-Hebert, Mandernach, Donnelly-Sallee and Norris (2014); categories are as follows:

- Theoretical – Theoretical programming emphasizes trends in higher education or a generalized understanding of postsecondary teaching. Programming that focused on generalized understanding with no integration of applied technology was a key factor

when assigning a theoretical designation. For example, the workshop of “Transforming Students into Self-Regulated Learners” provided an overview of transformational and self-regulated learning, but did not integrate specific guidance on teaching practices or instructional behavior.

- Applied – Applied programming highlighted actionable teaching strategies. Faculty development initiatives that provided specific guidance on instructional behavior were categorized as applied. If an initiative provided both theoretical and pedagogical information, it was categorized as applied. For example, the workshop on “Best Practices in Blended Learning” provided a high-level analysis of the research in this area along with specific instructional strategies to maximize learning in a blended classroom format.
- Institutional – Institutional programming focused on understanding university policies and procedures. For example, the workshop on “Campus Peer Reviewer Training” focused on educating faculty about the criteria and procedure for online teaching evaluations.

Faculty development programming was offered in two different online formats including:

1) open, non-facilitated (open-paced, non-structured workshops that could be completed by faculty at their own time and pace); and 2) time-limited, facilitated (structured online workshop that is completed during specified three-day timeframes with a facilitator and peer group).

Participation in faculty development programming was then analyzed to determine differences in interest rate, attendance ratios and completion rates. The dependent variables are: 1) interest rates (interest rates represent the number and proportion of faculty that registered to attend each faculty development event); 2) attendance ratios (attendance ratios indicate the proportion of faculty that attended- if online, attendance was determined by initial login to the

event- if they had initially registered for the event); and 3) completion rates (completion rates represent the proportion of faculty that attended the event and successfully completed all required activities or interactions).

## Results

A series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to determine differences in participation based on interest rates, attendance ratios, and completion rates. A level of  $< .05$  was used as level of significance for all ANOVAs.

Interest Rates: An ANOVA was conducted to examine faculty interest as a function of the focus and format of the online faculty development initiative. Findings revealed no significant interaction [ $F(2, 36) = 1.002, p = .379$ ] or for main effects for focus [ $F(2, 36) = .404, p = .671$ ] or format [ $F(1, 36) = .855, p = .362$ ]. The means and standard deviations are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

### *Mean Faculty Interest in Online Faculty Development Programming by Focus and Format*

		Format					
		Open, Non-Facilitated		Time-Limited, Facilitated		Total	
		Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Focus	Theoretical	26.50	4	38.00	2	30.33	6
	Applied	81.33	9	80.86	14	81.04	23
	Institutional	170.17	6	14.5	2	131.25	8
	Total	97.84	19	68.72	18	83.68	37

Attendance Ratios: An ANOVA was conducted to examine faculty attendance ratios as a function of the focus and format of the online faculty development initiative. Findings revealed no significant interaction [ $F(2, 36) = .213, p = .809$ ] or for main effects for focus [ $F(2, 36) = .120, p = .887$ ] or format [ $F(1, 36) = .390, p = .537$ ]. The means and standard deviations are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

*Mean Attendance Ratios in Online Faculty Development Programming by Focus and Format*

		Format					
		Open, Non-Facilitated		Time-Limited, Facilitated		Total	
		Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Focus	Theoretical	79.84%	4	79.32%	2	79.67%	6
	Applied	77.82%	9	76.71%	14	77.15%	23
	Institutional	80.14%	6	71.50%	2	77.98%	8
	Total	78.98%	19	76.42%	18	77.74%	37

Completion Rates: An ANOVA was conducted to examine faculty completion rates as a function of the focus and format of the online faculty development initiative. Findings revealed no significant interaction [ $F(2, 36) = .006, p = .994$ ] or for main effects for focus [ $F(2, 36) = .142, p = .868$ ] or format [ $F(1, 36) = .542, p = .467$ ]; the means and standard deviations are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

*Mean Completion Rates in Online Faculty Development Programming by Focus and Format*

		Format					
		Open, Non-Facilitated		Time-Limited, Facilitated		Total	
		Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Focus	Theoretical	84.19%	4	91.18%	2	86.52%	6
	Applied	78.64%	9	85.66%	14	82.91%	23
	Institutional	81.64%	6	91.18%	2	84.02%	8
	Total	80.76%	19	86.88%	18	83.74%	37

## Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to examine preferences of function and format for faculty teaching online to engage in optional faculty development initiatives at the institution used in this study. The results of the study reveal that there are no significant interactions or main effects for

focus and format of the faculty development programs offered to online faculty who participated in this study.

Institutions and their faculty benefit from active engagement in professional development initiatives. As funding for faculty development initiatives is limited, institutions must focus on delivering quality initiatives that will effectively reach the highest number of faculty in order to realize a return on their investment. The first step is to examine the barriers limiting participation for a particular faculty population (Thomas, et al., 2012); once these barriers are identified, faculty development programming must be designed (both focus and format) to ensure that online adjuncts are able- and motivated- to participate. For example, Thomas et al. (2012) found that the greatest barriers for clinicians to participate in scholarly activity were: lack of dedicated time, colleagues' lack of interest, lack of collaborators, lack of participants and limited access to resources. As explained by the authors, the issue was not a lack of programming to support scholarly activity, but rather that existing barriers limited the ability for clinicians to take advantage of any resources offered. Thus developing professional development that is of interest to the faculty member is a priority. Moreover, faculty interest may take several different forms. As previously mentioned, Steinert, et al., state that (2010), faculty desire professional development workshops which foster personal and professional growth, value learning and self-improvement, are relevant to current needs, and provide an opportunity to network with colleagues.

Our findings revealed that whether the focus was theoretical, applied, or institutional, there was attendance from all types of faculty in the different development programs offered among the different formats provided. Of the three different focus types of programs offered, a mean average of 83.68% faculty members were interested in signing up for the program. These

findings validate that the university is offering an appropriate number of focus workshops and development programs that are of interest to the faculty.

Faculty members must attend development initiatives to receive their benefits. While there are several reasons faculty members do not attend, time and scheduling appear to be the most problematic barriers (Dailey-Hebert, Mandernach, Donnelly-Sallee & Norris, 2014; Steinert, et al., 2009; Ambergey, 2006; Thomas, Karr, Kelly, & McBane, 2012). Barriers and perceived barriers, such as time, scheduling, must be eliminated or adjusted. Faculty are more likely to select asynchronous development opportunities over synchronous development opportunities due to scheduling constraints (Nellis, Hosman, King & Armstead, 2002). While this finding is not new, when comparing the preference for asynchronous opportunities with the desire for financial incentives, it raises a host of questions about the necessary financial (or other tangible incentives) that would be required to override or mediate the scheduling preference.

Although barriers exist, faculty still successfully complete programs for which they register. Our findings revealed that no less than 77.15% of faculty attended a development program they signed up for and no less than a mean of 78.64% of faculty completed the program(s) they signed up to attend. This indicates a high level of faculty investment in seeking (and attending) programming that meets their needs and interests; thus, the high completion rates across all types indicates a need for diversity in programming to meet all faculty needs.

Professional development for online faculty needs to reflect their diverse backgrounds, experience and expertise. By emulating the environments and technologies online faculty will use, faculty have the opportunity to explore and model their online classroom environments to meet standards and best practices. Poor online teaching, or online teaching which is conducted

no differently from what occurs in a classroom setting, can jeopardize student satisfaction, instructional effectiveness, and perceptions of the university (Barczyk, et al., 2011).

As indicated by the findings, there is no distinct preference for either the focus or format of faculty development programming for online faculty. This suggests that universities may benefit from offering a diverse range of faculty development programs to fit the needs and preferences of various faculty sub-populations. Flexibility and variety in faculty development programming ensures access to resources for all faculty. Institutions could benefit from putting resources into professional development that is delivered online.

Recognizing the need to prioritize initiatives with the greatest impact, it is important to examine the utility of faculty development programming in relation to the investment required to offer it. The institution offered thirty-seven professional development workshops during the academic year. A mean average of 83.68% of faculty indicated an interest in the type of programming offered. A mean average of 77.74% attended the events for which they had registered. A mean average of 83.74% of attendees that attended an event went on to successfully complete all required activities or interventions. Based on the high rates of interest, attendance and completion, it appears that the university is effectively leveraging faculty development resources into initiatives with high likelihood of success. As such, while the findings of the current study did not indicate an overwhelming preference for a particular focus or format, it highlighted that the investment required to support faculty development initiatives was offset by the high usage rates.

Although this study is useful for understanding preferences for faculty teaching online to engage in optional faculty development initiatives, future research is needed to address limitations of the current investigation. Key limitations include small sample size and lack of



causal information to explain the observed faculty behaviors. As the current investigation only examined preferences for a specified time period, future research should expand the sampling to include a greater diversity of faculty. In addition, future research should examine the reasons as to why faculty may or may not complete a development program for which they had registered. With approximately half of the faculty successfully completing the programs and half not, it would be useful to examine differences between these two faculty groups to account for the differential investment in faculty development initiatives. Not only would it be useful to pinpoint factors that lead to successful engagement in faculty development (to attempt to emulate this motivation with other faculty), but exploring barriers to successful completion would also allow for more targeted future programming to meet the needs of this faculty population.

The results of the study indicate that universities should provide variety in the focus and format of faculty development programs offered to meet the diverse needs of online faculty. Recognizing that online faculty are a heterogeneous population, it is important to offer a range of programming to meet the unique needs of each sub-group. Providing flexibility and variety in the types of programs offered ensures that universities are supporting a diverse faculty population in an efficient and effective manner.

Likewise, it is important to note that variety alone is not sufficient. For faculty development initiatives to provide satisfactory return on investment, it is essential that programming is created in direct relation to the ever-changing needs of faculty. Faculty development personnel must work in close collaboration with administrators, instructional trainers, online learning programs and faculty representatives to tailor the format and focus of programming in relation to the unique context of the target faculty group. Needs assessments should be regularly conducted to determine the most effective faculty programming for the target

faculty during the target time period; issues to address in a needs assessment include: 1) specific instructional and/or pedagogical challenges for which faculty seek additional support; 2) administrative or institutional processes that need clarification or support to ensure instructional effectiveness; 3) technological tools, applications or platforms that may increase instructional efficiency and/or effectiveness; 4) challenges with course, curriculum or institutional understanding; 5) desire for increased networking with colleagues, administration or institutional initiatives; 6) preferences for the format, timing, duration and frequency of faculty development programming; and 7) barriers that prevent attendance, effectiveness and successful completion of faculty development initiatives. Appendix A provided a sample needs assessment to help faculty development personnel to determine the most appropriate professional development opportunities to fit the unique needs of each institution. When allocating limited resources, it is essential that faculty development initiatives targeting online instructors are offered in direct relation to faculty needs and preferences.

## **CONCLUSION**

As the number of online courses continues to increase, so does the need for institutions to effectively support faculty teaching in this instructional mode. The growing body of research on this topic reflects institutional challenges in identifying strategies to support faculty teaching online. But, as also reflected in the current literature, the needs of faculty teaching solely online varies considerably from their face-to-face counterparts; institutions must adjust faculty development strategies to reflect not only the pedagogical considerations of the online classroom, but the theoretical and practical needs online faculty who may have limited connection to traditional higher education or who may be working in geographic separation from the campus. While a one-size fits all solution is desirable, the key to effectively meet the needs

of online faculty rests in tailoring faculty development programming in response to institutional needs assessments that gauge needs, preferences and desires of faculty teaching online.

## REFERENCES

- Amburgey, V. (2006). One model of professional development for higher education faculty. *Computers in the Schools, 23*(3/4), 105-113. doi:10.1300/J025v23n0307
- Barczyk, C., Buckenmeyer, J., Feldman, L., & Hixon, E. (2011). Assessment of a university-based distance education mentoring program from a quality management perspective. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 19*(1), 5-24.  
doi:10.1080/13611267.2011.543567
- Boucher, B. A., Chyka, P. J., Fitzgerald Jr., W. L., Hak, L. J., Miller, D. D., Parker, R. B., & ... Gourley, D. R. (2006). A comprehensive approach to faculty development. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 70*(2), 1-6.
- Brooks, C. F. (2010). Toward 'hybridised' faculty development for the twenty-first century: Blending online communities of practice and face-to-face meetings in instructional and professional support programmes. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 47*(3), 261-270. doi:10.1080/14703297.2010.498177
- Calderon, O., Ginsberg, A., & Ciabocchi, L. (2012). Multidimensional assessment of pilot blended learning programs: Maximizing program effectiveness based on student and faculty feedback. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 16*(4), 23-37.
- Carbonaro, M., Snart, F. & Goodale, C. (2002). Faculty of education professional development. In D. Willis et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference 2002* (pp. 634-638). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.

- Dailey-Hebert, A., Mandernach, B. J., Donnelly-Sallee, E., & Norris, V. R. (2014). Expectations, motivations, and barriers to professional development: Perspectives from adjunct instructors teaching online. *Journal of Faculty Development, 28*, 67-82.
- Daly, C.J., & Dee, J.R. (2009). Innovative models for organizing faculty development programs: Pedagogical reflexivity, student learning empathy, and faculty agency. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, 7*(1), 1-22.
- Donnelly, E., Mandernach, B., & Dailey, A. (2007). Development on demand: Professional enhancement resources for a geographically-diverse faculty. *Distance Education Report, 11*(11), 5-6.
- Felder, R.M. & Brent, R. (2010). The national effective teaching institute: Assessment of impact and implications for faculty development. *Journal of Engineering Education, 99*(2), 121-134.
- Grant, M.M. (2004). Learning to teach with the web: Factors influencing teacher education faculty. *Internet and Higher Education, 7*, 329-341.
- Haviland, D., Shin, S., & Turley, S. (2010). Now I'm ready: The impact of a professional development initiative on faculty concerns with program assessment. *Innovative Higher Education, 35*(4), 261-275. doi:10.1007/s10755-010-9140-1
- Hill, L., Soo La, K., & Lagueux, R. (2007). Faculty collaboration as faculty development. *Peer Review, 9*(4), 17-19.
- Hixon, E., Barczyk, C., Buckenmeyer, J., & Feldman, L. (2011). Mentoring university faculty to become high quality online educators: A program evaluation. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 14*(5). Retrieved from:

[http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter144/hixon Barczyk Buckenmeyer feldman144.html](http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter144/hixon_Barczyk_Buckenmeyer_feldman144.html)

Hornum, B., & Asprakis, A. (2007). The times they are a-changing: Faculty support mechanisms in a shifting academic landscape. *Peer Review*, 9(4), 20-22.

House C. (2007). Using Blackboard creatively as a new faculty orientation tool. *Academic Leader*, 23(9), 2-3.

Kane, S.A. (2003). Interdisciplinary faculty development seminar: A model for learning emerging technologies while developing interdisciplinary partnerships. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 12(4), 421-430.

Kukulka-Hulme, A. (2012). How should the higher education workforce adapt to advancements in technology for teaching and learning? *Internet and Higher Education*, 15(4), 247-254.

Lackey, K. (2011). Faculty development: An analysis of current and effective training strategies for preparing faculty to teach online. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 14(5). Retrieved from:

<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdle/winter144/lackey144.html>

Lorenzetti, J. (2009). Developing faculty competency in online pedagogy. *Distance Education Report*, 13(18), 5-8.

Marek, K. (2009). Learning to teach online: Creating a culture of support for faculty. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 50(4), 275-292.

Meyer, K.A (2014). An analysis of the research on faculty development for online teaching and identification of new directions. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 17(4). 93-

- Meyer, K. & Murrell, V. (2014). A national study of training content and activities for faculty development for online teaching. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 18(1).
- Nellis, P., Hosman, D., King, J. M., & Armstead, C. (2002). Web-based faculty development using time-revealed scenarios. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2002(120), 27.
- Offerman, D. (2010). Adjunct faculty in online education: Expectations, accountability and quality assurance. *Distance Education Report*, 14(4), 5-7.
- Orr, R., Williams, M. R., & Pennington, K. (2009). Institutional efforts to support faculty in online teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 34(4), 257-268. doi:10.1007/s10755-009-9111-6
- Ragan, L.C., Bigatel, P.M., Kennan, S.S., & Dillon, J.M. (2012). From research to practice: Towards the development of an integrated and comprehensive faculty development program. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Network*, 16(5), 71-86.
- Steinert, Y., McLeod, P. J., Boillat, M., Meterissian, S., Elizov, M., & Macdonald, M. (2009). Faculty development: a 'Field of Dreams'?. *Medical Education*, 43(1), 42-49. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03246.x
- Steinert, Y., Macdonald, M., Boillat, M., Elizov, M., Meterissian, S., Razack, S., & ... McLeod, P. (2010). Faculty development: if you build it, they will come. *Medical Education*, 44(9), 900-907. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03746.x
- Thomas, T., Karr, S., Kelley, K. W., & McBane, S. (2012). Overcoming barriers to scholarly activity in a clinical practice setting. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, 69(6), 465-467. doi:10.2146/ajhp110290

Vaill, A.L., & Testori, P.A. (2012). Orientation, mentoring and ongoing support: A three-tiered approach to online faculty development. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 12(1), 111-120.

## Appendix A

Sample Needs Assessment to Determine Faculty Development Programming  
to Support Online Teaching*Demographic Information*

The following information will be utilized to help us to better understand the background, context and needs of our faculty so that we may provide more targeted faculty development opportunities.

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Gender:

- Male
- Female

Highest degree received:

- Bachelors
- Masters
- Specialist
- Doctorate
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Academic rank:

- Adjunct instructor
- Assistant professor
- Associate professor
- Professor
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

In which modes do you regularly teach? Select all that apply:

- Campus (face-to-face)
- Online
- Blended/hybrid/flipped

How many years have you taught at the college level? \_\_\_\_\_

Of the total years teaching, how many years have you taught in each of the following modes?

Campus: \_\_\_\_\_

Online: \_\_\_\_\_

Blended/hybrid/flipped: \_\_\_\_\_

How many years have you taught at this institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Do you live within 20 miles of the campus?

- Yes



- No

For ADJUNCT faculty only, which of the following best describes your professional position?

- Fulltime faculty at another institution teaching adjunct online for this institution
- Adjunct faculty teaching online at a number of different institutions
- Adjunct faculty teaching only at this institution; not employed elsewhere.
- Working professional teaching adjunct online in addition to regular, fulltime employment

### Teaching Topics:

Indicate your interest in attending faculty development programming that targets each of the following teaching topics.

		Low				High
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Teaching adult learners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Dealing with plagiarism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Integrating active learning strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	Enhancing writing skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	Instructional strategies for international students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Fostering student engagement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Strategies for teaching under-prepared students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	Technology to enhance teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Integrating service learning into the online classroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	Teaching to multiple learning styles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11	Creating a student-centered learning environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12	Personalizing the online learning experience	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13	Strategies to facilitate online discussions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14	Enhancing critical thinking in the online classroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15	Fostering connections with online learners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16	Efficient grading strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17	Web 2.0 tools for the online classroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18	Emergent educational technologies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19	Best practices for online education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20	Classroom assessment techniques	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify):						

### Professional Development Topics:

Indicate your interest in attending faculty development programming that targets each of the following teaching topics.

		Low				High
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Utilization of the learning management system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Orientation to university systems, policies and procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Creating a teaching portfolio	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4	Publishing your research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	Presenting your research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Designing and conducting classroom-based (SoTL) research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Self-assessment of teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	Preventing professional burnout	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Professional time management strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	Organizational strategies to enhance teaching efficiency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11	Tools to increase teaching efficiency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12	Mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify):						

### Format Preferences:

Indicate your interest in attending faculty development programming offered in each of the following formats:

		Low				High
		1	2	3	4	5
Workshops	Face-to-face campus workshops or presentations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Synchronous online workshops, webinars or presentations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Archived recordings of synchronous workshops or presentations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Webinars hosted by professional faculty development organizations (external to the university)					
Group Interaction	Interactive conference calls with multiple participants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Synchronous online chat sessions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Moderated threaded discussions that occur over specified time period	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Moderated threaded discussions that occur with no specified beginning or ending time period	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Professional communities networked via social media (Facebook, LinkedIn, etc)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Online	Facilitator-led asynchronous online courses with lectures, interactive components and threaded discussions for a cohort of faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Self-paced asynchronous online courses with lectures and interactive components but no threaded discussions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Virtual assistants (i.e., avatar-led webquests)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Online &	Informational web pages	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Best practices examples	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	White papers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Multimedia presentations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Emails (newsletters, announcements, etc)					
<input type="radio"/>	Individual consultations on teaching via synchronous interaction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Individual consultations on teaching via email or online communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Peer review of teaching via observation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Peer review of teaching materials via email or online communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify):					

### Scheduling preferences:

With what level of regularity would you participate in faculty development opportunities at your institution (assuming that you are interested in the topic and the schedule permits)?

- Never
- 1 or 2 times per academic year
- 3 to 6 times per academic year
- Once per month
- 2 or 3 times per month
- Weekly

Which format of faculty development opportunities do you prefer?

- Synchronous events that require participation at a scheduled time
- Asynchronous opportunities that can be completed on your own schedule
- Either; the format isn't a factor
- Mixture of both
- Neither; not likely to attend regardless of format

What time of day are you most likely to participate in synchronous faculty development events?

- 7:00am to 10:00am CST
- 10:00am to 1:00pm CST
- 1:00pm to 4:00pm CST
- 4:00pm to 7:00pm CST
- 7:00pm to 10:00pm CST
- None; not likely to participate in synchronous activities

Which day of the week are you most likely to participate in synchronous faculty development events?

- Weekend
- Monday
- Tuesday
- Wednesday
- Thursday
- Friday

### Importance:

Indicate the level of importance for each of the following aspects of professional development:

	Low				High
	1	2	3	4	5

1	Collaboration and conversation with other faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Access to resources and activities that you can complete independently	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Ongoing engagement with faculty development materials	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	Interaction and collaboration with other faculty in same discipline	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	Interaction and collaboration with faculty in other disciplines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Connection with the academic department	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Connection with the university community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	Connect with other online instructors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify):						

**Motivation:**

Indicate to what extent each of the following institutional or intrinsic rewards motivates you to participate in faculty development initiatives:

		Low				High
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Personal interest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Desire to enhance teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Professional satisfaction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	Professional growth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	Monetary compensation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Pay increases as a result of advanced training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Teaching awards	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	Faculty recognition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Professional development certificate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	Scheduling priority	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11	Faculty retention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12	Promotion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13	Funding for externally-sponsored events or conferences	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14	Funding for additional training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15	Access to additional materials or resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16	Free professional memberships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify):						

What is your greatest motivation for participating in faculty development initiatives?

**Barriers:**

Indicate the extent to which each of the following are barriers for your participation in faculty development initiatives:

	Low				High

	1	2	3	4	5	
1	Unaware of faculty development initiatives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2	Scheduling of events	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3	Lack of time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4	Lack of interest in programming topics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5	Dissatisfaction with the mode of programming delivery	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6	Programming topics not relevant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7	Programming topics not timely	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8	No interest in ongoing faculty development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9	Too large of workload	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10	Faculty development participation requires too much time/investment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify):						

What is the greatest barrier that prevents your participation in faculty development initiatives?

Please share any suggestions/requests you have for that may help us to create faculty development programming and initiatives that better serve your needs.