



MAGNA ONLINE SEMINARS

Supplemental Materials

How to Evaluate the Impact of Faculty Development Programs

Thursday, March 17, 2011

Presented by:

Sue Hines

Sue Hines is the director of faculty development at Saint Mary's University of Minnesota and teaches in SMU's Doctor of Education in Leadership program. She has over 26 years of teaching experience in higher education combined with several years of academic administration, consulting, and research. Her research focuses on faculty development programs.



MAGNA

©2011 Magna Publications Inc.

All rights reserved. It is unlawful to duplicate, transfer, or transmit this program in any manner without written consent from Magna Publications.

The information contained in this online seminar is for professional development purposes but does not substitute for legal advice. Specific legal advice should be discussed with a professional attorney.

CASE STUDY: *ABC University*
Teaching and Learning Center

Situational factors:

Type A center with a director and full-time staff dedicated to supporting academic quality.

The center's programs:

Annual new faculty orientation

Monthly brown bag program

Consultation program

Grant program (For teaching and learning projects)

Teaching & Learning workshops program

1st Year Faculty Mentoring program

Large-Course Redesign program (funded by outside grant)

Note: The Large-Course Redesign program is aimed at reducing the student drop-out and fail rate in large introductory freshman courses.

PROGRAMS	EVALUATION LEVEL											
	Participation				Satisfaction				Learning			
	Method	Staff	Timing	Comments	Method	Staff	Timing	Comments	Method	Staff	Timing	Comments
New Faculty Orientation	Online registration	Admin Assist	Every time	Create & post annual report on website	The Event survey	Admin Assist	Post-event	Email eval link with cert. of completion	1. Appl. Exercises 2. The Event survey 3. The Mid-semester follow-up survey	1. Facilitator 2. & 3. A.A.	2. At event 3. The following mid-semester	Meet semesterly with facilitators to debrief on learning outcomes
Teaching Workshops												
Instructional Technology workshops												
Blended Delivery Intensive												
Teaching & Learning Academy												

PROGRAMS:	EVALUATION LEVEL											
	Impact on Teaching				Impact on Student Learning				Impact on Institution			
	Method	Staff	Timing	Comments	Method	Staff	Timing	Comments	Method	Staff	Timing	Comments
New Faculty Orientation	*1. The event survey	Admin. Assist.	1. post-event	1. & 2. Semesterly debriefing with facilitators	-----				-----			
Teaching Workshops	2. The follow up survey		2. the following mid-semester	Review yearly data with fac. dev. cmtee In fall	-----				-----			
Instructional Technology workshops	*1. 2. & 3. Clicker usage 4. Bb usage		3. & 4. yearly		Student survey	Admin. Assist.	Fall 2013					
Blended Delivery Intensive	*1. 2. & 3. Curriculum Committee Focus group	Admin. Assist. 3. Director	3. annually	Review data with fac dev comtee	Compare student ratings & GPAs with like f2f courses	Director & data analyst	After 5 degree programs participate		Compare # of course "Incompletes" & program completion rates with like f2f courses	Director & Data Analyst	1 year after Impact on student learning is determined	
Teaching & Learning Academy	*1. 2. & 3. Teaching Blog		3. weekly throughout the event	Review post event	1. Student survey 2. Program Director survey	Director	Fall 2012					

Evaluation Planning Worksheet

1. Identify the programs you offer with an X
2. ✓ the boxes for each level you wish to evaluate for *each* program
3. Note the timing in the checked boxes for each evaluation

(Ex: every time, semesterly, annually, 2012, etc.)

		EVALUATION LEVELS					
X	PROGRAMS 	Participation	Satisfaction	Learning	Impact on Teaching	Impact on Student Learning	Impact on the Institution
		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Orientation						
	Brown Bags						
	Consultations						
	Grant program						
	Learning Communities						
	Teaching & Learning Workshops						
	Mentor program						
	Course Design Workshops						
	Workshop Intensives						
	Teaching Certificate						
	Teaching Fellows						
	SoTL						
	Faculty Writing						
	Online workshops						
	T.A. program						
	other?						


Evaluation Methods

(Hines 2009 & 2011)

	Methods	Efficiency Strategies
<p>Level I: Participation</p> <p>(Who is participating in the faculty development services?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track attendance • Track usage of online resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use online registration • Develop customized databases • Google Analytics™ for website usage
<p>Level II: Satisfaction</p> <p>(What was the participant's level of satisfaction?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfaction surveys at event • Annual campus-wide satisfaction surveys • Focus groups • Advisory board reviews of resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather data with Student Response Devices (aka Clickers) • Create a standardized online survey through SurveyMonkey® • Create an automated system for emailing the survey link • Focus groups for select programs only
<p>Level III: Learning</p> <p>(Did the participants learn?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application exercises at the event • Open-ended surveys • Post-event follow-up surveys • Pre-post assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Level II strategies • Embed questions into satisfaction surveys
<p>Level IV: Impact on teaching</p> <p>(Did participants change their practices as a result of the program?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant reports that include changes in teaching • Presentations reporting changes in teaching for funded projects • Solicit self-reports of changes in teaching through surveys, emails, interviews, or focus groups • Student ratings • Student surveys or in-class feedback • Pre-post classroom observations • Pre-post review of teaching products • Faculty-created critical incident analysis • Teaching portfolios • Experimental studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine satisfaction and behavior change inquiries into one online survey • Gather pre-post data for consultation services using a coding system for anonymity • Ask the faculty member to provide measures indicating a need for consultation & use it for pre-post measures • Data mine select items on student ratings • Set up blogs for faculty to record critical incident analyses or other reflective writing • Set up e-portfolios for faculty projects receiving funding • Combine survey efforts with other institutional surveys to reduce survey fatigue • Use experimental designs for only high impact or high cost programs

<p>Level V: Impact on Student Learning Outcomes</p> <p>(Did the student learning outcomes change as a result of the program?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require grant reports to include changes in student learning • Require a publication or presentation reporting changes in student learning for funded projects • Solicit self-reports of changes in student learning through surveys, emails, interviews, or focus groups • Student surveys or in-class feedback • Pre-post measures of student performance • Pre-post measures of student progression • Experimental studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine behavior change and student learning outcome inquiries into one online survey • Same as Level IV strategies
<p>Level VI: Impact on the Institution</p> <p>(Was there an institutional change as a result of the program?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-post measures of attrition, retention, or graduation rates • Experimental studies • Data mine NSSE results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the Office of Assessment • Use experimental designs for only high impact or high cost programs

**CASE STUDY: Evaluation Planning Framework
for ABC University**

		EVALUATION LEVELS				
PROGRAMS 	Participation	Satisfaction	Learning	Impact on Teaching	Impact on Student Learning	Impact on the Institution
Orientation	✓every time	✓3X (only with major changes)				
Brown Bags	✓every time	✓annually				
Consultations	✓every time	✓every time	✓every time (if applicable)			
Grant program	✓every time		✓every time	✓every time	2013	
Teaching & Learning Workshops	✓every time	✓every time	✓every time	✓annually		
Mentoring program	✓every time	✓every time	✓every time	✓after 50 participants	✓after impact on teaching is determined	
Large-course Redesign program	✓every time	✓3X (only with major changes)	✓every time	✓every time	✓annually	2014

Reference List

- Chism, N. V. N. & Sazbo, B. L. (1997). How faculty development programs evaluate their services. *Journal of staff, program & organizational development*, 15(2), 55-62.
- Hines, S.R. (2009). Investigating faculty development program assessment practices: What's being done and how can it be improved? *Journal of faculty development*, 23(3), 5-19.
- Hines, S. R. (in press). How mature teaching and learning centers evaluate their services. In J. Miller & J. Grocia (Ed.), *To improve the academy*, Vol. 30. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Kirkpatrick D. & Kirkpatrick J. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Minter, R.L. (2009). The paradox of faculty development. *Contemporary issues in education research*, 2(4), 65-70.
- Morrison, G. R., Ross, S.M., & Kemp, J.E. (2004). *Designing effective instruction* (6th ed.). Somerset, NJ: John Wiley.
- Suskie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Suggested Readings

- Guskie, T. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Killion, J. (2008). *Assessing impact: Evaluating staff development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kreber, C., & Brook, P. (2001). Impact evaluation of educational development programmes. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 6(2), 96-108.
- Kutner, C., Sherman R., Tibbetts J., Condelli L. (1997). *Evaluating professional development: A framework for adult education*. Building Professional Development Partnerships for Adult Educators Project. U.S. Department of Education.
- Smith C., DeVol M. & Stetson N. (2003). *Evaluating staff and organizational development*. California Community College Council for Staff Development and Community College League of California.

ACADEMIC Leader

FEBRUARY 2011
VOLUME 27, NUMBER 2

THE NEWSLETTER FOR ACADEMIC DEANS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

How to Evaluate Your Faculty Development Services

By Sue Hines EdD

Faculty development is a nationwide phenomenon that emerged from the academic accountability movement in the early 1970s, yet rarely was there interest in evaluating the effectiveness of this effort—until now.

Faculty developers across the nation are working on developing methods to evaluate their services. In 2010, the 35th Annual Professional Organizational and Development Network Conference identified assessing the impact of faculty development as a key priority. It was this growing demand that spawned my interest in conducting a 2007 statewide and a 2010 nationwide investigation of faculty development evaluation practices in the U.S. This article will describe how to develop a customized evaluation plan based on your program's structure, purpose, and desired results, based on contemporary practices discovered through this research.

First, working definitions of "evaluation," "assessment," and "program" need to be established since oftentimes these terms have led to confusion.

"Evaluation" is defined as judging the effectiveness of various services to determine value and improvements.

"Assessment" means determination of the level to which the center achieved its specific outcomes—similar to academic program assessment. Directors of faculty development centers appear to be more interested in measuring for improvement and merit (i.e., evaluation) than in designing and measuring program out-

comes and indicators (i.e., assessment). "Program" is oftentimes used in reference to a faculty development center and the center's themed offerings, such as a mentoring program, grant program, instructional program, and consultation services. Therefore, "program" will refer to the center's services and themed offerings in this article.

Before an evaluation plan can be developed, it is important to carefully examine three situational factors unique to your faculty development center: the structure, purpose, and evaluation mind-set. There are four faculty development structures typically found at universities: (1) a large, centralized, university-funded program with a full-time director and staff; (2) a smaller, low-budget program with a faculty member acting as a part-time director with a part-time administrative assistant; (3) a dean or department head organizing events loosely based on strategic planning; and (4) no structure, instead faculty are responsible for self-development (Minter, 2009). Evaluation is possible with any staff size, yet the extent will vary accordingly.

Second, consider the purpose of the center. For example, is it designed to meet the needs of faculty or the institution, or to promote academic quality? Programs focused on the needs of faculty tend to evaluate faculty behavior. Those targeting institutional needs extend measurements to impacts on the institution, and those that focus on academic quality tend to emphasize evaluation of faculty and student learning out-

comes.

Third, the evaluator's mind-set needs close examination. The research indicated this area to be the most impactful element in evaluation planning. Those who believed that program evaluation was beneficial, and informative, and that it improved practices were more likely to implement a routine, systemized, in-depth evaluation process. Those who believed it was an act of accountability, difficult to do, or done only for resource requests oftentimes created an evaluation system based on reports of faculty participation and satisfaction.

The next step is to consider the level to which each program should be evaluated, keeping in mind the impact of the situational factors. The research identified six evaluation levels: (1) participation, (2) satisfaction, (3) learning, (4) impact on teaching, (5) impact on student learning outcomes, and (6) impact on the institution. Think of each level as concentric rings (like ripples) emanating from a center point representing a single

PAGE 4 ▶

In This Issue

- 2** The Four-Year Information Technology Plan: Listen to the Class of 2015
- 3** Promoting Research While Advancing Instruction, Part 2
- 6** The Community Role and Challenges of a College Leader
- 8** Online Format Saves Academic Program

A MAGNA PUBLICATION



PRESIDENT:

William Haight; whaight@magnapubs.com

PUBLISHER:

David Burns; dburns@magnapubs.com

MANAGING EDITOR:

Rob Kelly; robkelly@magnapubs.com

ADVISORY BOARD:

Robert E. Cipriano, chair emeritus of the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies at Southern Connecticut State University, ciprianor1@southernct.edu

Anne V. Massaro, Program Director, Organization & HR Consulting, The Ohio State University, Massaro.11@osu.edu (electronic subscription)

Charles F. Harrington Professor, Management-Marketing-International Business, University of North Carolina at Pembroke
charles.harrington@uncp.edu

Thomas R. McDaniel, professor of education, Converse College
tom.mcdaniel@converse.edu

James O. Hammons, professor of higher education, University of Arkansas
jhammons@uark.edu

Michael Murray, professor, department of management, DePaul University
mmurray@depaul.edu

Academic Leader (ISSN 8750-7730) is published monthly by Magna Publications Inc., 2718 Dryden Drive, Madison, WI 53704. Phone 800-433-0499 Fax: 608-246-3597. Email: support@magnapubs.com. Website: www.magnapubs.com. One-year subscription: \$208 (Multiple print subscriptions and Group Online Subscriptions are available, call Customer Service at 800-433-0499.) Photocopying or other reproduction in whole or in part without written permission is prohibited. POSTMASTER: Send change of address to *Academic Leader*, 2718 Dryden Drive, Madison, WI 53704. Copyright ©2011, Magna Publications Inc.

Submissions to *Academic Leader* are welcome. Please review article submission guidelines located at <http://www.magnapubs.com/catalog/academic-leader/>.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use of specific clients is granted by *Academic Leader* for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Transactional Reporting Service, provided that \$1.00 per page is paid directly to CCC, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923; Phone 978-750-8400; www.copyright.com. For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license by CCC, a separate system of payment has been arranged.

The Four-Year Information Technology Plan: Listen to the Class of 2015

By Albert DeSimone Jr.

The process started with a casual discussion among my colleagues and was fueled by the *ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology, 2010*. It continued with conversations with my son, who happens to be a member of the class of 2014, and students in a freshman seminar that I teach on the topic of leadership.

Distilled from these conversations are what I believe to be the five technology expectations of the class of 2015:

- **Person-centric**—The personal computer was *TIME*'s "Man" of the Year in 1982. In 2010, Mark Zuckerberg, founder of Facebook, was Person of the Year. In a 28-year span, person-centric, self-focused technology has become the norm. The desktop computer has given way to the laptop as the personal computer of choice, with the smartphone gaining ground as the device of choice to access the Internet. The individuals in the class of 2015 will expect more and more personal content to be delivered to their handheld devices, and this includes content directly related to the academic experience: online course materials, video, financial transactions, etc.
- **Social learning**—The social experience has always been a part of the academic experience, and social networking is a natural extension of that experience. Students are entering college with a keen awareness of and dependence on social networking. A curriculum that leverages that awareness and dependence will enhance learning.
- **Responsibility**—Our society will continue to be cognizant of and sen-

sitive to the needs of the many and to the needs of the less advantaged. The class of 2015 will be the flag bearer of this cognizance and sensitivity, which will manifest itself in a desire for green technology and an assurance that technology is accessible to all students, regardless of physical challenges.

- **Reliability**—The Internet is there 24/7, so all the services that rely on it for delivery—student systems, learning management systems, email, etc.—should too.
- **Same-place experience**—Higher education is becoming more and more place independent. The class of 2015 will expect this place-independence to be accommodated. Residential campuses, international campuses, and campuses inside someone's home (or mind) are all becoming the same.

If indeed this is our planning and delivery road map for student services, it carries with it a number of resource-allocation implications:

- Students enter college with their own devices—devices they are using more and more in the cloud. They are coming to college increasingly dependent on Web-based applications. Computer labs, computer loan programs, and even volume-purchased software will be less of a requirement. Reallocate those dollars to the development of content to be delivered to those devices Web-based applications into the curriculum. Make sure that your cloud is part of the global cloud. If you have an institutional portal, mobilize the content. If you do not have an institutional

PAGE 7 ►

Academic Leader 2010 Index now available online at:
www.magnapubs.com/publications/newsletters/al2010index

Promoting Research while Advancing Instruction, Part 2

In this three-part series, Jeffrey L. Buller explores how colleges and universities can encourage substantive research without detracting from excellence in teaching. Part 1, which appeared in the last issue, discussed the ways in which the traditional division of faculty responsibilities into teaching, research, and service creates an inherent expectation that these activities are distinct.

By Jeffrey L. Buller, PhD

Reconsider the merit pay system

In Part 1, we examined several reasons why it's important for universities to look at faculty work not in terms of the actions that are taken but rather in terms of the benefits that result. Of course, it's one thing to *say* that changing how we view faculty roles can help promote research while advancing teaching; it's another thing entirely to bring about such a massive change.

The problem is that the division of faculty duties into teaching, research, and service is not merely a matter of semantics; that same division also drives the faculty evaluation systems at most colleges and universities. For instance, if we examine the way in which merit increases are assigned in many systems, faculty members receive a larger raise if they score "excellent" or "outstanding" in all three areas. There are two drawbacks to this process. First, as I mentioned in an earlier article, most merit increase pools in higher education are so small that they prove to be disincentives at every level of performance. See Buller (2009) 7–8. In other words, if faculty members who reached a certain level of performance were ever assigned annual increases of 10 percent or more, merit pay systems might well be effective. But in many cases, merit increase pools are only 1 percent or 2 percent, leaving the effectiveness of this entire strategy in doubt. The most highly ranked among the faculty say things like, "All this extra work, and all I get is another 1 percent? I'm not going to try as hard next year." Faculty members who receive a standard increase say, "All this hard work, and all I get is the *average* raise? I'm not going to try as hard next year." And faculty members who end up low in the ratings say, "All the work that I've done, and

they *dock* me 1 percent? I'm not going to try as hard next year." As a result, morale decreases, the amount of effort plummets, and a system that was intended to encourage a higher quality of work in actuality has the opposite effect.

The second problem with merit pay systems based on teaching, research, and service is that, by examining activities instead of results, they don't reinforce the behaviors they're intended to reward. A common administrative complaint is, "We keep rewarding excellence in teaching and research, yet we're not seeing the increase in grant activity, publication of refereed research, recognition through national teaching awards, or development of innovative pedagogy that we had anticipated." What the system has done is reward participation in a process that people hope will lead to certain results, when it would be far more effective to *reward the results themselves*. There are three major ways to avoid this problem:

- Targeted merit plans are the most direct method of making sure that the rewards a system provides are directly tied to the results that the institution regards as desirable. In these systems, the raises that most faculty members receive are distributed as across-the-board adjustments or cost-of-living increases. Merit increases are assigned only for promotion and for the achievement of specific, clearly identified goals. For instance, a faculty member might receive a merit increase (either as a permanent addition to the base or as a bonus to be paid out over a specific number of years) if he or she has written a successful grant proposal that was funded over a certain amount by an external agency, published a book of research with an established university press, been honored with a national or international award for teaching, and

so on. These merit increases, though not common, are large enough to be a genuine incentive to a truly motivated faculty member. The university thus achieves the goal it has identified as important, and faculty members are rewarded for their successes, not merely their efforts.

- Post-tenure review systems can provide an opportunity for institutions to offer incentives for continued achievements, even in the later stages of a faculty member's career. Today, post-tenure review at many institutions is regarded by professors as an unpopular and unproductive hurdle: an inconvenience at best, a threat to their livelihood at worst. But if more colleges and universities incorporated positive rewards for those faculty members who were doing exemplary work into a process largely known for its sanctions against those who were no longer productive, the entire activity could become far more beneficial both for the individual and the institution. Rewards for highly productive faculty members might include additional sabbatical time, bonuses or long-term salary increases, access to additional graduate assistantships, enhanced research or travel money, public recognition, or other benefits that would be regarded as particularly meaningful by each faculty member.
- Distinguished professorships carry the concept of enhanced post-tenure review even further and combine an extremely high level of public recognition with increased compensation. The difficulty many institutions face is that, with only a few ranks available for faculty promotion, relatively limited incentives exist for encouraging continued achievement once someone reaches the level of full professor. But by adding additional ranks above the

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT...
From Page 1

program or service. Determine the level to which each program needs to be evaluated, based on the center’s purpose and program’s desired outcome or goal. Then determine the timing for each level of evaluation. Consider staging out and staggering the evaluation process—especially if staff levels are low or workload is high. For example, gather participa-

tion, learning, and satisfaction data for your mentoring program until a significant number of faculty members have participated. Then at that point, evaluate the impact the program had on the attendees teaching practices. Another option is to gather participation, learning, and satisfaction data for new workshops then stop gathering satisfaction data after receiving high reports from three consecutive sessions. Or if a program is designed for high impact on stu-

dent learning outcomes and institutional change, such as a large course redesign program, then plan for gathering baseline and follow up measures on a term or annual basis. Additionally, if multiple programs are going to be evaluated for impact on teaching or beyond, stagger the process so an in-depth evaluation is done on one program per year.

As you develop your evaluation plan,

PAGE 5 ►

Table 1

Evaluation Level	Methods	Strategies
Level I: Participation (Who is participating in the faculty development programs and services?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track attendance (by individual, program, department, or school) • Track usage of online 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use online registration • Develop customized databases • Use Google Analytics for website usage
Level II: Satisfaction (What was the participant’s level of satisfaction?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfaction surveys at event • Annual campus-wide satisfaction surveys • Focus groups • Advisory board reviews of resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather and log data with student response devices (aka clickers) • Create a standardized online survey through SurveyMonkey® • Create an automated system for emailing the survey link • Focus groups for select programs only
Level III: Learning (Did the participants learn?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application exercises or assessments at the event • Open-ended surveys • Post-event follow-up surveys • Pre-post assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Level II strategies • Embed questions into satisfaction surveys
Level IV: Impact on Teaching (Did participants change their attitudes or practices as a result of the program?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require grant reports to include changes in teaching • Require a publication or presentation reporting changes in teaching for funded projects • Solicit self-reports of changes in teaching through surveys, emails, interviews, or focus groups • Student ratings • Student surveys or in-class feedback • Pre-post classroom observations • Pre-post reviews of teaching products • Faculty-created critical incident analysis • Teaching portfolios • Experimental studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine satisfaction and behavioral change inquiries into one online survey • Gather pre-post data for consultation services, using a coding system for anonymity • Ask the faculty member to provide measures indicating a need for consultation, and use it for pre-post measures • Data-mine select items on student ratings • Set up blogs for faculty to record critical incident analyses or other reflective writing • Set up e-portfolios for faculty projects receiving funding • Combine survey efforts with other institutional surveys to reduce survey fatigue • Use experimental designs for only high-impact or high-cost programs

Table 1 continued on page 5

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT....

From Page 4

remember that program evaluation should be tailored to measure your level of interest specific to each individual program. The research showed that measuring out to the institutional level was typically reserved for high-impact programs specifically designed to increase student progression and retention. Measuring out to the student learning level was typically seen in high-impact programs designed to improve student learning, such as grant programs, learning community programs, and intensive instructional improvement initiatives.

Once the evaluation levels and timing are determined for each program, decide on the evaluation methods to be used. Keep in mind that multiple measures increase reliability, and efficient strategies leads to a greater likelihood of implementation. The table below lists methods and strategies used

for measuring the six levels at various colleges and universities involved in the research.

Last, once the evaluation levels, methods, and timing are determined for each program or service, identify who will be responsible for gathering the data and when the analysis will occur. Setting time aside for an annual data review and implementation is common.

Evaluation of faculty development programs can be done in an efficient and effective manner by developing a systemized plan designed for staggered, staged-out evaluation that considers staff time and available technology. Following this evaluation approach will lead to feasible, purposeful, and informative data that can you help determine whether faculty development really is making a difference.

References:

Hines, S.R. (2009). Investigating

faculty development program assessment practices: What's being done and how can it be improved? *Journal of Faculty Development*, 23(3), 5-19.

Hines, S. R. (in press). How established centralized teaching and learning centers evaluate their services. In J. Miller & J. Grocia (Ed.), *To Improve the Academy* (30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Minter, R.L. (2009). The paradox of faculty development. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 2(4), 65-70.

Sue Hines is the director of faculty development and an assistant professor at Saint Mary's University of Minnesota and teaches in SMU's doctor of education in leadership program. On March 17 she will lead the Magna Online Seminar How to Evaluate the Impact of Faculty Development Programs. For information, see <http://www.magnapubs.com/catalog/faculty-development-programs/>. ▼

Table 1 Continued

Evaluation Level	Methods	Strategies
<p>Level V: Impact on Student Learning Outcomes (Did the student learning outcomes change as a result of the program?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require grant reports to include changes in student learning Require a publication or presentation that reports changes in student learning for funded projects Solicit self-reports of changes in student learning through surveys, emails, interviews, or focus groups Student surveys or in-class feedback Pre-post measures of student performance Pre-post measures of student progression Experimental studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combine behavioral change and student learning outcome inquiries into one online survey Gather pre-post data for consultation services, using a coding system for anonymity Ask the faculty member to provide measures indicating a need for consultation, and use it for pre-post measures Set up blogs or discussion boards for faculty to record changes in student learning Set up e-portfolios and include student learning outcomes for faculty projects receiving funding Combine survey efforts with other institutional surveys to reduce survey fatigue Use experimental designs for only high- impact or high-cost programs
<p>Level VI: Impact on the Institution (Was there an institutional change as a result of the program?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-post measures of attrition, retention, or graduation rates Experimental studies Data-mining of NSSE results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with the office of assessment Use experimental designs for only high- impact or high-cost programs

The Community Role and Challenges of a College Leader

By Jean A. Wibbey, PhD

Strong and innovative leadership collaborations keep the college in the community landscape. Today, the president and the college's leadership team are invaluable resources to states and to the nation—they educate the many talented people who work in our industries, businesses, and civic sectors. Chief executive officers address the overall balance of education at their institutions by looking at community advisory council input, educational trends, and state needs.

As technology, competition, and products change, the college leader needs to ensure that the institution's teams quickly respond to these demands by creating new programs, practices, and organizational structures. Some universities struggle with the nimbleness needed to react to regional economic educational demands. However, in our knowledge-based economy, postsecondary education must seek to *quickly* align its offerings—curricula, innovation, and partnerships—with the needs of the marketplace. This requires adeptness with inspiration and communication with the faculty.

The college president and the leadership team should embrace the public agenda and need to be engaged in the community. This ensures that the college's education policies, programs, curricula, and resources address current, emerging, and future economic realities. Forging strong contacts with regional workforce development boards, hospitals, area legislators, social service and civic organizations, and many other partners in the community requires competence, confidence, and participation.

Presidents are charged with the task of staying visible to local and state politicians. The president has a continuous duty to keep legislators informed of the college's state of affairs and the resources needed to maintain currency for growth

initiatives for their students and their community. Presidents can demystify the complexities of postsecondary education to legislators and must be advocates for appropriate levels of state, federal, and industry support. They can become trusted advisors when state initiatives, rules, and regulations may have an impact on postsecondary performance.

Also, while presidents are accountable to the larger community, they provide leadership and inspiration to the campus so that its culture is vibrant and welcoming to the public it serves. Offering social and cultural programs and opening the college's facilities to its varied constituents are what deeply weave the college into the fabric of its community.

Resources

Marshaling resources to meet the needs of students at our institutions today requires a well-conceived strategic plan that identifies the goals and needs of the colleges. Strategic planning prioritizes such goals based on college mission, and through consensus it provides the compass. Once a president has listened to all the stakeholders of the institution and the community, priorities and fiscal needs can be aligned.

Resources come in two forms: human and fiscal. The personnel colleges require to conduct their programs and services to support student success include high-quality faculty and advisors, retention specialists, counselors, curriculum and technology specialists, skills center and activities professionals, tutors, grant writers, foundation members, and advisory councils; in reality, it's the entire college community. Some of these contributors have real operating overhead, while foundations, advisories, and supportive committees and teams do not. They are all central, however, to achieving the college's mission.

Presidents work with their foundations for fund raising and gifts, mine for dollars appropriated to local community

agencies that partner with the college, engage in grant writing, connect with alumni, and work with local legislators to communicate the college's agenda for its constituencies. If necessary, realigning existing resources may be called for.

As an outcome of good leadership that creates a noteworthy, stimulating, and engaging culture, student enrollment will increase along with satisfaction and success, and, therefore, funds.

Leading and managing resources

Experience in leadership and entrepreneurship both internal and external to higher education is helpful. Knowledge of planning and assessment, strong skills in program and curriculum development, teaching experience, computer literacy, proficiency in enrollment management, a broad understanding of budget and campus operations, and great enthusiasm and confidence are all necessary. One of the most important responsibilities is hiring the right people.

Style

College personnel usually enjoy working with people and promote innovative, participatory leadership and decision making. Everyone likes a collaborator. While it may take longer for projects and programs to get started when using a collaborative approach, once the culture is in place, projects can be completed in a reasonable period of time. Collaborating is an important, unique feature of college life. It keeps the wheels turning, since people are the batteries of these organizations. The magic is appealing and draws people to you as a leader. Elements of personal leadership style representing respect and trustworthiness make people feel safe and cared for.

As leaders, presidents can become isolated and feel alone. The job is complex, exhausting, and replete with many

PAGE 7 ►

LEADERSHIP SKILLS...

From Page 6

extraordinary occurrences. It is impossible to work alone and not seek the experience and acumen of peers. Utilizing the expertise and wisdom of mentors is very important, as is achieving a good foundation of personal balance.

Data to support decisions

Data informs decisions and enhances strategic planning. Colleges are accountable to many constituencies: students; federal, state, and local governments; taxpayers; accrediting bodies; parents; boards of trustees; and employers. As a result, the use of performance and needs assessments; student attitude surveys; learning outcomes assessments; degree completion, retention, transfer, and job

placement rates; and other key performance indicators is necessary. Almost every decision should be informed by data and research. These accountability systems help target and leverage educational resources more efficiently and effectively for immediate utility and for future capacity building.

Overcoming resistance to change

There will always be people who are comfortable with the status quo and reject efforts to change. A proven textbook approach is to fully educate those affected by new processes or ideas so they understand the goals of changes. This is where data can be helpful. Another strategy to overcome resistance is to enlist respected faculty and other leaders at the college to influence their

peer resistors. As always, it is best if negotiators are part of the process as collaborators. While this may not be so appealing, using their disapproving information can be constructive, since the project's informed shortcomings can be overcome early. Some will be so intractable that any effort to move the person forward with a change won't work. The best thing to do is neutralize the person's ability to build adversarial coalitions and mobilize other potential resistors. This is why a full understanding of project goals by many is vital. In every case, it is hard to argue against trying something new that endeavors to benefit students in a positive way.

Jean A. Wibbey is the provost of Palm Beach State College-Palm Beach Gardens. ▼

PROMOTING RESEARCH...

From Page 3

level of professor—such as distinguished professor, eminent professor, or endowed chair—colleges and universities can reward those faculty members whose accomplishments continue to increase throughout their careers. Moreover, rather than continuing to encourage a false opposition between instruction and scholarship by the use of such titles as Distinguished Teaching Fellow or Eminent Research Scholar, these “super professorships” have the potential to promote research while advanc-

ing instruction through the designation that Bob Smith, the provost at Texas Tech, calls “the integrated scholar”: eminent faculty members who teach via their research and thereby serve both their communities and disciplines simultaneously.

Of course, the most comprehensive way to reintegrate teaching and research (as well as service) is to reevaluate the very idea of what a university is in the 21st century, and we'll consider that approach in Part 3.

References

Buller, J.L. (June 2009). The pros and cons of merit pay. *Academic Leader*.

25.6, 7–8.

Smith, B. (February, 2002). The integrated scholar: Have you seen one lately? *All Things Academic*. 3.1, 147–153. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from <http://libinfo.uark.edu/ata/cumulation/content.pdf>.

Jeffrey L. Buller is dean of the Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College at Florida Atlantic University. He is the author of Academic Leadership Day by Day: Small Steps That Lead to Great Success (2011) and other books on higher education administration, all of which are published by Jossey-Bass. ▼

TECHNOLOGY...

From Page 2

portal or are in the process of deploying a next-generation portal, content delivery to mobile devices must be a top priority.

- Invest more in reality than in virtual reality. Create same-place experiences with real-time video equipment and services.
- Information is infrastructure agnostic; allocate resources toward the content

that traverses the network and associated infrastructure, and source the infrastructure appropriately to save costs.

- Investments in green technology will return fiscal resources that can be allocated to other responsible requirements. Take green dollars and turn them into accessible websites and other technology, including software and equipment for the physically challenged.

Regarding technology planning for student services, base it on a four-year planning cycle. Survey the environment annually, adjust accordingly, and consider the opportunity that each year brings with respect to the most dynamic landscape within the academic enterprise: adapting technology to teaching and learning.

Albert DeSimone Jr. is the information technology communication officer at the University of Georgia. ▼

Online Format Saves Academic Program

By Rob Kelly

In 2006, New York Institute of Technology's graduate clinical nutrition program was in trouble: enrollments were way down, and the prospects for attracting more students were not good. Similar programs with lower tuition and in more convenient locations made NYIT's program less appealing. It seemed that it was just a matter of time before the school pulled the plug on this program. In a last-ditch effort to save the program, the department decided to switch from face-to-face to online delivery to try to reach an untapped student market for the program.

The administration could have very easily eliminated the program. With three full-time and three adjunct faculty, and 20 students, it was the smallest program within the School of Health Professions. However, there were several factors that led to approval of this plan:

- The program had a history of offering online courses. Two previous courses had received positive feedback from students.
- The faculty were willing to teach online. Mindy Haar, program director, had some expertise in online instruction and helped faculty learn to teach in this environment. "When we first started, a lot of [the faculty preparation] had to be done by us. But more and more it's becoming part of the formal structure within the school," Haar says.
- It fit the institution's goal of increasing its number of online offerings.
- The program's size meant that costs and risks would be low. "We never had to plead or show the numbers. They said, 'OK, let's see where this goes.' We never had more than three full-time faculty. Had it been much bigger, and had the department been bleeding money, it would have been different," Haar says.

Faculty preparation

As the program director and the instructor with the most online teaching experience, Haar took the lead on helping prepare faculty to teach online. The adjuncts participated in a one-day workshop that has since been expanded to two days. "Everybody had my cell phone number, and I made myself available. Any faculty member who had any difficulty could call me and I could walk them through the program. That's a very necessary thing, because even if the school has online support it's not always available 24/7. I was able to fill the gap," Haar says.

NYIT's Center for Teaching and Learning now offers faculty an eight-week online course in which they can have an online learning experience similar to that of their students. "Faculty who have done it have found it very helpful," Haar says.

Recruiting students

The task of marketing the program fell to the department. Haar and her colleagues began by reaching out to students who had been in the program during the previous 10 years but who had not yet completed it. A lot of those people came back, because many of them dropped out of the program when they moved out of the area or started working and couldn't fit it into their schedules. "Once we were online, they said, 'Wow! I have only 10 credits to go. I can take those online,'" Haar says.

In addition, the program advertised in dietetic journals and networked at discipline-specific conferences. "There is a student information session of graduate programs, and we always have a table. We did a lot of networking.

We did everything very informally, just knowing our profession and what would work. It would probably be different within each discipline," Haar says.

Graduates from other NYIT programs also have enrolled in the program. For example, students who hope to go to medical school but don't get accepted find the program to be an excellent way to improve their chances of getting accepted if they reapply. "What they find very inviting about our program is that they can do most of the program before attending medical school and then finish it online," Haar says.

Having connections with faculty and staff in life sciences makes it more likely that students in that program will explore the online nutrition program, Haar says.

Since going to an all-online format, the program has more than doubled its enrollment to 50.

Advice

Haar offers the following advice for launching an online program:

- Get someone within the department to lead the effort.
- Start with pilot courses.
- Understand the market/student needs.
- Address technical and pedagogical issues, and make sure the institution has an infrastructure to ensure that faculty can get immediate help.

Contact Mindy Haar at mhaar@nyit.edu. ▼



We'd like to know what you think!

Please share your thoughts on this issue in a four-question online survey located at www.surveymonkey.com/s/ALNS.