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Adjunct faculty comprise a large percentage of part-time faculty for many colleges and universities today. Adjunct faculty are hired because they are experts in their content areas; however, this does not guarantee that they are skilled in effective classroom management. These instructors can become bewildered and frustrated because they lack the knowledge and skills that are needed to run an effective classroom.

While educational organizations have adopted blended learning environments as an effective delivery method for their students, this method has not gained much traction as a way to deliver instruction to their own employees. Thus, there are opportunities to use blended learning as a strategy for professional development in the workplace. What is more common in the workplace is the application of knowledge management (KM). KM is used in organizations to identify, share, and validate knowledge in order to improve individual and organizational performance. Blended learning combined with KM strategies, can leverage face-to-face and online instruction delivery methods to give adjunct faculty real-time support as they learn to implement specific instructional methods and classroom management techniques into their face-to-face classrooms.

The goal was to construct and validate a blended learning professional development course for adjunct faculty. Design and development research methods were used to conduct the study in four phases. In phase one, a course design framework that integrated the four modes of the SECI KM model (i.e., socialization, externalization, internalization, and combination) was developed. Included with the framework was a mapping of the learning outcomes, knowledge type, and activities associated with each SECI mode. In phase two, an expert panel reviewed the framework and mapping. The Delphi technique was used to capture panel members’ feedback. Revisions to the framework and mapping were made based on the results of the expert review. In phase three, the framework was used to develop the course within the Desire2Learn learning management system. In phase four, a formative evaluation of the course was conducted using focus groups with key stakeholders including faculty, staff, and administrators.

The sequential nature of the phases in which the professional development course was designed and developed resulted in a refined instantiation of the course, which was received positively by key stakeholders; however, summative and confirmative
evaluations would be needed to determine the effectiveness of the course delivery and content, as well as, whether the course is viable over time. The incorporation of the SECI principles for faculty professional development was also determined to be worthy of continued consideration. Future research focusing on the implementation of SECI principles to guide instructional design in various online and blended learning contexts is recommended.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Background

Adjunct faculty comprise a large percentage of faculty for many colleges and universities today. According to statistics published by the United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2012), the number of part-time faculty is growing at a rate faster than that of full-time faculty. The number of part-time faculty at colleges and universities has increased 62.5% from 436,893 part-time faculty in 1999 to 710,167 part-time faculty in 2009 (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). With this increase, many of the part-time faculty hired by post-secondary institutions are new to the field of education; these faculty members are hired because they have specific expertise in a content area (Berrett, 2012; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). Oftentimes, these individuals lack formalized training on the fundamentals of pedagogy including learning theory, instructional methods, classroom management techniques, and approaches to assessment and evaluation of learner performance (Abbitt, 2011; Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013; Tannehill, 2009). Adjunct faculty are hired to fill what many institutions believe to be a temporary need for instruction (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009).
Professional development (PD) programs for full-time faculty are common; however, fewer opportunities for adjunct faculty exist (Dolan et al., 2013; Tannehill, 2009; Womble, 2008). Cross and Goldenberg (2009, p. 51) suggest no one is ‘minding the store’ and the needs of non-tenure track faculty are going unmet. For example, course observations may show an instructor to be knowledgeable about the course content area, but have poor classroom management skills. Faculty are often provided training on procedures and processes, but lack training on the pedagogical aspects also required of an instructional practitioner (Dolan et al., 2013).

While some professional development for adjunct faculty is available, there is oftentimes a lack of participation (Berrett, 2012; Dolan et al., 2013). Three major reasons stand out. The first reason is compensation (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Gappa & Austin, 2010; Kezar, 2012). Frequently these development occurrences are unpaid opportunities. Adjunct faculty may not be motivated to pursue these opportunities if they believe the college or university does not value the development sessions enough to provide compensation for participation (Kezar, 2012; Nasreen & Mirza, 2012). The second reason is a lack of self-awareness of the adjunct faculty members to know they need the additional development (Tannehill, 2009; Venkatraman, 2012). Well-educated individuals may have the perception that since they are already degreed, subject matter experts with content knowledge they can then deliver the information to others without needing the additional training on how to deliver the material effectively. The third reason is adjunct faculty have limited time to participate in traditional professional development activities (Dolan et al., 2013; Li, Sun, & Zheng, 2011). In many cases time equals money, but there are also logistical time constraints for adjunct staff (Womble,
Determining times to offer face-to-face training and support services that are available to all staff each time it is offered is a near impossible task (Dolan et al., 2013; Li et al., 2011). Many adjunct faculty are career professionals currently working full-time jobs in their career field or have other familial obligations that infringe on their time (Bonk & Graham, 2005; Tannehill, 2009). With these constraints, individuals have a challenge meeting recurring training and development requirements outside their contracted course hours. Smaller education organizations often have limited development opportunities offered, as departments are smaller in scope, thus resulting in even fewer options and resources for adjunct faculty.

Many organizations only provide online training or only provide face-to-face training environments (Womble, 2008). In higher education it is common to see face-to-face training only for adjunct faculty who teach for brick and mortar colleges or universities and online training only for adjunct faculty who teach for online campuses. Limiting the training and support opportunities to like formats of delivery may have some benefits when it comes to modeling course facilitation, but it also can limit additional opportunities for engagement and efficient, effective facilitation (Womble, 2008). Some of the obstacles to learning that can arise in a face-to-face setting may not be as effectively addressed in one modality of training and support and at one time only. Therefore, while educational organizations have adopted blended learning environments as an effective delivery method for their students, this method has not gained much traction as a way to deliver instruction to their own employees. Thus, there are opportunities to use blended learning as a strategy for professional development in the workplace (Kezar & Sam, 2013).
What is more common in the workplace is the application of knowledge management (KM). KM is used in organizations to identify, share, and validate knowledge in order to improve individual and organizational performance (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Smith, 2001). Kidwell, Vander, and Johnson (2000) identified examples of how KM strategies can be used in higher education including curriculum development, research initiatives, alumni and administrative services, and strategic planning. In addition to these applications, Yeh, Huang, and Yeh (2011) applied KM to the instructional design of pre-service teacher education and suggested further research in how KM supports instructional design is warranted.

Yeh et al. (2011) developed a teacher training program that integrated knowledge management and blended learning. They used the SECI knowledge management model, proposed by Nonaka (1991), as a framework for the instructional design of this blended learning course. SECI stands for socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization and illustrates the four modes of knowledge conversion (Nonaka, 1991). The formation, transferability, and reconstructing of knowledge is a requisite in knowledge management, but it is also important to learning and critical thinking (Smith, 2001; Yeh et al., 2011; Zhao, 2010).

The goal of Yeh et al.’s (2011) study was to develop the program and determine whether a pre-service teacher training program based on the SECI model was effective in developing professional knowledge and personal teaching efficacy of creativity instruction and what underlying mechanisms of the SECI model were most effective. After the authors designed the instructional program called “Creative-Thinking Instruction”, they recruited 44 pre-service teachers to participate. This experimental
blended learning program ran for 17-weeks. The authors used a variety of data gathering techniques including an inventory that measured professional knowledge in creativity instruction, an inventory that measured personal teaching efficacy in creativity instruction, and a reflective questionnaire. Using a “before-and-after design” (Yeh et al., 2011, p. 155) both inventories were given to the teachers before and after the instruction while the reflective questionnaire was only administered at the end of the 17 weeks. To analyze the data gathered from the two instruments, the authors applied repeated measure analysis of variance to identify improvements in the teachers’ professional knowledge and personal teaching efficacy in creativity instruction. They also conducted a content analysis on the data gathered from the reflective questionnaire to identify what underlying mechanisms of the SECI model were most effective. The results indicated that the program improved pre-service teachers’ professional knowledge – most notably content knowledge – as well as their personal teaching efficacy. The content analysis resulted in the following conclusions regarding the underlying mechanisms of the SECI model that were most effective:

1. While e-learning contributed more to the acquisition of pedagogical knowledge, classroom teaching brought about more benefits in teaching content knowledge.
2. The production of digital teaching materials contributed to the application of the learned teaching strategies, the integration of theories with practice, and the stimulation of personal creativity.
3. The enhancement of personal teaching efficacy came from online peer evaluations, observational learning, group discussions, the application of creative strategies, homework, and feedback from the pre-tests and post-tests.
4. While knowledge creation arose mainly from online discussions, knowledge sharing came primarily from observational learning and the open access to online information.
5. Co-creation of knowledge in the term assignment contributed to knowledge building, sharing, and integration as well as self-reflection (Yeh et al., 2011, p. 154).
The authors concluded that KM is an effective component of professional
development but there is limited research in its application to professional development
programs. They recommended further research in this area, specifically, in the
development of “more KM-based teaching or training models to enhance the
effectiveness of both learning and instruction” (Yeh et al., 2011, p. 155).

**Problem Statement**

By nature of the credentialing models established in most higher education
institutions, adjunct and full-time faculty are content knowledge experts in their field and
not trained educational practitioners (Abbitt, 2011; Berrett, 2012; Tannehill, 2009). As a
result, performance gaps often exist in the areas of instructional methods and classroom
management. Performance gaps among adjunct faculty who teach in face-to-face
classrooms can be symptoms of incomprehensive or fragmented professional
development opportunities (Gappa & Austin, 2010; Nasreen & Mirza, 2012;
Venkatraman, 2012). For example, adjunct faculty are provided limited training or one-
time training and then they are placed into the classroom. This type of one-time training
does not provide adequate support for instructors who have never been in the classroom.
In fact, Venkatraman (2012) suggests that continued support of first-time instructors is
often needed for a minimum of one year and often beyond. Simply put, traditional
professional development models are not meeting staff development needs (Kim, Bonk,
& Oh, 2008; Tannehill, 2009; Womble, 2008). Educational organizations are increasing
the use of the blended learning environments for students, but have not appeared to
incorporate this same strategy within their own training and development structure (Bonk
& Graham, 2005). Kim et al. (2008) point out the value of blended learning as an option for professional development in the workplace.

Opportunities exist to develop accessible professional development programs that leverage the benefits of both face-to-face and online formats to give adjunct faculty just-in-time and real-time support as they learn to implement specific instructional methods and classroom management techniques in their face-to-face classrooms (Yeh et al., 2011).

**Dissertation Goal**

The goal was to construct and validate a blended learning professional development course for adjunct faculty. The aim of the professional development course was to facilitate just-in-time training for adjunct faculty who teach undergraduate students in a face-to-face environment and that would help these instructors become more efficacious in their classrooms. Adjunct instructors would learn the basics of face-to-face teaching including fundamental learning theories and instructional methods, principles of good teaching practice, classroom management strategies, and assessment strategies.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided this investigation:

*RQ1.* How can a SECI-based blended learning model developed to support pre-service teacher education be adapted to support professional development for adjunct professors in a postsecondary environment?

*RQ2.* To what extent does the resulting training course meet adjunct faculty needs and the university’s needs and requirements?

*RQ3.* What implications do the results have for refinement of the course?
Relevance and Significance

As an original contribution to the field of computing technology in education, this study adds to the body of knowledge by validating a KM-based instructional design and the construction of a blended learning professional development course in higher education.

As indicated by the results of Yeh et al.’s 2011 study, the integration of blended learning and the SECI model for professional development of pre-service teachers in creativity instruction did improve the professional knowledge and personal teaching self-efficacy of the participants. In 2011, Yeh et al. suggested that future studies should continue to develop models to enhance learning and instruction.

The selection of the SECI model for incorporation into the instructional design of a blended learning training course was an intuitive fit. The blended learning modality in conjunction with the incorporation of the SECI model framework provides an opportunity for the timely sharing of information in specific contexts in which the information would be perceived to be of greater value and relevance. Nonaka, Toyama, and Konno (2000) discuss the definition of knowledge as information put into context and that is time specific and the SECI model framework supports learning and development beyond just the creation of knowledge assets to the process of knowledge conversion (Jasimuddin, Klein, & Connell, 2005).

Each mode of the SECI knowledge conversion process supports learning and development of individuals, groups, and organizations (Nonaka et al., 2000). Chatti, Klamm, Jarke, and Naeve (2007) comment, “Similar to the knowledge creation process, the learning process encompasses more than knowledge acquisition. It is a dynamic...
process within a collective intelligence, continuous knowledge in action and cyclic conversion of tacit and explicit knowledge” (para. 10).

A common occurrence in educational institutions is the formation of silos in which faculty members may operate due to the standard structure of those organizations. Within his/her silo, a faculty member creates many knowledge assets, tacit and explicit; however, knowledge creation is not optimized due to the barriers that exist to professional development and collaborative opportunities. The design and development of a professional development course presented in a blended learning environment, which incorporated the SECI model, could encourage activities and interactions to overcome those obstacles.

Leveraging tacit and explicit knowledge assets through interactions with others and self-reflection was where the knowledge conversions could be actualized for faculty. A community of practice (CoP) comprised of educators with the purpose of professional development and knowledge sharing could result in and be nurtured through the continuation of activities, which support each mode of knowledge conversion. Through socializing and sharing, trust begins to form and the group value begins to be recognized (Li et al., 2011). As the dialogue within the group continues, so does the nurturing of the CoP and the momentum for the SECI process continuation (Li et al., 2011).

Notably a KM supported learning environment could support adjunct faculty as a portal to access information related to teaching and learning, the application of technology in the classroom, best practices, lessons learned, and so forth (Li et al., 2011). Access to information on the methods and techniques that incorporate preferred pedagogical practices can be stored, disseminated, and discussed. Kidwell et al. (2000)
proposed the benefits to be enhanced professional development opportunities for faculty, an increase in responsiveness with the incorporation of the knowledge shared amongst colleagues and administration, and the improvement of teaching and learning with technology.

This study serves as an extension of Yeh et al.’s 2011 research targeting adjunct faculty in higher education and those who are immersed in real classroom situations. This population has not yet been studied in a course delivered in a blended learning environment with the SECI model used for the instructional design of said course and will provide additional knowledge in that area. The proposed KM based blended training was designed to develop a CoP amongst new adjunct faculty with the support of more seasoned faculty members similar to that of Li et al.’s (2011) study where peer support is available. Wegner and Snyder (2000) discussed many of the values of establishing and nurturing CoPs within an organization. The sharing and promotion of best practices and lessons learned are two of the most commonly noted benefits. Collaboration amongst peers could help to solve problems more efficiently and effectively (Wegner & Snyder, 2000). Faculty as lifelong learners seek out the professional development opportunities that are innate to a well operating CoP. Companies that desire to recruit and retain talent can utilize a CoP to entice individuals to stay or join by providing unique or engaging opportunities (Wegner & Snyder, 2000).

The environment incorporates various computer mediated communication tools for enhanced collaboration and efficiency and to increase faculty comfort with technology. Yeh et al.’s (2011) findings supported the important role that technology plays in the integration of KM into the instructional design. Li et al.’s (2011) findings
also noted the role technology played in their study supporting the activities and interactions across time and space. The formation a CoP at the foundation of training and the tools to continue developing that community could be a benefit afforded by the structure established by the blended learning environment (Li et al., 2011; Yeh et al., 2011). Wegner and Snyder (2000) and Li et al. (2011) emphasized the importance of nurturing the development of CoPs to optimize the value therein.

The blended learning environment is further believed to be an appropriate intervention to provide timely and effective training and support. The blended environment provides an opportunity to model face-to-face classroom techniques and incorporate technology into the face-to-face classroom (Yeh et al., 2011). The online portion of that environment permits for on-going discussion and dialogue about the information covered in the face-to-face meetings and the development of a CoP. Support is available nearly real-time as situations arise in the classroom. Given the limited time that adjunct faculty have for professional development, it is assumed that not all of the participants would attend each of the face-to-face sessions. The online component of the course would provide the opportunity for those who would be unable to participate a chance to catch up and receive additional support through the online reflections and discussions that ensue. The externalization stage of SECI KM model was deemed a natural place where this discourse would occur and be promoted (Yeh et al., 2011).

Other proposed benefits of utilizing a blended learning environment that included the modeling of technology integration in the classroom would be an increase in the adjunct faculty acceptance of future professional development opportunities provided through the blended environment, continued online collaboration, and faculty acceptance
of Web-enhanced curricula (Gappa & Austin, 2010). The latter two stages of the SECI KM model where knowledge is combined and internalized, support this benefit of a KM based blended environment (Yeh et al., 2011).

**Barriers and Issues**

The research proposed in this study was challenging for a variety of reasons. The design and construction of the KM based blended training course model needed to be completed; a significant time commitment was required for the content development portion as well as developmental iterations required as a result of feedback from stakeholders and the Delphi panel members. Obstacles such as the lack of commitment of an institution of higher education and the faculty and staff within that institution to participate in the data collection activities resulted in delays and incomplete data; the obstacle was overcome by repeating data collection from the faculty and administration to secure the data needed to complete phase four. The use of technology as part of the delivery of the PD had inherent risks, which increased with the learning management system being controlled by an outside party. Each of the aforementioned barriers or issues was minimized through careful planning and design of the study, however, was not be able to be eliminated due to the nature of the study.

**Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations**

An assumption was made that the participants had similar needs as the contingent faculty discussed in review of literature. While literature exists that has expressed differing opinions on the SECI model, it was assumed the model was relevant and credible upon which to support this study due to the supporting scholarly works noted in the review of literature.
The variation in the departmental support structures amongst the various degree program areas or colleges may be perceived as a limitation, as these structures could influence the outcomes of the professional development course. Some college, department, or program areas have mechanisms in place to support new faculty or have more actively involved administration, thus potentially affecting the perceived value of the content in the course and the anticipated impacts on efficacy and performance. Another potential limitation is outside professional development opportunities in which adjunct faculty members can choose to participate. Additional opportunities would likely enhance the instructor’s knowledge beyond the impact achieved from the structure of the blended learning professional development course proffered in this course design alone.

The target population of the professional development course was intentionally limited to faculty and prospective faculty for University of Wisconsin-Platteville (UW-Platteville) to constrain the scope of the training course content and make it manageable for the 15-week duration of the proposed implementation plan. Those who participated in the formative evaluation of the course included adjunct and full-time faculty members and administration who would oversee these faculty or who would be directly involved with implementation of the designed professional development opportunity.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purpose of this research study, the following definition of terms is provided:

*Adjunct Faculty:* The term adjunct faculty refers to individuals who instruct on a part-time basis and are in non-tenure track positions. These faculty members are credentialed
to teach at their institution; each typically classified as instructional academic staff or academic staff and carries the title of lecturer or instructor (Author).

*Blended Learning (BL):* The term blended learning refers to a blend of online and face-to-face teaching and learning. In blended learning, a substantial portion of the content is delivered online and interactions often occur asynchronously through discussion board interactions. Blended courses are indicated as having 30-79% percent of the online (Allen & Seaman, 2011, p. 7).

*Community of Practice (CoP):* A CoP is a “group of people informally bound together by shared expertise and passion for a join enterprise” (Wegner & Snyder, 2000).

*Contingent Faculty:* See adjunct faculty.

*Design and Development Research:* Design and Development research is “the systematic study of design, development, and evaluation processes with the aim of establishing an empirical basis for the creation of instructional and non-instructional products and tools and new or enhanced models that govern their development” (Richey & Klein, 2007, p. 1).

*Face-to-face (F2F) Instruction:* This term refers to instruction that occurs in a traditional brick and mortar classroom in which synchronous in-person instruction transpires (Author).

*Just-in-Time Training or Support:* This term refers to training and support provided in small segments that are manageable and relevant to the current responsibilities of the position being supported or upon which performance improvement attempts are being made (Author); this term often refers to a “pull” of information (Singh as cited in Bonk & Graham, 2005).
Learning management system (LMS): “the basic description is a software application that automates the administration, tracking, and reporting of training events” (Ellis, 2009). Examples of learning managements systems include Angel, Canvas, Coursesites by Blackboard, Brightspace by Desire2Learn, eClassroom, and Moodle.

Faculty development or faculty training: These terms both refer to support mechanisms for faculty to increase knowledge, skills, and abilities, which directly relate to instruction and working within the organization. Areas of development include, but are not limited to, lesson planning, classroom preparation, technology use, classroom management, administrative tasks (i.e. attendance and class participation, reporting grades, etc.), and collaboration with colleagues and other departments within the organization (Author).

Pedagogy: The term pedagogy is most commonly defined as the art, philosophy, or science of teaching. The term can be more thoroughly described as the guiding principles and strategies related to quality instruction (Author).

Real-time Training or Support: This term “real-time” refers to the “push” of “the right information in the right context, at the right time, and in the right format” (Singh as cited in Bonk & Graham, 2005, p. 480). The real-time training and support is provided in small segments that is manageable and relevant to the current responsibilities of the position being supported or upon which performance improvement attempts are being made (Author).

Summary

A need for a professional development course for adjunct faculty teaching in face-to-face undergraduate classrooms in the areas of instructional methods, classroom management techniques, and approaches to assessment and evaluation of learner
performance was acknowledged. The goal was to construct and validate a blended learning professional development course for adjunct faculty. Specifically, as an extension of Yeh et al.’s 2011 study, this design and development research aim was to a) determine how Yeh et al.’s (2011) SECI-based blended learning model could be adapted to support professional development for adjunct professors in a postsecondary environment, b) describe to what extent the resulting training course could meet adjunct faculty needs and the university’s needs and requirements, and c) recommend refinement of the course based on the evaluation results. Qualitative methods were used to answer the research questions.
Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Introduction

The review of the literature was organized into five sections that was relevant to the research including adjunct faculty development, the SECI model of knowledge management, instructional design theories and models, knowledge management in higher education, and communities of practice. Key research studies in each of these sections were used to reveal gaps in the literature and support the need for additional research in the area of knowledge management models and their application to the design of teaching and learning opportunities in higher education.

Adjunct Faculty Development

Professional development is offered using a variety of delivery formats and instructional design (ID) models. Each format has its strengths and weaknesses. For example, while face-to-face instruction may present time constraints, it offers the opportunity for synchronous, spontaneous dialogue (Bonk & Graham, 2005). Online training can offer more flexibility in regard to time, but at a cost. With online training, it appears that opportunities for synchronous communications seem to decrease. Blended learning can provide benefits of both environments, but only when those opportunities are in the design of the environment and leveraged by the facilitator and learners in those environments (Bonk & Graham, 2005). Kezar and Sam (2013) affirm technology can support institutional change and progress. Kezar and Sam (2013) stated, “technological
advances also provide avenues for information sharing of promising policies, practices, and strategies” (p. 83).

While there are a variety of professional development opportunities for primarily full-time faculty, the format and timing of training vary greatly amongst educational institutions (Dolan et al., 2013; Gappa & Austin, 2010). The variation in offerings seems to be for many different reasons. Some institutions report limited opportunities due to limited resources to dedicate to the training and development programs (Gappa & Austin, 2010). The demand for faculty and last minute voids to be filled were other noted reasons for the absence or lack of training (Kezar, 2012). Dolan et al. (2013) discuss the importance of professional development activities as a part of the institution’s and staff’s role in conducting business and meeting requirements of accrediting bodies; Meixner, Kruck, and Madden (2010) also emphasize the importance of the involvement of the administration in implementation of training opportunities. Some institutions do place a high value on professional development and include it in their own organizational value statements (Kezar, 2012). Others appear to place more value on research and encourage faculty to publish and acquire grants (Dolan et al., 2013). Finally, the segregation of full-time faculty and adjunct faculty has also added to the disparate offerings (Gappa & Austin, 2010; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012).

Adjunct faculty development opportunities are often brief in the form of a one-time seminar or orientation (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Some institutions loosely consider department meetings as professional development. Some institutions make professional development opportunities optional for adjunct faculty who report having previous experience (Dolan et al., 2013); however, experience does not always equate to
effectiveness and quality instruction (Kezar, 2012). Institutions that have received accreditation have made a commitment to the students, staff, and general population that their program and graduates will meet specific expectations of quality at a minimum.

It is reasonable for students to expect that their professors, irrespective of their employment status in the institution, will provide them quality instruction in a professional manner in an environment conducive to learning. Would it not also be true that part-time faculty should expect that during their employment in an institution they should be trained and developed to deliver that promise? (Dolan et al., 2013, p. 37).

Should the training provided by the institution for the faculty not model the same type of delivery with quality professional development opportunities for all faculty and offer opportunities that meet the diverse needs of the faculty population as well? Online training is mentioned frequently in the literature, but it appears this training is geared to those who are teaching in the online environments only. It also appears some institutions require training, although fail to enforce consequences for those who do not participate. There are adjunct instructors who do make an effort to demonstrate their interest in their professional growth and commitment to the profession through joining organizations such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), and National Education Association (NEA) (Selingo, 2008). Unfortunately the professional academic organizations still frequently limit their target audience to full-time or research faculty who make up the larger portion of their members (Dolan et al., 2013).

While the focus on adjunct or contingent faculty has appeared to increase over the past several years, Dolan et al. (2013) are careful to point out the validity of the information in publications discussing contingent faculty is to be questioned. A gap in the research exists for the implementation of professional development programs beyond the
suggestions for consideration published in some articles (Kezar & Sam, 2013). Meixner et al. (2010) also indicate the research on adjunct faculty has been primarily on the role of adjunct faculty in higher education and a basic exploration of who comprises the adjunct faculty population. Dolan et al. (2013) goes on to explain that the articles about adjunct faculty are often based solely on personal opinion and observation and are not research based. It appears there is a still a gap in literature for what is being done to develop faculty who are still teaching face-to-face in the traditional, brick and mortar learning environment.

The Maryland Consortium for Adjunct Faculty Professional Development (MCAPD) surveyed part-time faculty across the state during the 2004-2005 academic year (Dolan et al., 2013). The study was replicated in 2010 and had a higher participation rate with a slightly different composition of participants (Dolan et al., 2013). The survey respondents from the 2010 study represented 20% of the reported community college adjuncts teaching in 16 institutions (Dolan et al. 2013). The authors believe the survey findings of the study “reveal important demographics and professional development preferences information that may be useful to higher education institutions in Maryland and beyond” (p. 36).

Dolan et al. (2013) had two research goals; the goal of their survey research most relevant to this study was their review of the professional development needs and preferences of the adjunct faculty. The conclusions from their study were part of an effort to inform those who are planning and implementing professional development opportunities better. Participants were asked about professional development experiences in which they had participated and ones which they desired. The requirements of
professional development programs for contingent faculty were also opinions that were sought out. Additional information was collected as to the credit status of the courses they taught, the learning environments in which they primarily taught, and their academic rank at their institution (Dolan et al., 2013). Over 80% of the participants had a Master’s degree or above. The majority were Caucasian and between 40 years to 60 years of age. Sixty-two women and thirty-eight men participated. The current employment status outside of part-time teaching varied including retired, full-time non-teaching, part-time non-teaching, self-employed, and some part-time teaching for multiple institutions. The profile was completed by collecting information about the factors influencing their employment decisions. A total of 3,178 comments were received. These comments were organized into 17 categories. Participants noted the top five factors that influenced their decision to accept employment at the institution where they taught most often were “location of the college (14%), supervision and colleagues (13%), subject matter (13%), the teaching itself (12%), and flexibility of the school in meeting their teaching needs (10%)” (Dolan et al., 2013, p. 41). The top five factors that participants noted as the single most important factor influencing their choice of institution included “location (21%), supervision and colleagues (19%), subject matter (10%), job availability/offer (9%), and the reputation and quality of the college (8%)” (Dolan et al., 2013, p. 41). Dolan et al. (2013) queried about the negligible response of appreciation as a factor of importance in employment choice wondering if it was due to their individual intrinsic motivation and grit or the acceptance of the level of recognition adjunct faculty have always received.
Adjunct faculty’s awareness of and participation in two commonly provided professional development opportunities for full-time faculty were marginal if not a disappointment. Only 67% of respondents were aware of new-faculty orientation programs at their institutions. Eighty-three percent of those individuals who were aware of the orientation programs attended (Dolan et al., 2013, p. 41). The top two reasons for non-attendance were time conflicts and lack of belief the adjunct faculty member would benefit from the program as they had prior experience teaching. Time was also mentioned as a recurring obstacle by Li et al.’s study in 2011. When asked about a preference for delivery format and timing of new faculty orientations, faculty did respond with a preference of face-to-face for initial new faculty orientations versus alternative formats. The preference for timing of such orientations showed a slight preference for weekdays versus Monday through Friday evenings or Saturdays. The other common form of faculty development discussed was mentoring. Almost half the respondents had no visibility to whether this type of program was available, 19% confirmed it was not, and 34% had a general awareness (Dolan et al., 2013, p. 41).

The desire to enhance their teaching skills was very apparent through the part-time faculty responses to the question about preferred topics to be included in professional development. Notably top selections were related to classroom teaching methods, increasing student motivation, student assessment techniques, using technology in the classroom, diverse student populations and learning styles, and strategies for fostering critical thinking (Dolan et al., 2013, p. 42). Meixner et al. (2010) also suggested topics related to course facilitation, information literacy, and technology in the classroom.
The faculty participants reflected on the mandatory requirement of professional development to be offered by higher education institutions and if the training provided should be mandatory for the part-time faculty. A majority of the faculty believed it should be a requirement that institutions offer professional development opportunities, while just less than half felt the part-time faculty should be required to participate (Dolan et al., 2013).

Overall, Dolan et al.’s (2013) findings echoed other studies and reports that state contingent faculty desire to be recognized as committed professionals in academia (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar, 2012). Further, they have a desire for continual growth in the areas that would contribute to their effective classroom teaching practices. Dolan et al. (2013) reported that MCAPD conferences offering professional development opportunities for part-time faculty that address the aforementioned topics have been successful as reported from participant evaluations of their overall experience at the conference (Dolan et al., 2013).

Institutions have an opportunity to use the information gathered from the adjunct faculty who participated in MCAPD survey to better their professional development opportunities. Opportunities exist to create programs that include the training on classroom instructional strategies and methodologies. Environments can be developed that target the broad adjunct faculty group. The benefits of training faculty in a blended learning environment increase the likelihood that the obstacles that historically have led to less than optimal experiences can be overcome (Tannehill, 2009). Faculty who understand the modality in which they will be teaching and the pedagogy which underscores effective teaching, are better qualified and prepared to deliver the subject
matter content to the learners (Abbitt, 2011; Gappa & Austin, 2010). It is evident part-time faculty desire that understanding and have a commitment to the craft of teaching (Dolan et al., 2013).

The learning environment in which training occurs does not have to mirror the learning environment in which the faculty will be teaching entirely (Gappa & Austin, 2010). Blended learning environments provide benefits to learners and their development by combining online learning and face-to-face classroom instruction (Bonk & Graham, 2005; Yeh et al., 2011). The mixed mode delivery of the professional development will have a portion that mirrors the face-to-face environment in which the adjunct faculty are instructing and an online portion, which enables the participants to overcome the time and location obstacles that frequently exist with the coordination of adjunct faculty professional development opportunities.

We encourage our students to explore their beliefs and expand their knowledge and acceptance of ideas previously unfamiliar to them. We should encourage that same openness with regard to the backgrounds of our faculty who guide them through that process (Meixner et al., 2010, p. 147).

The use of the blended training environment and instructional methods also benefit faculty by exposing them to technology with which they may not be familiar and is an appropriate intervention to address training challenges encountered with the adjunct faculty target audience (Gappa & Austin, 2010).

**SECI Model of Knowledge Management**

An understanding of knowledge management and the SECI model is not possible without an understanding of the terms, which comprise the model. First, what is knowledge? Merriam-Webster (2013b) defines knowledge as “information,
understanding, or skill that you get from experience or education” (para. 1). Merriam-Webster (2013b) also defines knowledge as an “awareness of something: the state of being aware of something” (para. 2). The definition of knowledge is further refined in literature as information put into context and that is time specific (Nonaka et al., 2000, p. 7). Davenport and Prusak (2000) define knowledge as “a fluid mix of framed experience, values, contextual information, and expert insight that provides a framework for evaluating and incorporating new experiences and information” (p.5). Through reading, it becomes evident that knowledge is dynamic as it is subject to change as the time and environment in which the information is learned or applied varies and experience and new knowledge in created. While knowledge may be assessed, the appraisal is only a snapshot of one moment in time. When looking at the SECI model, the process of knowledge conversion is a focal point and not solely the specific knowledge assets created (Jasimuddin et al., 2005). The complexity of knowledge creation and knowledge conversion makes it difficult to isolate knowledge assets due to their dynamic and complex nature (Davenport & Prusak, 2000; Nonaka et al. 2000).

The distinction between tacit and explicit knowledge is a significant point to make when attempting to understand the SECI model. While not the primary focus, the relationship that exists between the two types of knowledge is important to consider as the SECI process influences those relationships. The interventions utilized within each phase work as a catalyst of change in the knowledge conversion continuum. Chatti et al. (2007) further elaborate “similar to the knowledge creation process, the learning process encompasses more than knowledge acquisition. It is a dynamic process within a
collective intelligence, continuous knowledge in action and cyclic conversion of tacit and explicit knowledge” (p. 2).

Merriam-Webster (2013a) defines explicit as “very clear and complete: leaving no doubt about the meaning” (para. 1). The definition of tacit is “expressed or understood without being directly stated” (Merriam-Webster, 2013c, para. 1). When each term is applied as a modifier of knowledge, the definition remains similar. Explicit knowledge is explained as tangible and able to be codified (Chatti et al., 2007; Jasimuddin et al., 2005). Tacit knowledge is formed from experience, subjective, and often more challenging to articulate (Chatti et al., 2007; Jasimuddin et al., 2005). Polanyi, 1987 (as cited in Williams, 2006) states tacit knowledge “consists of subjective insights, intuitions and hunches; it is deeply rooted in an individual’s actions and experience, as well as in the ideals, value, or emotions he or she embraces” (p. 82). Tacit knowledge is perceived as a high value knowledge asset as it captures knowledge under the lens of someone experienced and can be a source of competitive advantage for an organization (Jasimuddin et al., 2005). In 2001, Smith discussed two categories of tacit knowledge, technical and cognitive (p.314-315). Technical tacit knowledge can be described as the know-how and cognitive tacit knowledge values, perspective, and mental models (Smith, 2001).

It is apparent through the readings there is some validity to the statement the more we learn, the more we learn that we do not know. Significant efforts have been made to look at tacit knowledge specifically due to the fact it is more challenging to capture, manage, and store than explicit knowledge. In 2005, Jasimuddin et al. provided an analogy in which they compared knowledge to an iceberg with explicit knowledge being
The visible portion and the tacit knowledge the portion beneath the surface of the water. The authors note the tacit portion that lies below the waterline often supports the explicit portion. Their explanation is consistent with the review of literature, which indicates that experiences provide knowledge upon which new knowledge is formed. Looking at one portion alone is not enough to manage knowledge or the continuum in which knowledge is created.

Williams (2006) explores the “tacit/explicit distinction” (p. 81) in some detail, including reviewing hierarchical relationship of data, information, and knowledge. He delves into the complexity of knowledge when consideration of time and context are applied. Williams (2006) notably mentions, “at the most formal level, tacit knowledge re-emerges as the product of the process of the mastery of complex knowledge” (p. 96). The statement speaks to the continuum and the levels of achievement, which can be attained with movement within the SECI model. Williams is not alone in the identification of data, information, and knowledge and the importance of understanding these terms as knowledge is explored. Davenport and Prusak (2000) also discuss the data, information, knowledge relationship and go on to note “organizational success and failure can often dependent on knowing which of them you need, which you have and what you can and can’t do with each” (p. 1). Davenport and Prusak (2000) continue by noting, “understanding what those three things are and how you get from one to another is essential to doing knowledge work successfully” (p. 1).

Nonaka et al. (2000) state, “an organization creates knowledge through the interactions between explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge” (p. 9). In the SECI KM-based training, knowledge conversion occurs through socialization, externalization,
combination, and internalization (Nonaka et al., 2000; Yeh et al., 2011); see Table 1 for definitions and examples.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes of Knowledge Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Socialisation** (Tacit-Tacit) | The process of converting new tacit knowledge through shared experiences. Since tacit knowledge is difficult to formalise and often time- and space-specific, tacit knowledge can be acquired through shared experience, such as spending time together or living in the same environment.  

*Business Example:* An apprenticeship where hands-on learning with an expert is a requisite of that learning experience.  

*Educational Example:* Faculty learning through the formation of trust and sharing of experiences in informal gatherings outside of the physical classroom in which they work. |
| **Externalisation** (Tacit-Explicit) | The process of articulating tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. When tacit knowledge is made explicit, knowledge is crystallised, thus allowing it to be shared by others, and it becomes the basis of new knowledge.  

*Business Example:* Employees with significant experience and tacit knowledge may share about those experiences in an effort to improve processes during participation in a quality control circle.  

*Educational Example:* Proficient faculty sharing about experiences from their classrooms with others in a community of practice. |
| **Combination** (Explicit-Explicit) | The process of converting explicit knowledge into more complex and systematic sets of explicit knowledge. Explicit knowledge is collected from inside or outside the organization and then combined, edited or processed to form new knowledge. The new explicit knowledge is then shared with others.  

*Business Example:* When an employee gathers information from a variety of sources within an organization and then creates a report that synthesizes this information and forms a knowledge asset.  

*Educational Example:* When a faculty member learns from the experience others have articulated and information gathered from various resources such instructor support materials, textbooks, and so forth and creates new knowledge. |

(continued)
Internalisation (Explicit-Tacit)
The process of embodying explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge. Through internalization, explicit knowledge created is shared throughout an organization and converted into tacit knowledge by individuals. Internalisation is also closely related to ‘learning by doing’.

*Business Example:* By reading information such as manuals an individual can learn about products or processes and then reflect upon them, committing the information to memory and creating tacit knowledge about the product or processes.

*Educational Example:* An instructor reflects upon his or her classroom experiences and commits the experience to memory and their knowledgebase.


Figure 1 depicts the SECI process and how knowledge is converted and created.

The spiral in the middle denotes how the process is never truly complete as new knowledge is created; Williams also reiterated this continuum in 2006.

*Figure 1.* The SECI process. Adapted from “SECI, Ba, and Leadership: A Unified Model of Dynamic Knowledge Creation” by I. Nonaka, R. Toyama, and N. Konno, 2000, *Long Range Planning, 33*, p. 12, with permission from Elsevier.
Further exploration of the model has led to expansion of the model with the addition and discussion of ba (Gourlay, 2003; Nonaka et al., 2000). Ba is the “shared context of knowledge creation” (Gourlay, 2003, p 2) and defined as a shared context in motion, in which knowledge is shared, created, and utilized by Nonaka et al. in 2000. Ba is a place where information is given meaning through interpretation to become knowledge, and new knowledge is created out of existing knowledge through the change of the meanings and the contexts (Nonaka et al., 2000). Davenport and Prusak (2000) indicate that knowledge is closely connected to action which supports other others propositions. “Ba provides the energy, quality and places to perform the individual knowledge conversion and to move along the knowledge spiral” (Nonaka & Toyama, 2002, p. 1001). Jasimuddin et al. (2005) touch upon the importance of context and one specific aspect of context they note is the organizational culture. The strategies selected to facilitate the SECI process may be dependent upon the context in which they are applied (Williams, 2006). For those organizations using the knowledge for competitive advantage, the “strategy would be based upon an organizational culture that is conducive to easy knowledge replication within the organization but presents difficulty in imitation by competitors” (Jasimuddin et al., 2005, p. 108). Strategies would also be designed and implemented with the understanding of “knowledge-as-a-spectrum” (Jasimuddin et al., 2005, p. 109).

Nonaka et al. (2000) denotes “Ba lets participants share time and space, and yet it transcends time and space” (p. 15). They go on to identify four types of ba as shown in Figure 2 and present the two dimensions of interactions.
The type of interaction is an important consideration when looking ahead to the specific activities to be designed in a training program or to perpetuate the continuum of knowledge conversion. The media also becomes important when during the application of the model in the blended learning environment. While face-to-face contact is self-explanatory, Nonaka et al.’s (2000) explanation of virtual media comprises online media and physical media such as books. Action is another key term expressed when reviewing the information about Ba and that energy is required for the ba to become activated (Nonaka et al., 2000; Tee & Karney, 2010).

Nonaka et al (2000) denote “ba can be built intentionally, or created spontaneously. Top management and knowledge producers can build ba by providing physical space such as meeting rooms, virtual space such as a computer network, or mental space such as common goals” (p.25). It is the job of management and the knowledge enablers to energize the ba, promoting movement along the continuum previously discussed. At times ba must also be built or connections made for participants to sustain progression; again leaders are hold a crucial role as they may have greater
visibility to potential connections and can intervene with purposeful interactions (Nonaka et al., 2000).

The four types of Ba coincide with the four modes of the SECI process providing context. Table 2 below includes the explanations of each type as was identified in Nonaka et al. (2000, pp. 16-17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four Types of Ba</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Originating Ba</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialoging Ba</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systemising Ba</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exercising Ba</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Knowledge is dynamic as it always moving along the continuum. Although we are unable to fully inventory knowledge other than at a snapshot in time, Nonaka et al. (2000) have suggested four categories in which we might identify knowledge assets to better understand how these assets might be “created, acquired, and exploited” (p. 20). Nonaka et al. (2000) state, “Knowledge assets are the inputs, outputs and moderating factors of the knowledge-creating process” (p.20). The knowledge assets may differ from one organization to another, as the assets are specific to the individuals and groups that
comprise that organization. A knowledge vision is valuable for an organization to create to provide direction to the KM process within that organization (Nonaka et al., 2000); “the firms knowledge vision also defines the value system that evaluates, justifies and determines the quality of knowledge the company creates” (Nonaka & Toyama, 2002, p.1000). See Table 3 below for the four knowledge asset categories developed by Nonaka et al. in 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Four categories of knowledge assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiential Knowledge Assets</th>
<th>Tacit knowledge shared through common experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skills and know-how of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Care, love, trust, and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Energy, passion, and tension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routine Knowledge Assets</th>
<th>Tacit knowledge routinized and embedded in actions and practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Know-how in daily operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisational routines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisational culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Knowledge Assets a</th>
<th>Explicit knowledge articulate through images, symbols, and language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Product concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brand equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic Knowledge Assets</th>
<th>Systemised and packaged explicit knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documents, specifications, manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Patents and licenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Leadership guidance towards the knowledge vision is not enough alone, the knowledge producers are another critical aspect. The knowledge producers have critical
contributions to make whether those contributions be as an individual, group, or as the organization as a whole (Nonaka et al., 2000). Many of the contributions follow good business practice and communication principles. Nonaka et al. (2000) and Smith (2001) include less tangible assets such as love, care, trust, and commitment as part of what is produced and note each are critical to the sharing of knowledge and to knowledge conversion amongst individuals, groups, and within the organization.

Some authors such as Gourlay (2003) have expressed concern for the empirical basis of the SECI model. Gourlay (2003) comments on the omission of “many important philosophers, of learning theory, of earlier discussion of tacit and declarative knowledge, and the misreading of important organizational writers” (p.2) as a reason for concern when reviewing the SECI model. Limitations were identified with the original two dimensions of the SECI model presented by Nonaka and Takeuchi in 1995 (Gourlay, 2006); subsequent literature identifies this original information as solely the epistemological view of the SECI process (Wu, Senoo, & Magnier-Watanabe, 2010). The ontological perspective is explored in later publications identifying the layers and how the knowledge spiral also moves amongst individual, group, organization, and inter-organization levels (Li et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2010). Wu et al. (2010) explored the ontological aspect of the SECI model and proposed the inter-organization level as a “social network” as they believed “social network was more comprehensive as it involved related individuals outside of organizations, and eliminates unrelated organizations” (p. 794).

While literature exists that has expressed limitations, this review of literature, denotes the numerous studies that have been based upon the model, finding it relevant
and credible upon which to support other research studies, interventions, and forward movement. Rice and Rice (2005) believe “the SECI model has implications both for managerial style and organizational structure, and for the first time emphasized the whole human process of communication as an essential component of organizational knowledge management and learning” (p. 673). Focusing on the learning and development piece, it is believed that looking at the SECI model for talent development within an educational organization is a viable opportunity for continued exploration (Tee & Lee, 2011; Yeh et al., 2011).

Further investigation of the SECI model examines strategies to manage knowledge creation and conversion through specific activities that become a part of the SECI process at specific intervals and within certain contexts. The strategic intervention of knowledge enablers at specific times within the learning environment is also explored. These strategies and activities will be discussed further in the instructional design section.

**Instructional Design Theories and Models**

Instructional design is a systematic process used to optimize teaching and learning. Several instructional design theories and models have been implemented within organizations to design professional development training (Gustafson & Branch, 1997). Instructional design theories provide “explicit guidance on how to better help people learn and develop” (Reigeluth & Frick, 1999, p. 5). Instructional design theory is different from descriptive theories such as learning theory in that design theory provides detailed prescriptions for how to help people learn. Design theory is used by practitioners (e.g., instructional designers, trainers, educators) to purposefully design instruction in specific contexts and for specific situations (Reigeluth & Frick, 1999). Examples of
instructional design theories include: Reigeluth’s Elaboration Theory (Reigeluth, Merrill, Wilson, & Spiller, 1980); Keller’s ARCS Model (2010); and Snyder’s design theory for creating online learning environments for adults (COLCA) (Snyder, 2009).

Instructional design theory is often used synonymously with instructional design models; however, instructional design models comprise broader elements such as analysis, design, development, implementation, evaluation, and revision that are integrated and work interdependently to develop, refine, and product instructional products (Morrison, Ross, Kalman, & Kemp, 2013). In their instructional design model, Morrison et al. (2013) identify four fundamental elements to consider when designing instruction including the learners (i.e., target audience), objectives (what the learners are expected to know and do after completing the instruction), instructional strategies and methods (i.e., how the content will be delivered), and the evaluation procedures (i.e., determining how the learners achieved the objectives). Instructional design models combined with instructional design theory serve to guide practitioners in the design of effective instruction.

For example, Lou, Chung, Dzan, and Chih (2012) chose to apply a problem based learning (PBL) model in a blended learning environment to impact creativity learning effects. The researchers chose the blended learning environment due to the many different applications of technology, which could be applied to reach a broader student population and increase learning efficiency. The PBL model was selected so that concepts already learned could be reinforced and then applied. Lou et al. (2012) further elaborated through the use of PBL, students would “discuss creative ideas and use project activities to learn creativity and enhance student learning effects in creativity” (p. 1283).
The combination of the blended learning and PBL specifically targeting creative instruction for college students developed into Lou et al.’s (2012) Blended Problem Based Learning Creative Instructional Design (BPBLCID) model for evaluation. The fuzzy Delphi method was used for the expert questionnaire “to create a collection of opinions and ideas and individual expert opinions” (Lou et al., 2012, p. 1284). Once integrated and an analysis was completed, the basis for the study was formed. The BPBLCID indicators were ascertained and assessed. The assessment resulted in the identification of the importance of each indicator as it related to creativity character traits, ability in the creative process, innovative design of products, and instructional environment for creativity (Lou et al., 2012).

The authors demonstrate thoroughness in the evaluation by looking at those four main areas and their importance. Experts are included in the analysis to assist with the fuzzy Delphi method. Lou et al. (2012) determined that the diverse blended learning environment integrated with the PBL in the design had a positive impact on the creativity instruction and performance of the learners. The evaluation mechanisms applied in the study enabled Lou et al. (2012) to identify both primary and secondary indicators. Future suggestions for research provided by the author included using the information learned about the indicators in future designs relating to creativity.

Opportunities also exist to build instructional design theories and models using technologies and frameworks outside of the field of instructional design (Li et al., 2011; Smith, 2010) such as Yeh et al.’s 2011 application of the SECI model in the instructional design of blended learning. When knowledge management (KM) is applied as a pedagogical element of the instructional design (ID) of the training environment,
opportunities for learning and teaching become further optimized (Sammour, Schreurs, Zoubi, & Vanhoof, 2008; Yeh et al., 2011). Common factors identified in KM models that exist are the sharing, creation, validation, presentation, distribution, and application of knowledge (Bhatt, 2001). The proper integration of each of these factors is also critical for successful teaching and learning to occur.

An example of the application of a model previously external to ID is Yeh et al.’s 2011 application of the SECI model in the instructional design of blended learning and it was proven to be a model worth further consideration. The results of their study indicate the integration of blended learning and the SECI model for professional development of pre-service teachers in creativity instruction did improve the professional knowledge and personal teaching self-efficacy of the participants. In 2011, Yeh et al. suggest future studies should continue to development models to enhance learning and instruction. In 2012, Tammets’s meta-analysis also indicated there is room for additional exploration of the SECI Model and activities, which promote lifelong learning for teachers.

Yeh et al. (2011) developed the program to span 17 weeks and had 44 participants in the study. The experimental instruction design (Yeh et al., 2011, p. 148) identified in Figure 3 outlines the activities that supported each phase of the SECI model and the knowledge produced.
Instructional goals were established throughout the training that first enhanced the pre-service teachers’ self-awareness in the areas being evaluated and then transitioned to goals designed to develop the teachers’ pedagogical knowledge and personal teaching efficacy (Yeh et al., 2011).

Yeh et al. (2011) used the Inventory of Personal Teaching Efficacy in Creativity Instruction, the Inventory of Professional Knowledge in Instructional Design (both administered before and after the instruction), and a reflective questionnaire (administered at the end of the study) to address the research questions. Each of the instruments and the questionnaire were used to gather quantitative and qualitative data.
Through a content analysis of the reflective questionnaire data, Yeh et al. (2011) determined several underlying mechanisms that supported the successful effect of the instruction and enhanced the knowledge sharing and creation. These mechanisms included “blended learning, guided practice, observational learning, group discussion, peer evaluation, and feedback” (pg. 155).

Tee and Lee (2011) also chose to use a PBL approach guided by the SECI framework to support in-service teachers in cultivating their technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK). Key design considerations for creating activities and conditions to facilitate socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization were made. Tee and Lee (2011) synthesized information from Nonaka et al. (2000) and Tee and Karney (2009) stating the overall conditions were designed to “energise the knowledge sharing and cultivating activities by providing enabling conditions of autonomy, fluctuation and creative chaos, redundancy, requisite variety, and trust and commitment” (p. 92). The intent of their study was gain a deeper understanding of how an improvised PBL approach implemented in the context of the SECI framework could help cultivate TPACK.

The design-based research process included qualitative and quantitative measures, which assisted the authors with forming their conclusions and implications. The findings of Tee and Lee’s 2011 study suggested the design was conducive to stimulating the SECI process and could help teachers cultivate TPACK. The authors noted the pre-service teachers in the study gained a deeper understanding of the three basic components of TPACK. It was noted the socialization and externalization were most evident in the class discussions and informal out of class discussions (Tee & Lee, 2011). Externalization and
combination were seen in more formal activities that were incorporated in the class design. Passive roles by some instructors were a noted item that was unfounded in their study and a topic they noted would be of interest in a future study.

**Knowledge Management in Higher Education**

KM is used in organizations to identify, share, and validate knowledge in order to improve individual and organizational performance (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). The aim of higher education institutions is similar in objective with the goal to create and verify knowledge through research and then distribute the knowledge through publication (Fullwood, Rowley, & Delbridge, 2013). Kidwell et al. (2000) describe KM as “the process of transforming information and intellectual assets into enduring value” (pg. 28). Davenport and Prusak (2000) note that knowledge “often becomes embedded not only in documents or repositories but also in organizational routines, processes, practices, and norms” (p.4). Again, these perspectives can also be said about institutions of higher learning as they impart knowledge onto students who then apply the knowledge and become valuable and contributing members of society who add value to the society as a whole. One might question, why the slow adoption of KM into the educational environment and note that there still appears to be a lack of research and understanding in the area (Fullwood et al., 2013).

In corporations and the business world, managing knowledge assets is viewed as crucial to the everyday functions to maintain a competitive advantage (Agarwal, Kiran, & Verma, 2012; Kidwell et al., 2000). The opportunity to access knowledge at the critical moment when it is needed in a just-in-time or real-time fashion eases the burdening expectation of information overload or excessive memorization of data and facts that may
never be needed. Time-on-task and efficiency gains are recognized with the application of KM. Kidwell et al. (2000) were early believers of the application of knowledge management strategies in higher education and with great forethought, they identified several examples of how KM strategies could be applied.

Kidwell et al. (2000) provided suggestions for how KM could be applied in areas of higher education including curriculum development, research initiatives, alumni and administrative services, and strategic planning. Additionally the authors noted benefits within each of those designated areas. While the adoption of KM in education appears to have been slow to start, it seemingly has picked up momentum with the recent publication of articles on the application of KM in higher education increasing. For example, Agarwal, Kiran, and Verma (2012) created a proposal for a KM based curriculum development portal. The authors believe the effective use of this portal could then be used for competitive advantage for their programs over other institutions of higher learning. Similarities to the benefits recognized in the business sector are becoming apparent in higher education as well. As the physical boundaries that once limited commerce have been removed, so have many of the boundaries and physical limitations of educational institutions now competing for students, faculty, and staff in a global market (Agarwal et al., 2012). Fullwood et al. (2013) chose to explore the types of knowledge shared by academics, their attitudes, and intentions towards knowledge sharing, their expectations, and influence of organizational culture. The authors found knowledge associated with research and teaching and learning were most frequently shared. The expectations were found to be high and positive, believing knowledge
sharing would foster relationships, contribute to their career development, and provide new opportunities (Fullwood et al., 2013).

As previously noted, Tee and Lee (2011) have also embraced the SECI model as a design consideration for their research on cultivating technological pedagogical content knowledge through problem-based learning. The authors carefully selected activities and created conditions to facilitate socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization in both synchronous and asynchronous modes. Tee and Lee (2011) note the context was created to engage participants and encourage knowledge sharing through conditions which were most applicable to adult learners such as autonomy, requisite variety, trust and commitment.

Careful notes are to be taken from a review of the application of KM in the corporate sector. Kidwell et al. (2000) recognized these lessons learned and outlined some basic points for those who are new to the implementation of KM within their organization. First, the purpose of the KM implementation must be determined and along with the purpose a strategy. Consideration of the organizational climate and culture may also impact the strategy chosen (Fullwood et al., 2013). Second, all the stakeholders need to be included in the planning processes, including parties directly and indirectly involved. These individuals might include the persons for whom information is being collected or who will be using the knowledge management system, the individuals from whom the knowledge is being gathered, and representation from the technology staff who will be supporting the project. Ancillary members might be individuals from human resources or financial departments. The administrative stakeholder is very important, as
he or she is the individual who will champion the initiative, support the project implementation, and help to overcome any obstacles that might present themselves.

On first attempt at a knowledge management project, Kidwell et al. (2000) suggest to start small and select a project that has promise for success. The success will create buy-in to the KM model and increase opportunities for future applications. A detailed action plan must be created for the pilot, a plan that insures the involvement of all the stakeholders and details the process, technology, roles, and measures of success. Upon completed implementation of the pilot, a careful review of the outcomes will provide good information and organizational lessons learned for future implementations.

The application of KM in higher education continues to expand as individuals look outside the traditional applications. As previously discussed, Yeh et al. applied KM to the instructional design of pre-service teacher education in their 2011 study. The authors developed a teacher training program that integrated knowledge management and blended learning. They used the SECI knowledge management model, proposed by Nonaka in 1991, as a framework for the instructional design of their blended learning program. The formation, transferability, and reconstructing of knowledge is a requisite in knowledge management. These skills are also important to learning and critical thinking, which are expected outcomes of learning institutions (Li et al., 2011; Yeh et al., 2011; Zhao, 2010) and thus made the application of KM to the instructional model a viable opportunity to explore.

**Communities of Practice**

Communities of practice (CoPs) provide another external perspective on knowledge creation and could potentially proffer benefits to the instructional design of
professional development opportunities (Li et al., 2011; Smith, 2001; Wegner & Snyder, 2000; Yukawa, 2010). In these communities, knowledge is shared and created as the information is synthesized by those participating in these communities (Gray, 2004; Lave & Wenger, 1990). It is noted the characteristics of the CoP are very similar to the features identified when the SECI model is the ID framework for teacher professional development and peer coaching (Li et al., 2011). Nonaka et al. (2000) also mentions the similarities between the SECI model and CoPs in their work.

The results of a case study completed by Li et al. (2011) indicate, “well-designed peer coaching activities certainly contribute to build CoP which can provide both individual teacher and teacher groups with sustainable and effective supports for professional development” (p. 49). The authors designed several peer coaching activities within a Web 2.0 environment for educational professionals such as teachers, educational researchers, and school principals. The study was completed in two school districts in China.

Activities were designed that followed the SECI model of knowledge creation beginning with activities, which developed social connections. Micro-blogs and question and answer sessions were then applied in the training to encourage participants to share knowledge (Li et al., 2011). The latter activities, which were more complex in design such as instructional design, co-editing, and co-construction of instructional strategies, were incorporated in the peer coaching activity design. These activities were employed to encourage collaboration and consultation. The last activity in the design was for action research in which the “participants to design and implement a ‘learner-centered’ class
(including instructional design, teaching video records, and teaching reflection) according to the project” (Li et al., 2011, p. 47).

The SECI knowledge model as shown in Figure 4 provides further insight into the participant knowledge developed and the interactions within the framework as designed by Li et al. (2011). This framework builds upon the importance of individuals, groups, and organizations in the knowledge creation and conversion SECI process and ontology.

![SECI Knowledge Model](image.png)

**Figure 4.** SECI knowledge model. Reprinted from “A Case Study on Design of Teacher Peer-Coaching Activities Supported by a Web 2.0 Community” by S. Li, H. Sun, and X. Zheng, 2011, *Hybrid Learning*, p. 42, with kind permission from Springer Science and Business Media.

During socialization, individuals are brought together because of some commonality or areas of common interest. In Li et al.’s (2011) study, the common thread was instruction. Yukawa’s study in 2010 evaluated CoPs with common threads of blended learning for Library and Information Science (LIS) education. Although Yukawa’s (2010) study did not identify the SECI model explicitly, similarities are apparent and will be discussed later. In both studies as everyone began to share explicit
knowledge and share about their individuals experiences respective to a specific topic or situation, group knowledge began to form (Li et al., 2011; Yukawa, 2010). As the group knowledge is combined with the individuals’ knowledge, it could be applied in the organization. Jasimuddin et al. (2005) and Smith (2001) also note the value in storytelling activities in the sharing of knowledge. Critical thinking is encouraged as new experiences occur and new tacit knowledge created from those experiences providing the individuals, the group, and the organization an opportunity to reflect (Yukawa, 2010).

As new topics and conversations are had, the cycle of knowledge creation continues. Li et al. (2011) reported evaluation of the participation and artifacts created in the Web 2.0 environment is on-going, but the preliminary results are promising as to the value of the activity design for the nurturing of the CoP. Another notable finding of Li et al.’s (2011) study was that individual motivation was also a contributing factor to the sustainability of the CoP. Gray’s (2004) research on the informal learning which occurs in a CoP also supports that motivation is required and that the value of the community can drive that motivation. Value of a CoP is often determined by the opportunities to share or gain new knowledge or skills within the constructs of the CoP (Gray, 2004; Li et al., 2011). Perceived value may be different for individuals with varying levels of experience. Gray (2004) notes

“as a community of practice, the online environment facilitated a space for the learning and enculturation of newcomers as well as an opportunity for more experienced practitioners to gain new insights into various aspects of the practice and their own professional identities” (p.32).
Different experiences levels and those with different knowledge and skills, all contributing to the interactions within the CoP contribute to the value. Gray (2004) also confirms the interactions amongst the individuals, groups within the CoP, and the community as a whole contribute to the formation of new knowledge and understanding.

Yukawa (2010) presents a different perspective on CoPs and their application to the design of a CoP for blended learning. As previously mentioned an evaluation of an integrated model for library and information science (LIS) education is performed. Yukawa (2010) takes time to review Wenger’s design framework (1998) and the three modes of belonging, which include engagement, imagination, and alignment. Yukawa (2010, p. 61) provides a diagram as to how the CoP Learning Processes in the blended the classroom might be delineated and is shown in Figure 5.
Each of the modes of belonging has congruencies to attributes or features identified in the literature defining the SECI model. Engagement denotes similar attributes to socialization with sharing of information and establishing credibility, but also overlaps with externalization as actions are taken. Engagement is key to sustaining a CoP and directly relates to the energy required to move forward along the continuum of
knowledge presented with the SECI model. Imagination has attributes such as recombination, perceiving new patterns, and exploration, which mirror attributes in both the combination and internalization phases of the SECI model. Alignment appears to be more complex in nature with considerations of power, influence, and discourse, but vague similarities exist with socialization as it moves to the next level and the movement throughout the phases of the SECI model occurs.

Li et al. (2011) note stimulus is sometimes required to assist with moving from one phase to the next in a newly formed CoP, which is not unlike the discussions of the interactions and the four types of *ba*, which impact the progression through the SECI model. Each of the aforementioned mechanisms from Yeh et al.’s (2011) study are also notably activities which help move individuals, groups, and organizations through the various phases of knowledge creation as well. Human intervention may be necessary in the form of a knowledge enabler to encourage progression and actions to occur (Nonaka et al., 2000).

Both Gray (2004) and Li et al. (2011) indicated a moderator or facilitator is an important consideration when developing and sustaining a CoP. Guidance by this person or person(s) is important to move the individual and group beyond socialization and sharing, into meaningful interactions which assist with knowledge creation and promote reflective practices. A CoP developed and nurtured in an online environment is a place where collegiality can thrive, as the environment spans geographical boundaries and time (Gray, 2004; Yukawa, 2010). For adjunct faculty, who as previously noted often work in silos, the CoP can reduce or remove the feelings isolation, which can be present.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

The goal was to construct and validate a blended learning professional development course for adjunct faculty. Design and development research methods (Richey & Klein, 2007) were used to conduct the study in four phases. In phase one, a course design framework that integrated the four modes of the SECI KM model (i.e., socialization, externalization, internalization, and combination) was developed. Included with the framework was a mapping of the learning outcomes, knowledge type, and activities associated with each SECI mode. In phase two, an expert panel reviewed the framework and mapping. The Delphi technique (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963) was used to capture panel members’ feedback. Revisions to the framework and mapping were made based on the results of the expert review. In phase three, the framework was used to instantiate the course design. The course was developed within the Desire2Learn learning management system. In phase four, a formative evaluation (Morrison et al., 2013) of the course was conducted using focus groups with key stakeholders including faculty, staff, and administrators. Each of these four phases along with a description of the data collection and analysis process follows.
Phase 1: Course Design

A well-documented and thought out design framework was crucial to capturing the essence and purposeful considerations incorporated into the design. Phase 1 was an extensive phase where the course instructional design process ensued. In this phase the design model was refined and development of the course components began including collaboration on course content and the application of technologies to support teaching and learning within the course. It was in this phase where the extension of Yeh et al.’s 2011 study was most evidenced with the innovation of KM as a viable framework for the design of professional development and the blended environment in which it was applied. Davenport and Prusak (2000) stated, “knowledge can be likened to a living system, growing and changing, as it interacts with the environment” (p. 8). A framework incorporating the SECI model into the instructional design was planned to nurture that system.

KM-based Model

The formation, transferability, and reconstructing of knowledge was a requisite in knowledge management; however, knowledge conversion was also important to learning and critical thinking (Yeh et al., 2011; Zhao, 2010). In SECI KM-based training, knowledge conversion occurred through socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization (Nonaka et al., 2000; Yeh et al., 2011). “Through the SECI spiral of continuous knowledge creation and utilization, tacit and explicit knowledge expands in terms of quality and quantity, from the individual to the group, then to the organizational level” (Nonaka & Toyama, 2002, p. 996). Knowledge was proposed to move along the continuum between tacit and explicit knowledge and amongst the levels as a result of
different stimuli from the environment, intrinsic motivation, or by prompting by the knowledge enablers (Naeve, Yi-Luoma, Kravcik, & Lytras, 2008).

The guided movement along the continuum prepared participants in the process to perform in a manner congruent with the knowledge vision of the organization. “Leaders provide the knowledge vision, develop and promote the sharing of knowledge assets, create and energise ba, and enable and promote the continuous spiral of knowledge creation” (Naeve et al., 2008, p. 17). The ontological perspective of the SECI model identified the layers and how the knowledge process moved amongst individual, group, organization, and inter-organization levels (Li et al, 2011; Wu, Senoo, & Magnier-Watanabe, 2010); the perspective reinforced the careful consideration of the determination of design concepts and environment implemented. Figure 6 shows KM-Model concepts integrated to form the design framework for this professional development course. Yeh et al. (2011) noted, “the ecological focus emphasizes interactions between people, identity, knowledge, and environment factors” (p. 147). A feature of this design framework was that it functions as a system of interdependent activities and attributes, which supported the professional development of participants in the proposed course.
Figure 6. Course Design Framework. Complex aspects required of faculty professional development were addressed through the integration of concepts from the review of literature; notably concepts from the SECI model, blended learning, Bloom’s taxonomy, just-in-time delivery, and communities of practice were used to form this framework for the design of the professional development course.

A systematic review offered a view of some of the additional attributes with the integration of SECI into the design. The interactions amongst the individual, group, and organization throughout the knowledge spiral added another dimension to contemplate in addition to the four SECI modes (Naeve et al., 2008). A benefit of using a KM model was the potential to support sustainability through knowledge-rich interactions integrated into the design (Davenport & Prusak, 2000; Nonaka and Toyama, 2002). Nonaka and Toyama
(2002) emphasized the importance of looking at the knowledge-creating activities and not just the outcomes alone.

**Course Outcomes - Knowledge Vision**

The aim of the professional development course was to facilitate just-in-time training for adjunct faculty who teach undergraduate students in a face-to-face environment and that will help these instructors become more efficacious in their classrooms. The specific professional development course goals and outcomes were written in the initial phases of the instructional design process to meet the needs of the adjunct faculty at a college. The target institution changed before the focus group evaluation of the constructed instantiation and in result, the orientation goals were updated. The updated orientation course goals and course outcomes can be found in Appendix A. In relation to the SECI model, the course goals were the knowledge vision, which would direct course facilitators on how to lead the course and justify the components of the design that support the SECI knowledge conversion process. Hypothetically, participants in the course would move along the knowledge continuum towards meeting the course outcomes, which reflect the university’s knowledge vision, and leading to greater teacher efficaciousness in the classrooms.

Course outcome 1 related to the mission, vision, and values of the university. Davenport and Prusak (2000) were careful to note in their discussion of knowledge, the importance of values and beliefs to the organization and to the people in the organization. “Values and beliefs are integral to knowledge, determining in large part what the knower sees, absorbs, and concludes from his observations” (Davenport & Prusak, 2000, p. 9). It was possible for those individuals with dissimilar beliefs to interpret or process
information differently, thus influencing their organization and application of the knowledge. Providing a baseline of the organization’s beliefs and commitment was an effort to provide context for those faculty who were new to the university.

Course outcomes and weekly learning outcomes were written using the revised Bloom’s taxonomy. Krathwohl (2002) was careful to point out that Bloom’s taxonomy served purposes beyond that of just a measurement tool and served to aid communication, guide congruence in curriculum, activities, and assessments, and prospect educational opportunities of varying degrees of breadth and depth could be contrasted. Krathwohl (2002) reexamines the four knowledge dimensions of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy:

- **Factual Knowledge** – The basic elements that students must know to be acquainted with a discipline or solve problems in it.
- **Conceptual Knowledge** – The interrelationships among the basic elements within a larger structure that enable them to function together.
- **Procedural Knowledge** – How to do something; methods of inquiry, and criteria for using skills, algorithms, techniques, and methods.
- **Metacognitive Knowledge** – Knowledge of cognition in general as well as awareness and knowledge of one’s own cognition (p. 214)

All four knowledge dimensions were touched in the training course.

Yeh et al. (2011) targeted instructional goals with specific activities based upon the SECI modes of knowledge conversion and activities, which promoted learning throughout stages of their course. Similarly in this course design, faculty participants would also complete weekly activities based upon the SECI modes which promoted knowledge conversion and movement toward higher order thinking and prepared participants to meet the course outcomes.

Throughout the course design and development, the outcomes were used as an anchor point when determining course materials, resources, activities, and evaluations (Morrison et al., 2013; Vai & Sosulski, 2011). The instructional design leveraged the
knowledge conversion process to engage and familiarize adjunct instructors with the basics of face-to-face teaching including fundamental teaching methods, principles of good teaching practice, classroom management, and assessment strategies.

**Instructional Methods**

Using the SECI model as a framework for the design created opportunities for effective instructional design principles to be applied such as the generative strategy and cognitive load noted by Morrison et al. (2013). Each instructional strategy supported different aspects of the SECI knowledge process. For example, the organizational category of the generative strategy “helps the learner identify how new ideas relate to existing ideas” (Morrison et al., 2013, p. 139) was visible as connections were made between the knowledge types and how explicit or tacit knowledge was converted to have new meaning for the individual participating in an activity which prompted the knowledge conversion to occur (Davenport & Prusak, 2000; Smith, 2001; Williams, 2006; Yeh et al., 2011). Applying generative strategies that supported active learning was critical for movement along the knowledge continuum and believed necessary to increase value to the participants potentially.

Faculty have a challenging task of not only being experts in their subject matter, but they also needed a sound understanding of all it takes to create a quality learning environment for the students all the while supporting the mission, vision, and values of the organization for whom they are working. The knowledge required to run a classroom successfully was immense and for many there was a learning curve as they entered the contingent faculty work force (Abbitt, 2011; Berrett, 2012; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Dolan et al., 2013; Tannehill, 2009). Introduction to all the course topics planned could
be quite daunting if all presented at one time and could lead to cognitive overload. Morrison et al. (2013) discussed cognitive load theory and the value in considering the extraneous cognitive load placed on learners through design elements. Intrinsic cognitive load could be influenced when context, *ba*, including the organization, timing, and learner support was considered.

In support of the SECI model, the provision of information and respective activities within the course was designed to elicit specific knowledge conversions. A strategy for effective course development and controlling step size of instruction included plans to reference prior knowledge and experience upon which the participant would draw (Morrison et al., 2013). This effective design strategy also aligned with actions encouraged to support the conversion of knowledge in the SECI process.

The first principles of instruction as identified by Merrill (2009) also were visible with the integration of SECI into the design framework. Merrill (2009) noted, “the principles had to be design-oriented; that is, they are principles about instruction that have direct relevance for how the instruction is designed to promote learning activities, rather than activities that learners may use on their own while learning” (p.43). These principles included the task-centered principle, the demonstration principle, the application principle, the activation principle, and the integration principle.

It was difficult to avoid drawing some congruencies between the four-phase cycle of instruction and the SECI model. These principles make mention of topics such as know-how which have been identified as tacit technical knowledge (Williams, 2006). Learner interaction was noted in the description of four of the five principles. For example, peer discussions and demonstrations were noted as part of the demonstration
principle (Merrill, 2009) and were in line with the interactions amongst levels implicit to the SECI model in the socialization phase. The activation principle included reference to the importance of the connection of prior knowledge or experiences (Merrill, 2009) which was also intuitive to the SECI model as knowledge conversion which presumed some foundation of knowledge or experience upon which the knowledge conversion occurs (Yeh et al., 2011). Merrill also discussed guidance and coaching and he indicated involvement of a facilitator. The facilitators in this design served a similar role as knowledge enablers or leaders in knowledge management in a professional development course.

The incorporation of verified instructional principles to complement the SECI model provided support to the selection of the learning activities, the just-in-time learning sequencing, and the learning environment selected. The design was structured to support participants, facilitators as knowledge producers and faculty as knowledge enablers, who would be necessary for the SECI model to function as prescribed (Nonaka et al., 2000). **Course Activities**

Evidence of the incorporation of SECI model into this design framework was most visible in the learning and development activities noted in the course design. The preliminary instructional design consisted of activities that were included as a part of KM-based models in a variety of previous research studies integrated with design elements, which were reflective of the principles of good teaching practice and learning theory. Appendix B delineates the learning and development activities associated with phases of the SECI model and the learning environment in which those components were evidenced. These activities were drawn from Li et al. (2011), Tee and Karney (2010), Tee
and Lee (2011), and Yeh et al. (2011). Tammets (2012) also proposed some strategies for consideration in a teacher training context based upon a meta-analysis of Nonaka and Takeuchi’s work and which can be viewed in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization</th>
<th>Teachers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss with colleagues about professional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shape the collective knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalization</td>
<td>Teachers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Share reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create learning materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comment colleagues’ reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>Teachers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaboratively work on materials/documents/requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make improvements and suggestions to the organizational documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Teachers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflect about professional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn from colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyze competences (based on org. documents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from “Meta-Analysis of Nonaka and Takeuchi’s Knowledge Management Model in the Context of Lifelong Learning” by K. Tammets, *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice, 13* (4), p. 12, with permission from Peter Smith, President of the Leadership Alliance.

The SECI model was comprised of a community in which differing levels of interactions could occur. Bielaczyc and Collins (2009) noted “the activities of learning communities must provide a means for (a) both individual development and collaborative construction of knowledge, (b) sharing knowledge and skills among members of the
community, and (c) making learning process visible and articulated” (p. 274). Each of their descriptors could also describe activities designed to support the various modes of knowledge conversion.

From the compiled information a preliminary design framework including an outcomes, knowledge, activity mapping was developed which was validated by an expert panel and in the construction of an instantiation of the course design in this study. A validation of the design was completed in phase two to increase the reliability and legitimacy of the selected activities and design. Vai and Sosulski (2011) mentioned many of the activities that were proposed for inclusion in this course as activities that were essential to online course design such as the collaborative class participation activities and discussions, the reflective activities, and self-assessment activities.

While much of the training course was to be guided through weekly discussion topics or activities and on-the-job experiences, opportunities for self-paced development also existed through additional resources available in the online environment. Naeve et al. (2008) distinguished between the push that often exists in formal learning versus the information pull that occurs in informal learning. A majority of the course centered on the formal training; however, the informal opportunities were also deliberated upon to support the potentially diverse skillsets and knowledgebase of those who would be participating in the development course. Activities that supported the push and the pull could support the diverse needs of learners.

Morrison et al. (2013) discussed how the careful selection of objectives and opportunities for immediate feedback were features and a part of quality designs for self-paced learning. Considerations were made for the inclusion of some activities, which
were to provide immediate feedback and were designated as checks for learning. Examples of these types of activities were the scenarios and matching appropriate responses or preferred language for effective feedback.

*Real-time and Just-in-time Training*

Davenport and Prusak (2000) discussed how knowledge develops over time as we gain experience in addition to the knowledge we gain from formal training, media resources, mentors, and informal learning opportunities. While providing one or two training sessions permitted all the material to be covered quickly, distributing the training and the learning throughout the term permitted the course to incorporate more breadth and depth into its design. In this design, velocity was reduced and viscosity was increased with the integration of the SECI model including the concept of *Ba* and knowledge as a continuum throughout the course design. The SECI model concepts offered a rich context for learning and a system that supported development towards a knowledge vision.

The sequencing and delivery of information and corresponding learning activities were carefully considered for this training course. The cyclical nature of responsibilities of the face-to-face environment including when the respective information would be needed or able to be reflected upon drove the sequencing of activities and course topics. Morrison et al. (2013) made note of the importance of appropriate pacing for effective designs. Risks were apparent with going too fast and too slow; using some asynchronous communication tools to support the just-in-time and real-time training provided an additional benefit that the learner had some influence on his/her pace.

Learning could occur through formal training which was structured with specific goals and outcomes established prior to the training beginning; learning could also occur
through informal or nonformal experience such as on-the-job experiences or self-motivated learning aspirations (Naeve et al., 2008). While the training for this course was leveraging the formal structure under which there would be greater influence, it had been recognized that there would be on-the-job experience gained in the classrooms each week. Strategic consideration of the dissemination of information and discussions of specific topics at times targeted when there was a likelihood of certain events occurring in the face-to-face classrooms was made. Leveraging events from the classroom in conjunction with events in the blended learning environment were strategic in design to support the concept of building or energizing ba.

For adults, relevancy has been noted as a critical aspect for learning (Li et al., 2011; Snyder, 2009). Distributing the training over the duration of the term at times when the information and activities would be perceived to be most relevant aligned with this effective practice for training adult learners. Singh as cited in Bonk and Graham (2005) stated, “real-time learning pinpoints the exact type of information needed and automatically delivers that information to a learner” (p. 480). Appendix C has the resultant Training Tracking Calendar outlining outcomes, topics, activities, facilitators, and resources for each week of the professional development course. The duration of the proposed course was similar to the duration used by Yeh et al. (2011) in which the length of the training was the entire term, 17 weeks. The calendar topics were determined based upon the needs analysis and discussions of at what point in the term specific information was believed to be needed or topics which often arise, thus relevant, timely delivery of information as common with real-time learning opportunities. For example in week 3 of the professional development, the concept of giving effective feedback and methods of
providing constructive feedback was reviewed. The timing was chosen because week 3 would be slightly before the weeks in which instructors are expected to prepare and provide students with week 4 academic progress updates.

Morrison et al. (2013) noted training targets performance and productivity. The authors also went on to mention how timing could be leveraged in the instructional design of training opportunities; this fact was especially true for the incorporation of SECI into the design of the professional development. In this professional development, the real-time approach was applied in conjunction with the knowledge vision, knowledge enablers, knowledge assets, and a selection of activities to fuel momentum along the SECI knowledge continuum.

**Blended Learning**

Knowledge that existed, but was not accessible was of little value to an organization (Davenport & Prusak, 2000). A plethora of organizational knowledge existed within the university amongst the many departments who supported the learners and the staff, in addition to members of the administration who oversaw the delivery of instruction. A review of literature identified lack of access to or provision of professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty due to schedule challenges as a recurring problem. Discussions with the initial prospective participant college identified that these challenges were apparent at their institution and access to the knowledge, which could support the adjunct faculty in their classroom instruction was currently limited as well. Follow-up conversations with the director of the teaching and learning center at the second prospective institution echoed findings noted in the literature. In addition to this study being an extension of Yeh et al.’s (2011) study where blended learning was used in
the design, it was still relevant and preferred for this design, as utilizing a blended learning environment would increase the accessibility and thus the potential value of the knowledge contained therein.

Nonaka et al. (2000) indicated the types of interactions in *ba*, helped time and space be shared amongst participants and for the purpose of this research, both were necessary to overcome barriers of time and accessibility that were identified. The blended environment was chosen as it proffered virtual and face-to-face opportunities for interactions amongst the individuals, group, and the organization; these interactions increased the context in which knowledge conversions could occur (Naeve et al., 2008) and were a match to *ba*, which would be expected necessary to overcome the presented obstacles.

The face-to-face portion of the course initially consisted of two formal face-to-face training sessions; one to be held prior to the start of classes and the other to be held near mid-term. These two face-to-face sessions were designed in workshop format where information was delivered and reinforced through active learning principles. One slight adjustment for the second institution was to split the first face-to-face training prior to the start of the term into two days due to integrating this course with other campus professional development activities for all staff and new non-instructional staff.

It was recognized that additional face-to-face knowledge creation occurs through informal learning that occurs on-the-job, while in the classroom as well as in shared physical spaces such as the faculty work room. The focus of the design discussion was on the formal opportunities of which there would be control and less on the informal spaces where influence was limited.
The online environment spanning the 15-week duration of the term would be utilized for asynchronous discussions and activities. It was not anticipated that synchronous modes of communication would be required in the design of the online portions; however, these sessions would be optional upon request. A significant portion of the information presented in the face-to-face formal training sessions would also be made available in the online environment should anyone need to revisit these topics areas or if anyone was unable to attend the face-to-face sessions.

Application of learning theories discussed throughout the course content would be modeled as much as possible as another mechanism of reinforcement of principles discussed. Opportunities existed in the online and face-to-face portions to model practices, which could be applied in the faculty’s face-to-face classrooms.

*Instructional Design of the Online Environment*

Davenport and Prusak (2000) forecasted that the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) may be a tool to enhance and enrich the knowledge sharing and knowledge conversions that occur within organizations; however, they were also careful to note that the technology alone would not guarantee the success of the knowledge exchange without a supportive culture for those activities. Organizational culture was relevant in the instructional design as it could directly influence the success of the design and the SECI process (Fullwood, 2013; Jasmimuddin et al., 2005; Nonaka et al., 2000). In preparation for those faculty who may not be accustomed to online learning, special attention in the instructional design of the online environment was made for clear communications, pedagogy, organization, and the visual design aspects which were important for effective and quality course design (Vai & Solulski, 2011). Again,
modeling of good practices would further reinforce the concepts discussed in the training course.

Morrison et al. (2013) noted important heuristics such as pacing, consistency, and cues. Pacing was addressed with the real-time aspects of the course design. Consistency was addressed with careful review of the information included to support the course; the review included what comprised the informational message and how the subject matter was communicated. The cues were incorporated into the content and activities of the weekly modules, guiding the participants’ knowledge conversion. These heuristics were also related to the context and 

Phase 2: Design Validation by Expert Panel (Delphi Panel)

The course design needed to be validated before course development in the Desire2Learn LMS. The Delphi method, a systematic group judgment technique, was selected to vet the instructional activities proposed for inclusion in the instructional design as the Delphi method elicited and organized the expert options of panel members through an iterative and controlled feedback process (Dalkey, 1972; Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Hsu & Sandford, 2007). “The Delphi technique is well suited as a method for consensus-building by using a series of questionnaires delivered using multiple iterations to collect data from an [expert] panel” (Hsu & Sandford, 2007, p. 1). The Delphi
technique was also determined a suitable selection for this validation phase due to its use in achieving specific objectives as noted by Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson in 1975. In 1975, p. 11, the authors noted five objectives, three of which were relevant to this study:

- To determine or develop a range of possible course alternatives;
- To seek out information which may generate a consensus on the part of the respondent group; and
- To correlate informed judgments on a topic spanning a wide range of disciplines.

The instructional design of the course was adjusted as deemed necessary from the feedback received from the expert panel.

About the Delphi Technique

Dalkey and Helmer developed the Delphi method at RAND Corporation in the 1950’s, initially as a technique for military technological forecasting purposes (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Delbecq et al., 1975). The Delphi method had three primary features including anonymity, controlled feedback, and statistical group response (Dalkey, 1972). Anonymity reduced the potential influence of dominant opinions within the group (Dalkey, 1972). The feedback was controlled as the exercise was conducted “in a sequence of rounds between which a summary of the results of the previous round are communicated to the participants” (Dalkey, 1972, p. 21). This approach of multiple rounds can be a time involved process, often taking two to three months to complete (Delbecq et al., 1975; Hsu & Sanford, 2007). The statistical group response used quantitative measures to assure the opinion of all group members were represented (Dalkey, 1972). While independent opinions were likely still exist, the combination of
these three features lended to convergence of opinions resulting in a group consensus (Dalkey, 1972).

Dalbecq et al. (1975) noted there are variations in the implementation and design of Delphi studies, especially in the use of open-ended or structured questioning, the number of rounds, and the decision rules to compile the opinions of the group into a consensus. Skulmoski, Hartman, and Krahn (2007) echoed Dalbecq et al. in noting the variations in application of the Delphi; however, they provided a table of 16 published research studies of which the average number of rounds noted was 3 and 40 dissertation reports which also had an average number of rounds as 3.

Delphi Process – Study Overview

The Delphi process began with the establishment of initial broad questioning that was the focus of the Delphi technique (Delbecq et al., 1975). The focus of this Delphi panel was to determine if the learning activities associated with phases of the SECI model had been associated correctly and if the learning activities had been applied properly in the instructional design of the professional development course. Individuals with specific expertise and knowledge were needed to address those questions.

The recruitment and selection of panel members and information about the two rounds of questioning are presented in Chapter 4. Taking into consideration the review of literature completed by Skulmoski et al. (2007) and Delbecq et al.’s (1975) text, it was anticipated three rounds of surveys would be needed to refine the learning and development activities and their association with each phase of the SECI process. Dalbecq et al. (1975) noted that subsequent rounds after consensus was achieved may be
eliminated or additional rounds may be added during the process if deemed necessary. In this study, consensus was received after two rounds had been completed.

As just discussed, the resultant consensus was the determining factor for the number of rounds to include. Variations were noted in the literature as to what determines consensus or level of consensus (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Hsu & Sanford, 2007; Skulmoski et al., 2007). For this study, it was determined that when the majority response amongst the panel members was agree or strongly agree and no panel members strongly disagreed, those results indicated a consensus had been ascertained amongst the panel members.

A table including the outcomes, knowledge type, proposed activity in context, and the SECI mode was developed for the detailed review by the expert panel. The results of the panel impacted the instructional design of the training course prior to the development of the instantiation of the design in phase 3.

The Zoomerang online survey tool was used to facilitate the questioning in each round. The anonymous survey feature was used to maintain anonymity of responses to the questionnaires. The on-going survey results were not made visible to participants to reduce concerns with conformity as well (Delbecq et al., 1975). The Zoomerang survey tool enabled the researcher to send out a reminder email to complete the survey to all participants; the only drawback of using the anonymous feature was the panel members who had already responded may have received an unnecessary reminder. Wording was chosen to indicate the reminder was for those who had not yet responded to the survey.
Delphi Process - Expert Panel Selection

Individuals were recruited for the expert panel through purposive sampling, in that a cross-section of expertise was be sought out due to the breadth of knowledge required to examine the KM associations with the respective learning activities (Hsu & Sanford, 2007). The Delphi method required individuals with specific expertise to provide informed feedback throughout the iterative process on the associations of the learning activities to KM, the application of the activities in the design, and the validity of the selections and thus this were also criterion for selection of panel members (Hsu & Sanford, 2007). Delbecq et al. (1975) and Ludwig (1994) mentioned the commitment and motivation of panel members was also an important consideration for panel recruitment and selection as the participant’s timely response to each round of inquiry was important to the successful implementation of the Delphi technique.

An email invitation was sent out to potential participants, which explained the study and the role of the Delphi panel within the study. A tentative timeline of the Delphi panel study was also included to make participants aware of the commitment and critical timing of their responses (see Appendix D). Upon a positive response to the invitation, a listing of panel members was created and maintained by the researcher to maintain anonymity amongst the panel members. The sample size required varies dependent upon the needs of the study; however, it was common to see sample populations from ten into the hundreds (Delbecq et al., 1975). Skulmoski et al. (2007) provided a table of published research, which indicated sample sizes between 3 and 174.

When an adequate sample population of eight individuals was recruited, it was believed “a representative pooling of judgments regarding the target issue” (Hsu &
Sanford, 2007) was available and the Delphi process resumed. The expert panel members were selected due to their extensive knowledge, training, and experience in the areas of instructional design, higher education, or knowledge management. All eight panel members had earned PhDs, most in a field of study related to one of the aforementioned areas or they had successfully completed coursework in at minimum one of those areas. Seven of the panel members had worked either part-time or full-time in higher education. Six of the individuals had direct experience with instructional design or the oversight of individuals responsible for instructional design. Five of the individuals had direct experience with knowledge management planning and implementation in the workplace. The intentional breadth of experience and knowledge desired was achieved through the panel selected.

Delphi Process – Round 1 and Round 2

Upon successful recruitment of an expert panel to review the course design, the data gathering began. The Delphi process round 1 consisted of a communication (see Appendix E) to each expert panel member that included a reiteration of the Delphi panel focus and the definition of consensus for the purpose of this research, along with a summary of the course design (see Appendix F) and the timeline for the Delphi study. The panel members were asked to review the materials via a survey link and provide input on whether the aspects of the SECI process were used correctly and were representative of the SECI model.

To expedite the review, a preliminary design was put together for consideration by the panel, which included the course outcomes supported by weekly outcomes and activities. Each weekly outcome had a knowledge type associated with it and proposed
activity to elicit that type of knowledge. Panel members were asked to verify the SECI mode designation that accompanied each outcomes-knowledge-activity (OKA) mapping to validate the appropriate knowledge type and corresponding SECI mode.

The outcomes-activity mapping was determined based upon a review of literature and experience of the researcher; Hsu and Sandford (2007) noted it was acceptable to use information drawn from a review of literature for round 1 of a Delphi panel review. The preliminary list can be viewed in the Delphi Expert Panel Round 1 Survey Information, which can be found in Appendix G. The Round 1 Survey included succinct instructions for the research panel participants on how to complete their review and the type of feedback requested as a result of that expert review. For the purpose of data integrity, the definitions of the knowledge types and modes of knowledge conversion used for this research study were provided. The evaluation also provided the opportunity for panel members to provide any additional comments or feedback about the SECI model incorporation into the design of this training course.

Upon receipt of responses to the round 1 survey in the timeframe requested, the responses were compiled and analyzed. A summary of the group results was prepared for dissemination to the panel for the next round of the Delphi process. In addition, revisions to the listing of learning activities associated with each aspect of the SECI model and instructional design were made.

Round 2 consisted of a communication to the expert panel members (see Appendix H) and a summary of the expert panel round 1 results (see Appendix I). All the original invitees who agreed to participate in the expert panel were offered the opportunity to participate in Round 2. The listing of learning activities was updated to
include the associations with the SECI modes and to appropriately reflect the findings of the expert panel. In addition, the instructional design framework was updated where the application of these activities was determined to need adjustment.

The panel members were asked in the same email to review the updated information via a survey link and provide input on whether the aspects of the SECI process were used correctly and were representative of the SECI model. He/she had the opportunity to provide feedback on the updated aspects of the design and to affirm the previous design components that had not changed. Items identified as not associated with SECI were not removed; however, they were indicated as such in the updated information (Delbecq et al., 1975; Ludwig, 1994). The Round 2 Survey again included the definitions for ease of reference and consistency. A copy of the round 2 survey can be found in Appendix J.

Upon receipt of all the round 2 survey replies, the researcher compiled and analyzed data collected. Since consensus was achieved, a summary of the panel round 2 results were prepared for distribution to the group indicating consensus and that no further rounds were needed. Included with the final report email (see Appendix K) was the round 2 results (see Appendix L).

Delphi Process – Analysis and Findings

Each round denoted that an analysis of the responses would occur. Each panel member’s responses were compiled with the responses of the other panel members, upon which the analysis ensued and a group consensus was formed (Dalkey, 1972; Delbecq et al., 1975). A discussion of the findings of the Expert Panel review can be found in Chapter 4 with the summary from each round included in the appendices of this report.
Impact on Instructional Design

Upon completion of this phase, the course design was updated to reflect the final changes or refinements as suggested by the results of the Delphi expert panel prior to the development of the instantiation of the design. These findings resulted in the adjustment, addition, or omission of activities, which had been identified to be included in the course in certain contexts, or simply altered the classification of the activity as it corresponded to the phases of the SECI process or context in which the activity was to occur. The findings from Phase 2, informed Phase 3 in which the course instantiation was constructed in the Desire2Learn LMS.

Phase 3: Course Development

Phase 3 consisted of the updated construction of the professional development course in the Desire2Learn LMS. Details about the training course and design were included in the reflective journal. As discussed in further detail later in this chapter, the reflective journal instrument was selected for use in this research to capture design and development decisions.

Training Course Instantiation

Design practices supported by literature were utilized in the development of the instantiation. The online portion of the training using the LMS features was constructed in the LMS prior to the review by the focus group and for further analysis if needed. Features of the LMS were used to create content that aligned with the outcomes-knowledge-activity mapping validated by the expert panel in Phase 2.

The training course calendar discussed earlier was updated and included in the course as an example of the proposed course pacing. It was noted during the presentation
prepared for the focus groups in phase four that a comprehensive implementation plan would need to be developed if the course as designed and developed was to be fully implemented. A few implementation items were noted in the presentation of the training course instantiation to the focus groups, however, the comprehensive implementation plan was out of the scope of this research study.

**Technology and Resources**

Desire2Learn, Articulate Storyline, and like technologies provided the opportunity to create interactive and engaging presentations of information and learning activities that also supported the design concepts noted above. The types of **ba** were associated with the classification of media and directly correlated to the resources and technology chosen to deliver information and promote action. See Appendix M for screen captures of the Desire2Learn LMS. Vai and Sosulski (2011) mentioned the use of technology and emphasized ease of access as essential as to not become an obstacle to achieving the intended outcomes of the course. A variety of technology components were used in construction of the online learning environment such as audio, video, and graphics. The technology selection process was captured in the reflective journal for consideration of how the model design and vetted activities correlated into the design and construction of the professional development as this phase was completed.

Collaboration occurred with UW-Platteville as to preferred resources and materials to be used in the training course to support the learning outcomes and faculty needs; this collaboration provided opportunities for consistency with the expectations set for adjunct faculty at their institution. Kidwell et al. (2000) encouraged the involvement of all the stakeholders in the planning process.
The curation of course materials was through individual exploration by the researcher and collaboration with various UW-Platteville staff. It was important to gather resources specific to UW-Platteville faculty to ensure relevancy of the information presented. Relevance of the material covered in the professional development program was important to increase commitment and value of the program for those who were participating in the training (Li et al., 2011; Snyder, 2009). The collaboration with staff occurred through email, in-person, and through access to resources available through the university website.

**Phase 4: Formative Evaluation**

Upon the approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) from Nova Southeastern University (see Appendix N) and UW-Platteville (see Appendix O), Phase 4 began. Phase 4 was the updated development of the course where the instantiation of the course design and content was evaluated. Richey and Klein (2007) stated the need to evaluate and validate model use by determining “to what extent [does] the resulting instruction meet[s] learner needs, client needs, and client requirements” (p. 23). Morrison et al. (2013) stated, “formative evaluation is most valuable when conducted during development and tryouts. It should be performed early in the process, before valuable time and resources are wasted on things that aren’t working” (p. 252). Gooler (as cited in Morrison et al., 2013, p. 318) identified an 8-step approach to planning the formative evaluation: purpose, audience, issues, resources, evidence, data-gathering technique, analysis, and reporting.

The purpose of the formative evaluation was to determine what needed to be improved upon in the application of the instructional design framework to the blended
delivery of a professional development course targeted at adjunct faculty. More specifically a look at the potential contribution of the content and activities to knowledge creation, conversion, or demonstration, the potential impact of the modality and design on communication amongst stakeholders, and knowledge sharing and creation. The evaluation also served to revisit how well the design might meet the needs of adjunct faculty and the university as designed and where improvements could be made.

The audience with whom the results of each focus group discussion were shared was the focus group members and notetaker for each group; the information was shared only to serve as a member check. The researcher who also served as the designer looked at the comprehensive results of the three focus groups to identify areas for improvement and the qualitative feedback to be evaluated in larger context with other data collected throughout the different phases of the study. A tertiary audience would be those who review the results of this phase in the final dissertation report.

The evaluation objectives were to gather data in a qualitative fashion looking at the items noted in the purpose. Morrison et al. (2013) denoted two ways of creating this list in either statement format or questions. Questions were determined as the approach to be taken for this study.

The resources required for this study were the planning tools for the course such as the course description, goals, outcomes, topics, and course calendar. For the evaluation, an example to demonstrate the online portion was needed and was constructed in Phase 3. Other resources were human resources; the professional development course stakeholders to evaluate, a moderator to facilitate the focus group discussions, a note taker to take notes at each focus group meeting, a space to present the
aforementioned information and where the online portion could be demonstrated for the group. Additionally copies of the handouts and snacks were provided for the research participants in each focus group.

The evidence collected was the reaction of the focus group, following focus group guidelines requesting positive and constructive feedback. In addition, the size and composition of the focus group was a consideration for the evidence collected, in an effort to insure that each stakeholder group had a voice to provide feedback during this formative evaluation exercise.

Focus groups in this research provided the opportunity to collect data through group interview and discussion techniques. The advantage of the focus group was that the researcher could “obtain detailed information about personal and group attitudes, perceptions, and opinions” (Kinzie, 2016, p. 62). The main disadvantage of the focus group was the “skills required to conduct an effective discussion” (Kinzie, 2016, p. 62). This risk was minimized by attempting to follow focus group moderation best practices and following a vetted guide for focus group moderation techniques. The variety in methods of data collection used in this study offer data for triangulation, which in turn increased the trustworthiness of the information supporting the findings and recommendations of this research (Creswell, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 1998).

The analysis of the data was completed via qualitative methods. Morrison et al. (2013) commented that “these types of analyses involve categorizing, interpreting, and, in general, ‘making sense’ out of subjective data” (p. 322). Key strategies included looking
for themes, and looking at the emphasis which was placed on the categories or themes by the focus group participants.

UW-Platteville was considered a viable site to host the focus groups due to the similarities between their faculty population and their existing faculty training courses, and the information gathered in the review of literature about problems related to adjunct faculty and their preparation to teach in face-to-face classrooms.

To conduct a formative evaluation, participants from the various stakeholder groups were recruited. Upon IRB approval from Nova Southeastern University and UW-Platteville, emails were sent to the prospective participants explaining the research study and the role of the researcher. Consent forms were also provided as an attachment to the email letter of invitation and made available during each focus group session so individuals whom volunteered to participate acknowledged their understanding and confirmed their intent to participate in the study. Creswell (2012) noted the consent process may lessen reservations the participants may have about the researcher’s presence in the educational setting. Once the participants confirmed their understanding of the study and provided their consent to participate, a complete listing of participants was maintained through the remainder of the research.

It is in this phase through focus groups the majority of data were collected about the instantiation of the design, which had been constructed with their institution in mind. The question instrument was predetermined as much as the design permitted to minimize bias (Creswell, 2012) and to attempt to keep the discussion focused on the evaluation at hand (Kinzie, 2016). The instrument and method are explained further in this section along with a discussion of the validation for each item.
Site and Participant Selection

The researcher recruited instructional faculty and staff from UW-Platteville via personal contact and email invitations. The researcher’s site selection and sampling for the focus group activities was convenience sampling (Creswell, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Morgan (1997) discussed the group make-up between strangers and those with whom the researcher is already acquainted. Morgan (1997) presented evidence that while there are pros and cons to each type of group makeup “decisions should rely on the basic criterion of whether a particular group of participants can comfortably discuss the topic in ways that are useful to the researcher” (p. 10).

The population of adjunct faculty from within UW-Platteville were considered a typical sampling (Creswell, 2012), as they embodied norms noted in the adjunct faculty population who have a need for development in the area of instructional methods and were new to instruction at the university. Additionally, new faculty who were also recruited for the focus group interviews could be direct participants in this course if implemented, as they could have similar needs to those of new adjunct faculty in the area of instructional methods and a vested interest in the course.

The administrators and experienced full-time faculty who were recruited for the focus group interviews would not be direct participants in this type of professional development course as originally proposed; however, they would have a stake in the course and the value for the faculty and the university. Marshall and Rossman (2011) noted, “the sensitizing concepts from the literature review and the research questions provide the focus for site and sample selection” (p. 104). While the proposed training program was designed primarily for adjunct faculty, the designer thought that the training
activities could be consolidated with new full-time faculty development activities due to
the existing environment of limited resources. Furthermore, it was important that all
stakeholder groups were represented and had an opportunity to provide feedback through
the focus group activities (Kinzie, 2016); having criterion such as the stakeholder
relationship was useful for quality assurance purposes of this phase (Marshall &
Rossman, 2011; Ortiz, 2016) and to reduce bias (Morgan, 1997). There was an
opportunity for stratified purposeful sampling to be deemed present amongst the focus
groups; however, this sampling is not discussed until the analysis phase when subgroups
were identified upon which comparisons could be made (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Once approval was granted from the NSU Institutional Review Board and from
UW-Platteville’s Institutional Review Board, an announcement was made at a school of
business meeting and a criminal justice department meeting to potential participants
requesting their voluntary participation in the research study. Individual emails were also
sent to potential participants in administration and faculty in other areas with whom the
researcher has access. Individual follow-ups were completed by phone and in-person as
needed. See Appendix P for an example of the introduction and invitation email.

It was estimated for the participants that their time commitment for the focus
groups would be up to two and a half hours with participation in the focus group and
member checks after meeting notes were compiled. The focus group sessions were
scheduled for two hours including the break for snacks. Eliot and Associates (2005)
indicated that 45-90 minutes is the ideal focus group time, however, if snacks are
provided additional time could be added. The focus group agenda included welcome and
introductions, a review of this phase of the research study and the completion of the
consent forms, an overview of the study and the design to provide context, a review of the course outcomes and calendar, a demonstration of the online environment, and then the discussion by the focus group which was structured by the predetermined questions. A unique identifier for each participant was created as names or other personally identifiable information was not to be used for summation of the focus group notes.

Participation was voluntary. It was the goal to have approximately 15 faculty and up to six administrators to participate; this goal was achieved.

One letter of informed consent was created and used for both faculty and staff who participated and provided feedback through the focus group activities on the course design and development. Each letter of informed consent identified the focus group discussions would be captured through the notes of the interviewer and a note taker and that there would be no audio or video recording. The letters of informed consent provided to each participant met the requirements of NSU and UW-Platteville for the information to be included in the consent form. See Appendix Q for a copy of the letter and all the information included.

Minor changes in the college specific content and outcomes included in Phase 1 and Phase 2 were due to a change in the research site. Upon determination of the site change, information prepared in Phase 1 was revisited and updated as necessary with the information specific to UW-Platteville as the new research site and target population.

Data Collection

Data collection occurred throughout the research; however, a significant portion of the data collection occurred during Phase 4, the formative evaluation. One exception was the reflective journal, which was maintained throughout the study by the researcher.
The researcher’s reflective journal is discussed more in an upcoming section. It was critical the data collected were directly connected to the research questions posed and exploratory concepts expected of the study (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). A log of data collecting activities was maintained as suggested by Marshall and Rossman (2011). The log indicated the date, time, space, activity, who, what, and where the data were captured. The data collected throughout the study were qualitative; the type of data collected was determined by the instrument used for data collection and the research questions posed.

**Instruments**

Various instruments were necessary to collect and return adequate amounts of credible data for the application of quality research methods. While this study was an extension of Yeh et al.’s (2011) study, some different instruments were selected that better served the current study due to research methodology being applied and advancements in qualitative research methods. Some adaptations of the instruments also were made due to the nature of the learning environment design and course content. The listing of the instruments, data collection methods, and the corresponding research questions to which they were associated are shown in Appendix R.

**Reflective Journal**

The researcher maintained a reflective journal to document design decisions before, during, and after the data collection. “Keeping self-reflective journals is a strategy that can facilitate reflexivity” (Ortlipp, 2008, p. 695). A reflective journal was chosen for use to explain individual precepts and biases and to examine individual suppositions (Creswell, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Ortiz, 2016; Ortlipp, 2008). A well-developed reflective journal provided an opportunity to provide transparency in the
research process (Ortiz, 2016; Ortlipp, 2008). Ortlipp (2008) inferred a well-developed journal would include documentation about decision making that occurred throughout the research process and “the thinking, values, and experiences behind those decisions” (p. 697). She mentioned that visibility to the decisions and supporting information was important for the researcher and the reader.

The reflective journal entries provided further insight as to the value and impact of the various design components and to see if the outcomes of each of those components came through as intended by the original course design (Reigeluth & Frick, 1999). The reflective journal also provided qualitative data (Creswell, 2012; Ortiz, 2016) to evaluate specific design components and gain context perspective.

Kinzie (2016) discussed the important skills of focus group moderators, noting the ability to be a good listener, ask probing questions, be able to bring the discussions back to the focus topic if disagreements or irrelevant discussions occur, encourage all parties to participate, and be sensitive and responsive to preconceived notions and potential bias. Many of these skills were also noted by Ortiz (2016) and Marshall and Rossman (2011). The ability to ask good questions was important during the focus group sessions and in the journaling process. The researcher’s reflective questioning ability was especially important during the journaling process to be sure adequate and relevant information was captured. At times, this skill prompted the researcher to continue to investigate and seek out further evidence to support entries in her journal (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Listening during the focus group discussions was directly related to the questioning, as the researcher had to be attuned to responses and at times the lack of response, which was also noteworthy. Seidman (2013) “identified three levels of listening: (a) actively
listening to what the participant is saying, (b) listening for what is said beneath the stated words, and (c) listening to how the interview is progressing” (as cited in Ortiz, 2016, p. 55).

Adaptability and flexibility were crucial during the research when the journal was being maintained. It was in the first three phases when the iterative process required of the design and development presented itself and needed to be captured within the journal entries as to why changes or adaptations needed to be made or occurred (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) or were considered. Having a clear understanding of the issues being studied helped make this process manageable (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Qualitative research had interpretative aspects, which made it impossible to remove all bias, as one’s personal values, judgments, and perceptions influenced these interpretations (Creswell, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). The researcher’s reflective journal provided an opportunity for the researcher to capture potential bias, which may have been brought with her to the data collection and analysis (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Ortlipp, 2008). The researcher’s personal bias was an important element for consideration and disclosure; when recognized it was minimized through several measures including the reflective questioning, the triangulation of data, and the member checks (Creswell, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Ortiz, 2016).

The researcher brought with her 15 years of experience in education and training environments, in addition to graduate level academic preparation in education and technology. She has had direct oversight of faculty training in three different roles in both K12 and higher education. Any notations related to theoretical or philosophical assumptions were drawn from her knowledge base and connections made to literature in
the later phases of analysis provide rationale and evidence for the notations. Where literature did not support the notations, the information was reviewed carefully to determine if that content would be included in the analyses and findings to reduce the impact of bias on the results and recommendations.

Focus Group Discussions

Initial recruiting for focus groups included a warm invitation to participate. Creswell (2012) and Krueger (2002) suggested the invitations include the following major elements: importance of participant, purpose of the study and estimated time to commitment. It was anticipated 4 – 6 participants from administration and 12-15 participants who would represent full-time and adjunct faculty would be recruited for the focus groups. The focus groups were completed face-to-face and scheduled at times convenient for the faculty and administrators to attend. Three focus group sessions were held to provide flexibility for those who were volunteering to participate and to meet recommended practice for focus group facilitation with three to five groups (Morgan, 1997). Marshall and Rossman (2011) and Morgan (1997) indicated groups composed of 7 to 10 persons were ideal; however, 4 persons to 12 persons were acceptable (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Morgan, 1997). Each focus group held was an acceptable size.

A semi-structured interview protocol was used with open-ended questions (see Appendix S) with opportunities for discussion provided to the focus group participants (Morgan, 1997; Ortiz, 2016). The discussion was facilitated by the researcher. An open-ended list of questions was selected to be consistent with what was used in Yeh et al.’s (2011) study and provided consistency amongst the three focus groups. Minor adjustments in Yeh et al.’s (2011) questions were made to reflect this study’s professional
development course design. Open-ended questioning was a method of capturing qualitative data (Creswell, 2012) and Ortiz (2016) noted that “asking ‘how’ rather than ‘why’ is another way to enrich what is gained through open-ended interviews” (p. 52).

The focus group questions were semi-structured, such that questions were created in advance of the session with follow-on questions determined during the group interview where clarification or additional questions became apparent (Kinzie, 2016; Ortiz, 2016). Marshall and Rossman (2011) discussed the moderator’s ability to facilitate and encourage discussions where differing opinion exists. Kinzie (2016) expressed the understanding that the questions were guiding the group discussion rather than creating a rigid structure, thus permitting those rich dialogues to ensue time permitting. Each of the predetermined questions was directly related to one of the research questions posed with the purpose of gathering additional qualitative information (Morgan, 1997). Guided questioning probed the participants for feedback on how might the following mechanisms including blended learning, guided practice, observational learning, group discussion, peer evaluation, and feedback contribute to the success of the training as it was described by Yeh et al. in 2011. Additional follow-on questions were asked impromptu because of question responses in a manner of dialogue to gain further understanding or clarification. Administrators and experienced full-time faculty were included in these interviews as well to gather qualitative information on the extent to which they believed the training course would meet the development needs of the academic departments and the university. All participants were welcome to weigh in on this topic from their perspective.
Worthen and Sanders, 1987 (as cited in Reigeluth & Frick, 1999) explained when researchers are concerned about the usefulness of an instructional product (i.e., blended learning professional development), three questions are important: What works? What does not work (or needs improvement)? and How can it be improved? The answers to these questions served as input to the development of recommendations for improving the usefulness of the blended learning course.

Marshall and Rossman (2011) indicated strengths of interviews to be useful for uncovering participants’ perspectives, facilitation of immediate follow-up for clarification, facilitation of the discovery of nuances in culture, collection of information on context, and facilitation of analysis, validity checks, and triangulation. They also indicated challenges could be possible misinterpretations due to cultural differences, cooperation of key individuals, difficult to replicate, dependent upon participant openness/honesty, and dependent upon researcher’s interpersonal skills. Kinzie (2016), Morgan (1997), and Ortiz (2016) addressed the advantages and disadvantages of interviews and focus groups, echoing what was noted by Marshall and Rossman (2011).

The researcher and a note taker captured notes as the focus group interviews progressed to maintain confidentiality; as a member check, the summary of the notes and a selection of quotations were reviewed and validated by the interviewees to provide increased accuracy to what transpired during the group interview (Creswell, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). During the member checks, focus group participants had the opportunity to add or correct anything they felt was not captured as they had expected. The researcher reviewed the notes looking for themes and thus providing additional qualitative information (Creswell, 2012; Eliot and Associates, 2005).
Reigeluth and Frick (1999) denoted interviews as one of the most useful data collection tools. Evaluation of interview data can inform the strengths and weaknesses of the design, potential implications for adding or removing elements, and considerations for alternative scenarios if applied. Reigeluth and Frick (1999) were also careful to denote “although such data, as conjecture from the participants, are always suspect, they can also be highly insightful and useful” (p. 641).

Trustworthiness

Tactics were applied to reduce the skepticism on the value of the findings of qualitative studies due to the criticism towards qualitative research methods. Given this study design was primarily qualitative, Marshall and Rossman (2011) identified specific constructs to be considered: credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability. These constructs were addressed through prolonged engagement in the research through all four phases of the study, through the data analysis, reporting of findings and conclusions, and where the recommendations were presented (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Table 5 is an adaptation of a table by Yin (2009) with the tactics that are incorporated into the design of this study and the phases in which they occur.
Table 5

*Tactics for Design Tests*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Study Tactic</th>
<th>Phase of Research in Which Tactic Occurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>• Delphi Panel</td>
<td>Phase 2, Design Validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use multiple sources of evidence</td>
<td>Data Analysis and Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflective journal</td>
<td>Entire Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit trail</td>
<td>Entire Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Member checks</td>
<td>Phase 4, Formative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>• Use focus group protocol</td>
<td>Phase 4, Formative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflective Journal</td>
<td>Entire Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>• Do pattern matching</td>
<td>Data Analysis and Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do explanation building</td>
<td>Data Analysis and Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Address rival explanations</td>
<td>Data Analysis and Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use logic models</td>
<td>Data Analysis and Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>• Use of theories in study</td>
<td>Overall research design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from “Case Study Research: Design and Method” by R. K. Yin. Copyright 2009 by Sage Publications.

The credibility of the results depended largely on the quality of the research design and the adherence to the design protocols (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) throughout the entire implementation of the study from the infancy of the design through to the evaluation of the results. Quality was also increased through a documented audit trail identifying the original design plan and including clear links between the questions asked, the data collected, and the findings (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

The researcher’s reflective journal provided an audit trail of what transpired during the instructional design and development of the course, in addition to focus group validation (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Member checks were completed where the data and interpretations were shared with the research participants to reduce any bias or misinterpretations, which could have occurred during the note taking process; these member checks occurred during the focus group and follow-up confirmation of notes.
taken in those group interview sessions (Creswell, 2012). The design included several instruments from which to collect data, which proffered the ability to triangulate data from multiple sources, via multiple methods, and multiple lenses (Creswell, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Sound data collection in general terms demanded the researcher pay special attention to creation of the artifacts, the evidence collected, and how the evidence was evaluated to minimize bias and other issues which could have arose with lack of attention to the aforementioned design considerations (Reigeluth & Frick, 1999). The other imperative design consideration was the evidence collected and methods of data analysis were designed to answer the initial research questions posed directly (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Methods of data analysis, such as triangulation (i.e. focus group interviews, reflective journal, literature review), were used to establish trustworthiness of the findings. An audit trail was also maintained should further confirmation be required as to the trustworthiness (also referred to as credibility) of the study design and findings (Reigeluth & Frick, 1999).

Qualitative research also required evidence be collected from the various stakeholders in the study topic area (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Reigeluth & Frick, 1999). Excluding a particular population involved in the study would have reduced the accuracy of the study results. Careful review of the population researched versus those populations who were only a part of the context was an important factor to denote in the research design (Ortiz, 2016). For example, the adjunct faculty were prospective participants in the training course and were members of the population recruited for the focus groups to discover the potential for the training course to meet their needs. The
members of UW-Platteville administration and other experienced full-time faculty were a part of the context of the training course in that they could be facilitators, course observers, and supervisors of the training course participants; their perceptions on the potential impact of the course on the university and faculty needs was valuable to address research question two. Further discussions of how these design considerations influenced the study are noted in the conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research.

Summary

Design and development research methods were outlined in Chapter 3 and provided the four phases required to complete this study including course design, design validation, course development, and formative evaluation. Adhering to these phases increased the rigor (Yin, 2009). The researcher was prepared for an ethically responsible study that involved human participants. The prospective research site and participants were identified and the IRB approvals received. A variety of methods of data collection and analyses increased the trustworthiness of the findings. Finally, the three research questions were addressed in a comprehensive fashion with substantial attention to the above-mentioned items.
Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

Design and development research methods were used to conduct the study in four phases. In phase one, a course design framework that integrated the four modes of the SECI KM model (i.e., socialization, externalization, internalization, and combination) was developed. Included with the framework was a mapping of the learning outcomes, knowledge type, and activities associated with each SECI mode. In phase two, an expert panel reviewed the framework and mapping. The Delphi technique was used to capture panel members’ feedback. Revisions to the framework and mapping were made based on the results of the expert review. In phase three, the framework was used to develop the course within the Desire2Learn learning management system (LMS). In phase four, a formative evaluation of the course was conducted using focus groups with key stakeholders including faculty, staff, and administrators. In this chapter, each phase is described by its purpose, data collected and analyzed, and results. The chapter concludes with a summary of results.

Phase 1: Course Design

The course design was a result a variety of inputs. The needs analysis information obtained prior to the start of this study in the researcher’s prior role at an academic institution was substantiated by a review of literature. Furthermore, the review of
literature aided in the identification of the three research questions and the literature served as the foundation for the instructional design framework.

Data Analysis

The review of literature, primarily Yeh et al.’s (2011) and Nonaka et al.’s (1995 & 2000) works, in combination with the researcher’s instructional design knowledge was the foundation upon which the design was conceptualized. The complex aspects required of faculty professional development were addressed through the integration of concepts in the review of literature, notably the SECI model, blended learning, Bloom’s taxonomy, just-in-time delivery, and communities of practice.

Findings

The results of this phase were assimilated into the comprehensive instructional design framework presented in Chapter 3 and in preparation for Phase 2 in which the design was validated by an expert panel.

Phase 2: Design Validation

Upon successful recruitment of an expert panel to review the course design, data collection began. The Delphi technique was used until consensus as defined in Chapter 3 was achieved. Two rounds of expert panel review resulted in the refinement of the outcomes, knowledge type, activity mapping documentation, which had been developed for the course and which reflected the instructional design considerations from Phase 1.

Data Analysis

An analysis of the responses occurred after each round. Each panel member’s survey responses were compiled with the responses of the other panel members, upon which the analysis ensued and a group consensus was formed (Dalkey, 1972; Dalbecq et
Consensus for each round was determined consistent with what was defined earlier and which noted when the majority response amongst the panel members was agree or strongly agree and no panel members strongly disagreed, these results were then indicative that a consensus had been ascertained amongst the panel members. Each survey had an area for optional comments justifying their responses or providing additional feedback on the focus of the panel. These comments were taken into consideration when additional clarification was required.

Responses to each of the sections that required feedback were tabulated in individual survey response summaries. In addition, a look at the number of participants who responded to the survey in whole and each section within the survey was noted. In the first round eight experts were invited to participate, however, only five completed all sections of the survey. One panel member was not available and one withdrew from participating in the panel, as she did not feel knowledgeable enough to provide the expert feedback needed for this study. In the second round, the seven remaining panel members were invited to participate again and six actively participated completing all the sections as requested. The summaries from round 1 and 2 that indicated consensus were referenced in Chapter 3 as a part of the methodology.

Findings

While consensus was achieved for a majority of the weekly outcomes, knowledge type, activity, SECI mode mappings during the first round, an additional round of review as required to review the three items (4h, 5f, and 5g) where no consensus was attained and four items (3d, 4f, 4i, and 5e) where a weak consensus had been noted. Considering the feedback received from the panel, those items were updated and reviewed again in
round 2. It was discovered through the panel review that there were two errors in the survey instrument and two items (5o and 5p) had to be reassessed.

Ultimately, the round 1 panel feedback resulted in the clarification of two discussion question activities and the check for understanding in which the faculty would order the process steps for handling an academic integrity violation. The other feedback resulted in the altered classification of a couple of the outcome-activity mappings as each corresponded to the phases of the SECI process and knowledge type identified.

The expert panel results from round 2 had no indicators of disagreement or strong disagreement, resulting in consensus as defined in this study. There were several items where one panel member indicated a neutral rating and noted vague sentences could be updated with action verbs from Bloom’s Taxonomy. Since the majority had indicated agreement or strong agreement, the neutral scores did not result in any additional adjustments to the outcomes-knowledge type-activity mapping.

Upon completion of this phase, the course design was updated to reflect the final changes and refinements as suggested by the results of the expert panel prior to the development of the course. No major adjustments were needed in the overall instructional design framework, only the aforementioned minor adjustments in the outcome knowledge activity.

**Phase 3: Course Development**

The development of the course was guided by the course design framework that integrated the four modes of the SECI KM model (i.e., socialization, externalization, internalization, and combination). The researcher also used her instructional design expertise and knowledge of the institution to develop the course.
Data Analysis

The analysis that occurred in this phase was strictly in the form of self-evaluation of the researcher against best practices in online course design common across online course design evaluation rubrics and documented in the literature. Good design practices such as consistent navigation, color schemes, accessibility considerations, etc. were applied for effective practice and in an effort to model these good practices for participants in the professional development course who would be using the online platform to support their classroom instruction.

Findings

The result of this phase was a blended learning professional development course. Developed in Desire2Learn LMS, the purpose of the course is to facilitate just-in-time training for adjunct faculty who teach undergraduate students in a face-to-face environment. The course covered the basics of face-to-face teaching including fundamental learning theories and instructional methods, principles of good teaching practice, classroom management strategies, and assessment strategies. In phase 4, the course design was evaluated by focus group participants.

Phase 4: Formative Evaluation

In phase four, a formative evaluation of the course was conducted using focus groups with key stakeholders including faculty, staff, and administrators. There were 17 participants distributed amongst the three focus group sessions; these group sizes fell into what was deemed acceptable for focus group sizes. The administrators who participated have oversight of faculty who teach face-to-face or over the faculty development of said faculty at the university; however, several individuals have or have had administrative
responsibilities at other institutions for face-to-face or online instruction and have had
oversight of adjunct faculty in those positions. Every participant in the focus groups had
some level of face-to-face classroom teaching experience, although, not all for UW-
Platteville. See Appendix T for descriptive characteristics of the focus group participants.

Prior to the focus group sessions, handouts for the session were sent via email
accompanying the focus group meeting calendar invitations. To provide additional
context and an overview of the comprehensive design, the researcher introduced the
session with a PowerPoint presentation (Appendix U). This presentation also ensured
participants in each of the three focus groups had the same base knowledge of the course
design and development entering the discussion. Participants were permitted to ask
questions during the presentation where clarification was desired.

After the presentation, the discussion ensued using the pre-determined questions
to guide the conversation. Open-ended questions included in the focus group question
protocol explored the perceptions of the underlying mechanisms that contributed to the
perceived value and effectiveness of the training course as designed. These questions
provided additional consistency amongst the groups as to the inquiry for the research
purpose. Each focus group successfully addressed each of these questions and provided
additional feedback valuable to considerations for extensions of this research or for future
studies.

Data Analysis

The intent of the conventional qualitative content analysis was not to render
distributions and frequencies for quantitative statistical analysis, but as a way to organize
and code the data (Sandelowski, 2000). Creswell (2012) noted one of the first steps in
analysis the researcher needed to complete was organizing the data for analysis. Notes from the three focus group sessions were used as the qualitative data collected for analysis.

“Qualitative content analysis is the least interpretive of the qualitative analysis approaches in that there is no mandate to re-present the data in any other terms but their own” (Sandelowski, 2000, p. 338). While the predetermined questions aided in the focus of the group discussions, often the rich dialogue addressed aspects of several of the predetermined questions. For example when discussing how the content and activities might contribute to the improvement of professional knowledge, the rationale for why it was important for adjunct faculty was noted. The delivery format also came up in conjunction with the activity discussions with participants recognizing how the integration of these concepts was a part of the design considerations. These connections in the conversation made for rich qualitative data considered beyond just quantification of codes denoted.

“Coding data is the formal representation of analytic thinking. The tough intellectual work of analysis is in generating categories and themes” (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 212). The codes were not a predetermined; however, some of the codes were drawn from the literature, actual words, and behaviors captured in the data, or the researcher’s creative insights (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). The mechanisms noted in Yeh et al. (2011) and the activities mapped to the SECI process designations were codes considered for the analyses. After organizing the data, other codes did become apparent as well. Additionally, from the clusters of data and codes, themes were determined (Creswell, 2012; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). A list of the prevalent codes and themes identified can be found in Appendix V along with SECI terminology associations. While
the SECI terminology was not used, many of the themes were descriptive of components of the SECI model. Appendix W includes a graphic representation of how the themes and codes from the focus groups overlay the SECI model.

Many codes and themes were noted throughout the group discussions in relation to specific questions posed and the interrelatedness of the components of the instructional design framework. Themes were listed in no particular order, as the use of frequency was not to indicate a quantitative analysis. “Both quantitative and qualitative content analyses entail counting response and the number of participants in each response category, but in qualitative content analysis, counting is a means to an end, not the end itself” (Sandelowski, 2000, p. 338). Qualitatively, the themes determined from the discussions were significant as each theme brought forward provided additional context and informed the formative evaluation process. Furthermore, how each theme demonstrated the evaluation of the course design through supporting, opposing, extending, or providing an alternative to what was designed and developed was important data for consideration. In this study, the qualitative content analysis was used for descriptive purposes and at times was confirmed by numerical means (Sandelowski, 2000). In addition, the use of multiple sources of data was assessed for converging evidence from which results were determined (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Yin, 2009) and which related to the focus group questions and responses.

Findings

The focus group discussed and addressed all the questions that had been predetermined for the focus group. No apparent gaps were identified from the original intent of data to be gathered from the focus group. The insightful feedback from the
participants about the course design, subject matter included in the design, the needs addressed by the course, and areas of improvement were helpful in answering the focus group questions and the overall research questions.

The blended learning framework was received by the focus groups as a viable option for the adjunct faculty population due to the flexibility it provided. The feedback from faculty who participated in the focus group is that what was presented was reasonable if properly positioned denoting the value for the instructor and the institution. For example, new faculty expressed the following:

- “I would safely say I would actually probably complete this.”
- “I think you could get buy in from faculty like myself who don’t want to spend a lot of time on stuff like this, but would be willing if it was presented the right way.”
- “In comparison to a previous recent professional experience at another institution, “this is much more thought-out.”
- “Highly valuable, a must do. We are focused on quality of teaching. It’s a great way to give training to adjunct or even normal faculty.”

The perceived value and benefit to participants throughout the course is an aspect of $Ba$ in the SECI model. $Ba$ as described in chapter 2 is where motivation and engagement fit into the SECI model and what helps learners desire to progress through the knowledge continuum.

An additional benefit noted of the format was the use of technology for the online portion of the professional development course. The knowledge and skills attained through observational and experiential learning through using the LMS and this modality was of perceived value as noted in the following example comments:

- “I really like the idea of blended vs. face-to-face. We get them into D2L right at the beginning, get them used to it, they are learning how to use it. It is critical to success here.”
• “Having a blended format helps new instructors work with the LMS. It is one thing to sit down and say, ‘this is how you set up a gradebook’ that it is working with different details. But it also introduces the idea of blended formats.”
• “They are scared about distance learning and don’t want to talk about it. This would help bridge the gap.”
• “I see this format as empowering and informing the instructors to be able to know what they can use to demonstrate to whoever reviews them what their valid outcomes have been.”

Knowledge assets are the result of knowledge creation and knowledge conversion. The knowledge and skills attained through the observational and experiential learning would be categorized as knowledge assets in the context of the SECI model.

Several of the focus group participants voiced agreement with the aforementioned benefits of blended format that had been identified during the design phase; however, it was identified through the coding activity that those who had indicated prior experience with online learning were more receptive to the technology aspect of the course design.

Beyond flexibility, it was believed by several parties that an opportunity to model quality design and preferred instructional practices would be a benefit to the prospective course participants. The modeling by the facilitators was intentional in this design, similar to observational learning in Yeh et al.’s 2011 study; the activities in which modeling was a part were identified by the expert panel as a part of the socialization mode of the SECI model.

Other mechanisms in the design such as guided practice, group discussions, reflection, engagement, and feedback were also discussed by the participants as being of value in the design. While those terms were not explicitly used in all cases in the focus group discussions, the coding did indicate that each mechanism was touched upon to varying degrees during the focus group discussions. Furthermore, the mechanisms were found to be distributed amongst the SECI modes. In example, self-reflection was
associated with the internalization mode of the SECI model during the expert review; individual comments representative of the perceived value of the reflective activities in the design were as follows:

- “It has a good process of reflection that forces new instructors to do this and that alone is an exceptionally valuable thing to be doing – regardless of whatever else is going on.”
- “The reflection is a huge attractant to me. I would be on the hook because you can pop through these.”
- “Midterm reflection is a good one for people to engage in. Just the fact that you are even asking them how it’s going.”

Concerns were raised about the amount of content and time expected in a couple of instances, however, this feedback was from only a couple of the focus group participants. These concerns were consistent with considerations noted in the researcher’s reflective journal when considering viscosity and velocity during the design phase. Examples of comments from focus group participants expressing concern about content in relation to the timing were:

- “My bigger point rather than what to cut, but to cut something because the message you are sending to the new employee and exposing them to this much stuff you actually haven’t given them a way to navigate what they really need to do with the timeframe and life obligations.”
- “Too much content in week 12 when faculty are preparing for the end of the term.”

The discussion and inputs from the faculty participants in the focus group indicated that even with the reservations about the time involved and the content selected, there was still merit in the design and most of the topics chosen. Perspectives and prior experience appeared to be the differentiated factor as to preferences for content and timing. Time for professional development, including reflection in general, was noted by this group and in the review of literature as a challenge for educators. One administrator noted, “Part of it is the organizational culture we set” and about being intentional with the set aside for reflective practice. It was noted, “that is something we don’t do well. I think
it’s typical we don’t have a lot time to do this in a university setting, but as educators in higher learning, we should be reflective.”

It was unclear to the groups who would facilitate and how the facilitation would be carried out, as those details had not been explicit in the presentation materials. While some of the information was a part of the design considerations in the development of the tracking calendar, it was not evident to those who were evaluating. In the SECI model, the facilitation of the SECI process is the responsibility of knowledge enablers. In the design framework, the facilitators are the knowledge enablers. In the review of literature, it was noted how the role the knowledge enabler promotes movement along the continuum which was like what was communicated in all three focus groups about facilitation. While the learner-centered design focuses on the learners, the knowledge producers, the role of the knowledge enabler was still a crucial aspect in integration of this model into the design.

Much discussion in each group surrounded expectations of the facilitator as to how frequently they communicated with the course participants, the type of feedback that would be provided to the participants, and the true role of the facilitator. The group discussion indicated the preferred skills set of the facilitator or team of facilitators, noting a desire for a facilitator versed in pedagogy, technology, and processes at the university. The desire to have a knowledgeable facilitator in those areas was representative of the knowledge assets expected as inputs and outputs in the design framework and the values and beliefs communicated. The researcher’s reflective journal and working calendar had indicated a team of facilitators; however, this information was not shared with the focus
groups. The focus group findings clearly note their recognition that the course may need a facilitation team to have the breadth of knowledge being sought.

Notes in the researcher’s reflective journal also indicated the facilitator would need to be knowledgeable, however, not necessarily an expert in all things. The role would be to guide the course participants to campus resources where appropriate versus the sole resource for the faculty participants. The referral to these resources was an intentional part of the design so the new faculty would know where they could go for answers related to specific topics, however, this was not evident to the focus group participants and thus an area for improvement in the development of the course. It was the intent of designer that these referrals would be strategic to further support the knowledge conversion process and solidify topics being discussed in the course. Those referrals would also further the interactions with the parties outside the group of faculty in the course, providing an opportunity for additional collegial dialogue and networking at the university in hopes of breaking down the silos discussed by the focus group participants and in the literature.

The referral of learners to individuals or groups outside of the training context would also demonstrate how the SECI model is integrated in this design framework with $Ba$ evident at the individual, group, and organizational levels as discussed in the review of literature. While it was a major theme in the discussion, the benefit to the learners in the course of familiarizing them with resources outside the course was brought up in the two of the focus group discussions.

Of all the discussions within the three focus groups, the most disparate responses were received when questioned about the most meaningful items in the course. The
coding of the responses for the most meaningful topic areas was inconclusive. Although no consensus was achieved amongst the group participants, some items were mentioned as meaningful. Content topic areas noted were academic quality and rigor, instructor expectations, classroom management, course syllabi, legal and ethical obligations (i.e. FERPA, mandatory reporting, etc.), engagement, feedback, difficult discussions, and shared resources. The seven principles of good teaching practice (Chickering & Gamson, 1987) was new in reference to most of the participants, however, the use of the practice was evident in some of the discussion amongst expectations to be communicated for faculty. They indicated the seven principles as a topic would be good as it clearly outlines good practice.

It was perceived that learners engaging with these topics through the learning activities in the course would develop knowledge or skills associated with each. Looking at the SECI model, these are knowledge assets resultant from knowledge creation or conversion activities. The resultant knowledge asset types would include experiential, routine, conceptual, and systemic knowledge assets as described by Nonaka et al. (2000). Examples can be given for each of the four areas:

- Experiential Knowledge Assets: Use of the LMS
- Routine Knowledge Assets: Creation of and submission of course syllabi
- Conceptual Knowledge Assets: Academic quality and rigor
- Systemic Knowledge Assets: Documents created such as assessments

Activities noted during this discussion as meaningful were the self-reflection, group discussion, observational learning, guided practice, and the mixed methods of content delivery in which the participants could interact with the content and one another.

In addition to the notable items mentioned earlier, more information can be discerned
from the faculty focus group participants who made comments such as the following examples:

- “I don’t know what the seven principles are, so this could definitely be useful for me coming to a new university.”
- “I think this is good because it is a one stop shopping... but is nice to have a go-to place for all things instructional. Professors are not wasting time. They can go somewhere and get into ‘how do I do my job?’”
- “The main thing is that it gives them exposure to these principles and then the general pedagogy.”
- “Assessment, feedback – you can operationally define that differently so I think you have tied that in very nicely in a couple of different discussion questions.”
- “It gives them foundational knowledge, but also the chance to apply.”

The coding for the least meaningful items also had several items identified; however, there were items recognized in all three focus groups that stood out. The content topic area and activities involving portfolios for staff and students was deemed an unnecessary requirement, as it not a consistent expectation for staff or students in all programs or courses. Two of the groups noted to remove the topic, while one of the groups suggested retaining it as optional.

The mention of career-focused was questioned; specifically the emphasis placed on career wording in the outcomes and the career and employability concepts in the course content. The career focus was noted by one of the administrators to be relevant from a competitive perspective for prospective students and their parents. The discussion on the career focus led into a suggested area of improvement would be in an increased emphasis or recognition of the importance of the liberal arts in the curriculum. The career and liberal arts topics would be an area identified for improvement for the course, with the career topic reconsidered for how it is included or emphasized.

The focus groups all indicated that consideration to split the course into multiple parts or levels might be beneficial. The rationales for breaking the course into multiple
levels varied. Rationales varied and included making completion of the course more manageable due to the breadth of important topics covered, including less content may equate to less time committed and expected, to provide additional time for reflection, and to increase the clarity and emphasis on specific topics. One administrator made a comment cautioning the amount of content included as not to confuse new staff on the priorities and expectations.

Related to the course duration, a common question was asked about how long the participants of the training would have access to the course after the course had completed and the potential value of indefinite access to the course resources. The duration of the course was identified to be 15 weeks in which the course would have an active facilitator and for which activities had been intentionally designed to promote knowledge conversion. Notes recorded in the researcher’s reflective journal indicated a preference where possible to refer participants to the local resources for on-going support. The course as designed was not intended to extend beyond the length of the term as at that point in time, the participants would have established connections to campus human and physical resources from which they could move forward. The permission to view the content in the course after the scheduled end date had not been explicitly identified in the scope of this design, as it would be a consideration for the detailed implementation plan in consideration of the LMS administration procedures and practice.

When looking at the course topics, there was consensus that the portfolio topic was the least meaningful content included in the presentation. Through the discussion for least meaningful, the mention of career focused in the outcomes surfaced in all three groups. Not all groups noted to omit, however, the emphasis on the career topic in the
outcomes language and course content was noted as too much. Portfolios are not used in all program areas or an expectation for all faculty. A few focus group participants suggested the implicit emphasis on career in the outcomes and lesson activities be reduced and to increase emphasis on the liberal arts and critical thinking skills.

The focus groups indicated that adjunct faculty needs could be met through the content selected for incorporation. Administrators and faculty acknowledged the diverse backgrounds from which the adjunct faculty often come and noted that pedagogy is commonly not a part of the adjunct faculty’s academic background and an area for development for those individuals. Several comments addressed how adjunct faculty needs could be met. Following are a couple of the comments:

- “There are a wide variety of new instructors ranging from little to no experience. It would help provide the context of the university or school or department’s expectations of pedagogy. What the rigor is, what is appropriate. Those details and other philosophical things.” – Administrator
- “…enabling them to build a community of adjunct faculty working together so they know each other and have someone to connect with and ask questions to and build an online community.”

The distributed format received positive feedback as valuable to meet the needs of adjunct faculty. The extended duration of the two face-to-face sessions was questioned as to the length and viability for adjunct faculty; however, it was also noted by some as a reasonable request since it was just two times during the semester. How the time invested would be of value was noted to emphasize when presenting the schedule to staff. Similar to information presented in the literature about adult learning, the direct applicability of the information being presented, the relevance to the teaching role, and the value were noted as extremely important to get and keep the participants in the professional development course engaged. By the transitive property, the adjunct faculty as adult learners in this course would need the information and activities to be valuable and
relevant. Assimilating the feedback from the group on the needs, the context would be critical to establish the perceived value and relevance. In connection to the SECI model, the value and relevance would be promoted and sustained in \textit{ba}.

The feeling of being alone or in a silo was noted as a common occurrence for faculty. It was believed that through this design, a community would be available to open up communications amongst at minimum the faculty participating in the course. Consensus was not had on whether the course as designed would encourage interaction with parties outside the course such as program coordinators and other staff members. The importance of interaction with the faculty members peer community was evident in the comment by one of the new adjunct faculty, “How are things going? Are there any problems? That’s a big deal. That would keep me going through this if I had that connection.” The appreciation by the faculty member for colleagues whom she sees on occasion checking in with her was acknowledged positively by her peers in the focus group and was confirmation that these types of interactions amongst peers are valuable.

Beyond the community is the sense of being valued. One new faculty member made the statement, “expose people to the idea of UW-Platteville cares about what you’re doing, how you’re doing, collaborating, etcetera.” Having a feeling of being valued or a contributing member of an organization was noted as a need for staff members. When reading about adjunct faculty in traditional educational organizations and the culture in those organizations, concerns have been documented that indicate limited efforts to communicate that adjunct faculty are valued or that they are contributing members to the organization. The inclusion of this type of professional development opportunity would demonstrate faculty are valued with resources allocated to support them. The adjunct
faculty could more clearly see their role in carrying out the mission along with the full-
time counterparts. Several of the adjunct faculty who participated noted their personal
displeasure with institutions offering no orientation, training, or support for adjunct
faculty. The lack of being accepted as a contributing member was noted by non-tenure
track or tenured faculty and was in line with findings in the research literature related to
satisfaction of adjunct faculty. A non-tenured faculty member comment, which resonated
with other faculty in the focus group, was, “an orientation is an opportunity to make
people feel they are part of a community.”

Additional comments in two of the groups noted that the needs identified were
true for full-time faculty as well. A question was posed as why not deliver this training
for any individual teaching, full-time, part-time, tenure line or adjunct? The content could
be valuable for all these parties and would provide some level of consistency when
communicating classroom expectations for quality teaching practices employed in the
mission and supporting the teaching aspect of the university’s mission. Again, the
discussion in this area segued into how the course could meet adjunct and university
needs. The interrelatedness of the components of this design framework were evidenced
in the focus group discussions and in the results of this data analysis that indicated many
of these concepts could not be discussed as standalone items due to how the topics
integrate and potentially influence with one another.

Throughout the discussion surrounding the themes identified, suggestions for
improvement or additional ideas for consideration were made. Several have been noted in
the above results; however, a few were not directly related to the themes discussed so far
in this section. The suggestions varied in complexity and in the areas for which the
suggestion was being made. Additional ideas brought forward in the focus group discussions are summarized below:

- Have each faculty member do a 10-minute presentation that can be videotaped, uploaded, and critiqued in terms of presentation skills.
- Look at how might mentoring be integrated into this design.
- At the end of the course, have faculty participants provide two tips for future new adjunct faculty.
- Identify a feedback loop from the new faculty to bring ideas, exemplar practices, and so forth back to the departments and the university.
- Create recognition for contributions of new or existing adjunct faculty to further increase the engagement and provide acknowledgement for the role played by adjunct faculty in the higher education environments.

While the university currently has a teacher professional development (TPD) course available online, it was evident in the discussions that many of the focus group participants were not fully aware of the TPD opportunity. Acknowledgement of informal opportunities for mentoring, training, and development was consistent amongst the groups, along with the indication due to the informal nature these opportunities lacked consistency and the breadth to fully support a new instructor, especially adjunct faculty. One administrator commented,

- “Touch with new instructors is very important and here needs to be a chance for them to collaborate with others and go through things you run across. What happens at midterm? Why didn’t this work in the classroom? I think that’s what you’re trying to formalize and that’s important.”

The majority of the faculty participants indicated a need for a structured professional development course or program for faculty to inform faculty of processes and pedagogical information like what was included in this course design. Consistency across the university was identified as a benefit of a structured program. Note that discussions about implementation included how this would be rolled out, would it be for the university overall or by college. Pros and cons to the approach were discussed with
more responses in support of the by college implementation due to some of the
procedural nuances amongst the colleges.

In the reflective journal, it was noted the TPD existed in the past, however, with
changing leadership and structure, it was unknown at the time of the focus group sessions
if the TPD was still active. Since the time of the focus group, access was granted to the
TPD. The structure of the existing TPD courses was fully online consisting of 13
modules in which 10 must be completed for level one to be successfully completed.
There appeared to be no required order for the content delivered. Level II of the TPD is in
a similar format with the number of modules required for acknowledgement of successful
completion of that training. Administration noted there had been challenges with
implementing required training at the university due to questions and concerns
surrounding expectations for professional development, fair labor guidelines,
compensation, and so forth.

Other larger scope potential barriers brought up during the focus group included
the fiscal and human resources to support this type of course implementation including its
maintenance. These potential barriers to implementation were consistent with other
studies presenting information on professional development for faculty in higher
education and on-going forum discussions in the field. The theme of organizational
culture in academia surfaced in the focus groups and appeared in the literature
surrounding discussions on the inclusion and utilization of adjunct faculty in higher
education.

The focus group feedback was consistent with information in the literature as to
the importance of buy-in from administration and faculty, the culture of the organization,
and communities of inquiry (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 1999). While the focus group did not use those terms explicitly in every case, what they described as important and the themes which were common amongst the three groups were representative of these topics. For example, the course facilitation theme in which they described the presence and role of the facilitator noted in each group is consistent with the literature and the emphasis on teaching presence in online learning environments (Anderson, Rourke, Garrison, & Archer, 2001). When these themes are looked at in conjunction with other responses by provided by the group, they articulated value in the components that would support a well-developed and well-functioning community of inquiry.

Some of the commentary in the group discussions extended to topics outside the scope of this project although related to faculty professional development or the implementation of professional development. While the focus of the conversation had to be brought back to the predetermined question being discussed, capturing some of these tangential conversations helped to identify potential extensions of this research and other future research opportunities. These topics consistently related to the details required for implementing the course such as a buy-in, organizational change, facilitation details, and potential barriers to implementation. As touched upon in this section, these topics were consistent with information found in the literature and will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

**Summary of Results**

The goal was to construct and validate a blended learning professional development course for adjunct faculty. The iterative approach of the applied design and development methodology positioned the results of the first three phases the study in
direct support of that goal. With the sequential nature of the methodology, movement from phase 2 to phase 3 would not have been possible without group consensus by the expert panel, which resulted in validation of the design at that point in time. The results of phase 2 served to inform phase 3 when the instructional design framework and the outcomes-knowledge type-activity mapping were further developed with details specific to the institution. The fourth phase evaluated the application of the design to an instantiation of the course for evaluation by focus groups.

The aim of the professional development course was to facilitate just-in-time training for adjunct faculty who teach undergraduate students in a face-to-face environment and that would help these instructors become more efficacious in their classrooms. Evidence based decisions were made for design concepts applied in phase 1. Phase 2 vetted the fundamental elements of a professional development course for adjunct faculty when the outcomes, activities, knowledge type, and conversions were assessed. Again, evidence-based decisions were made for development of an instantiation of the design in phase 3. Phase 4 in which the formative evaluation of the subject matter, timing, and value of the content for faculty who teaching in the aforementioned learning environment was more extensive.

While results of the study did indicate some areas for improvement or additional consideration, overall the results at the completion of phase 4 indicated the course design integrating SECI principles as valid and the development as proposed promising. Aside from the course topics, the course outcomes, and the knowledge conversion promoted by the design of the course, the participants in the focus groups agreed the facilitation and
the implementation of this blended learning professional development course would be
critical success factors for the course even more so than the design itself.
Chapter 5

Conclusions, Implications, Recommendations, and Summary

Introduction

The SECI knowledge management model, proposed by Nonaka (1991) and applied by Yeh et al. (2011) in a pre-service teacher education course was used as core component of the framework for the instructional design of this blended professional development course. The goal was to construct and validate a blended learning professional development course for adjunct faculty. The aim of the professional development course was to facilitate just-in-time training for adjunct faculty who teach undergraduate students in a face-to-face environment and that would help these instructors become more efficacious in their classrooms. Adjunct instructors would learn the basics of face-to-face teaching including fundamental learning theories and instructional methods, principles of good teaching practice, classroom management strategies, and assessment strategies. Three research questions guided this investigation:

RQ1. How can a SECI-based blended learning model developed to support pre-service teacher education be adapted to support professional development for adjunct professors in a postsecondary environment? RQ2. To what extent does the resulting training course meet adjunct faculty needs and the university’s needs and requirements? and RQ3. What implications do the results have for refinement of the course?

For each respective research question, a unique method of reporting on how the research question was addressed through the design, the collection of data, the analysis, and the presentation of the results was completed. The review of literature, the
researcher’s reflective journal, and the information resultant from the four phases of the design and development research methodology applied in this study informed the conclusions, implications, and recommendations presented in this chapter.

The presentation of the findings and recommendations outlined are the last segment in the audit trail for the study design (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). The chapter concludes with a summary of the study.

**Research Question 1**

*RQ1.* How can a SECI-based blended learning model developed to support pre-service teacher education be adapted to support professional development for adjunct professors in a postsecondary environment? Specifically, which mechanisms including blended learning, guided practice, observational learning, group discussion, peer evaluation, and feedback are identified as valuable and believed to contribute to the potential success of the proposed training course as designed and constructed?

An instructional design framework was developed that incorporated knowledge management principles into blended learning professional development course for faculty. The results from Yeh et al.’s (2011) study were used to inform the design and development of this blended learning professional development course. The SECI knowledge management model incorporated into the design of Yeh et al.’s (2011) study found to be effective in that instance was used in this study. The selection of the blended learning delivery format and the length of the course were also consistent between Yeh et al. (2011) and this study. One of the changes between studies was the target audience. Yeh et al. (2011) developed a training program for pre-service secondary education teachers, while this study target adjunct faculty in higher education.
Some details of the Yet et al.’s (2011) research design were undocumented in the literature so it was impossible to document every change completed. An attempt was made to capture the changes which were the most significant and for which evidence was had. Additional design decisions were documented using a reflective journal to maintain an audit trail of how the SECI model was used to design and develop the training course (Creswell, 2012).

While there may have been some similarities in the mechanisms chosen for the new course, the specifics of the activities were different as it was a different target audience with unique needs. Delving into the knowledge conversion activities, common underlying mechanisms can be noticed. The open-ended questions included in the focus group question protocol explored the perceptions of the underlying mechanisms included in the design and instantiation of the course. Similar to Yeh et al. (2011), content analysis based upon the focus group participant’s responses was conducted and themes determined with the findings noted in Chapter 4. A review of these findings in conjunction with the other sources of data looked for converging evidence from which inferences or conclusion were made (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Yin, 2009).

The results of the focus group indicated similar to Yeh et al. (2011) that knowledge creation, conversion, and sharing activities were primarily completed in the online environment. The focus group feedback and literature indicate the online delivery throughout the duration of the term would be a viable opportunity to remove the silos that have been documented to exist for the adjunct faculty population. The access to the course materials throughout the term and delivered via blended learning modality was
identified as having potential with the consideration that the course facilitation and the implementation had to be carefully planned for.

The facilitation piece was not explicitly identified in Yeh et al. (2011); however, elements requiring skilled facilitation were noted in the underlying mechanisms of the SECI model that were most effective. These mechanisms could include guided practice, peer evaluations, observational learning, and group discussions. The dialogic feedback necessary to carry out the activities effectively indicates some consideration to facilitation. Several of these mechanisms were intentional in the design of this professional development course and through the discussion surrounding facilitation were noted to be quality aspects of the design if implemented well.

In Yeh et al. (2011), materials created were noted to be effective for the application and integration of teaching strategies. The production of materials to share in the discussions and the reflection on the classroom application of what was being learned in the course were indicated as a potentially valuable mechanism in this design as well. The opportunity to collect evidence could potentially address adjunct and university needs with good practices being shared and demonstrated.

While a group project did not exist like the class collaborative assignment in Yeh et al. (2011) with an explicit co-creation of knowledge into one deliverable, opportunities for sharing were dispersed throughout the faculty development course with the expectation of sharing to occur with the discussion questions posed. The focus group indicated the opportunity to reflect and share through the course discussion activities and these discussions could be an effective aspect of the training similar to what had been noted about the term assignment in Yeh et al. (2011).
Research Question 2

RQ2. To what extent does the resulting training course meet adjunct faculty needs and the university’s needs and requirements?

Richey and Klein (2007) stated the need to validate model use by determining “to what extent [does] the resulting instruction meet[s] learner needs, client needs, and client requirements” (p. 23). To address RQ2, focus groups were held to evaluate the course design and discuss what they believed would work, what would not work, and what could be improved (Reigeluth, 1999). Intentional considerations were made for the instructional design framework with the adjunct faculty target audience in mind. It was their needs communicated to the researcher and substantiated by the literature, which were to be addressed by the design and development of this professional development course. Each of the major components of the instructional design framework selected were validated by the feedback from the focus group as to their value in the design and what was demonstrated in the instantiation of the design.

The just-in-time sequencing in conjunction with the blended learning delivery modality addressed the needs for flexibility while providing on-going support throughout the term. The sociology aspects of the design addressed the needs of faculty to have a sense of belonging and feel valued. The instructional methods and techniques applied which promoted learner interactions with more than just the content were perceived as valuable. Similar to ba in the SECI model, to move knowledge along the continuum, knowledge enablers facilitate interactions to motivate and engage the learners, the knowledge producers.
The engagement of the learners with one another, the facilitator, and potentially individuals around campus was seen as way to develop community and collegiality. The principles supporting the creation of a community of practice were intentional in the design; however, a community of inquiry (CoI), which differs slightly, was what was described in the focus groups as meeting the needs of the faculty and university. The focus group discussions indicated visibility to two aspects of a CoI with a lack of clarity on the teaching presence proffered through the design as presented. The emphasis on the facilitation who and how was very apparent amongst the three focus groups.

The incorporation of knowledge management principles was strategic to provide opportunities for knowledge conversion, cycling through the SECI phases. The acquisition of new knowledge along with knowledge conversion was viewed as important for the development of quality teaching practitioners and the university. The growth mindset was noted to be an expectation of the higher learning commission and students. Consistent communications that included the principles of good teaching practice, pedagogy, policies and procedures, and so forth were viewed to be topics that could only contribute in a positive manner to the institution.

The content was the most challenging aspect determining what content would best meet the needs of the faculty and the university. The findings of the focus group were not as conclusive when discussing which topics were the most meaningful or were mission critical. It appeared the responses differed based on previous experience, administrative or faculty perspectives, and understanding of the topics proposed. The focus group feedback provided the most insights in this area, which was expected with research approach taken to address this research question.
It was clear from the feedback that the professional development course would meet the needs of adjunct faculty and the university in the most basic sense of the topics covered. The delivery format received positive feedback along with the opportunity for community that could be fostered through effective course facilitation of the course.

One area of improvement would be more transparency as to the role of the course facilitator. How the course facilitators would encourage the student-centered aspect of this design was brought up several times in the focus group discussion, in addition to who would facilitate. In SECI terminology, the course facilitator would be the knowledge enablers. While a person or persons from the Teaching and Technology Center (TTC) was the recommended facilitator(s), a notion to have representation from the individual colleges by an instructor experienced in the classroom and online was brought forward more than once. Caution was given by participants in the focus group to avoid having a person in authority or supervisory role facilitate due to the potential implicit pressure. Members of the focus group agreed this course would not be something upon which performance would be measured, as this was a space for development and orientation. The individual(s) in the knowledge enabler role would be there to support, guide, encourage versus seeking evidence for discipline or performance concerns. In addition, as the SECI designation inferred, the facilitator would be play a role in encouraging knowledge conversion and if down poorly could stifle or stop knowledge sharing or conversion from occurring.

While overall the formative evaluation of the course acknowledged how many attributes of the design would meet the needs of adjunct faculty and the university, the responses were not lost that identified the other factors external to the instructional design
or the instantiation of the course, factors that posed a risk to successful implementation of the course. Many of the factors identified were consistent with information in the literature as to potential barriers, however, were out of the scope of this study.

Where possible in the design, considerations were made to minimize the risks or provide opportunities to overcome potential obstacles. For example, budget concerns encouraged the use of available resources for the instantiation of the course such as the campus LMS. This decision was also conducive as a side benefit would be additional exposure for new faculty to the LMS, its features, and use from the student perspective. Another design consideration was the recommendation to have someone from the Teaching and Technology Center (TTC) who facilitates the course due to his or her familiarity with pedagogy, technology, and campus procedures. Group facilitation of training provides an opportunity for effective utilization of resources to provide training in addition to the community support, which is also a part of this design. Community support is important during lean times as individualized resources may not be as readily available.

The sequencing of the course and delivery modality selected can reduce some of the time and accessibility concerns; however, those concerns will never be eliminated due to the nature of working with adjunct faculty who have other obligations and priorities vying for their time. A potential obstacle noted outside the locus of control of those individuals responsible for providing or implementing the professional development was the legal consideration relating to the fair labor standards, and compensation. While there may be some influence with how a course is positioned, again it not an area where a large
impact can be made through the design. The influence would be through the champions for the professional development, not the course itself.

While the amount of content or perceptions of what information was being emphasized were brought up in the focus group discussions, these themes were not the most prevalent in the group discussion. An opportunity for improvement would be to reduce these concerns further with acquiring additional feedback on the course content or implementing the course assessing the outcomes. Additionally completing a small pilot implementation of the course including a time study to determine if the time is a perceived, projected, or realistic concern may prove to be worthwhile.

Overall, the focus groups perceived the course as it was designed would be of value and would meet adjunct and university needs. The focus groups were able to provide a constructive critique of the course design resulting in additional ideas for consideration in the refinement of the course, to extend this research, and for additional future research opportunities.

**Research Question 3**

*RQ3.* What implications do the results have for refinement of the course?

To address RQ3, a review of the research literature combined with the results from the first two research questions was performed to identify recommendations for refinement of the course and how the SECI model, in particular could be used to guide the design of educational experiences in blended learning environments in the future.

The results indicate the need for clearer articulation of the role of facilitator in the course. An opportunity exists to enhance the syllabus section to include the facilitator and learner expectations. Additionally a comprehensive facilitator guide could be developed
to inform anyone facilitating the course about the design of the course to optimize the
teaching and learning to occur and to model the practices expected when the course was
designed and developed. As the knowledge enabler, the facilitator is considered a vital
component of energizing the *ba*, motivating learners. The focus group feedback identified
aspects of a community of inquiry that could be helpful to include in the facilitator guide
delineating the expectations for the teaching presence such a frequency of contact,
methods of outreach, feedback expectations, and so forth.

For UW-Platteville, the content related to the portfolios would be removed from
the outcomes and course materials to another repository to which a faculty member who
might need that information could access it. The career focused and employability
content would be revisited and modified to de-emphasize this content and have it only
included as a topic with which to be familiar. In a like fashion, the liberal arts connection
would be added so that faculty have a basic understanding of the role it and critical
thinking plays in teaching and learning and in the mission of the university.

Yin (2009) noted six primary sources of evidence including documentation,
archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant-observation, and physical
artifacts and discussed the strengths and weakness of each source. Several of these types
of evidence were used during this study. As Yin (2009) commented, evidence found in
documentation such as texts or previously published studies has the strength of stability
and broad coverage. The weakness can be reporting bias of the author, which may not be
known and specific access, may be restricted or withheld. The focus group interviews are
one of the primary sources of evidence in this study. While a strength was the interviews
were focused on the topics of the study and were quite insightful with the rich
information provided, weaknesses were response bias, inaccuracies due to differing experience or contextual perceptions, and reflexivity where interviewees gave the moderator who was also the researcher what they believe the researcher wanted to hear (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Ortiz, 2016). It was recognized the researcher’s role as moderator or even presence at the focus group sessions could influence the feedback received. The physical artifacts created through the reflective journal and the information captured in the online LMS provided insight into the culture and technicalities of the operations. Selectivity and availability were potential weaknesses of this type of evidence (Yin, 2009); however, by design these were minimized in this study due to the researcher’s role and access to the LMS.

Overall there were multiple sources of evidence in this study, which reduced the impact of the areas of weakness of each source of evidence when triangulation methods of analysis were applied (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Yin, 2009). The multiple sources of evidence increased the trustworthiness as was discussed towards the end of Chapter 3. Limitations did exist with the limited number of adjunct faculty involved in the formative evaluation due to limited availability. The scope of the project was another limitation, however, this limited scope provided a plethora of opportunities for continued research related to this study and for incorporation of the suggestions made to improve the design or extend this research.

Implications

“Although no qualitative studies are generalizable in the probabilistic sense, their findings may be transferable” (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 77). Klein (2014) indicated lessons learned from design and development studies “can apply to those who are
confronting similar design and development projects” (p. 3). The integration of concepts from blended learning, knowledge management, communities of practice, and Bloom’s taxonomy formed a framework for the instructional design of a professional development course for faculty believed to have validity and perceived as valuable.

This study can help to inform future research in a variety of ways such as considerations for facilitator preferences or expectations; implementation details, concerns, and considerations; and the identification of foreseen challenges. Additionally in the focus group, questions arose about how mentoring might be incorporated or the potential to have multiple levels of training delivered in this format. The focus group participants who were most interested in this format and the information they perceived as valuable within the program wanted to explore how the community and resources within the current design could be extended beyond that of the 15-week program design.

Other future research opportunities exist as modifications to this research study changing the theories within the integrated framework, the implementation of the training program as designed for further evaluation and assessment, and as extensions of the study to explore the aspects external to the original scope of the study.

**Recommendations**

This research encourages movement from the commonly implemented one-time face-to-face orientation to an orientation delivered in a blended learning format purposefully extended throughout the term proffering information in a just-in-time fashion incorporating activities strategically to promote knowledge conversion.

The results of the expert panel review were already incorporated into the design; however, the results of the focus group were not yet incorporated. It is recommended to
review the recommendations by the focus group to determine what is realistic to incorporate and fits within the goal and aim of the professional development course.

The development of the facilitator guide and comprehensive implementation plan would be recommended as direct follow-on projects to the course design. Each item was identified as critical when looking at the potential success of the course if deployed. After these items were developed, completing a summative evaluation of the implemented design (Morrison, et al., 2011) to evaluate the effectiveness of the course as planned and a confirmative evaluation to assess the viability over time would be natural extensions of this study.

Part of the aim of the professional development course was to help the instructors to become more efficacious in their classrooms. If the course were implemented, assessing the change in self-efficacy from the start of the term and the end, similar to what Yeh et al. (2011) did could be useful data to collect to extend the information received through the focus group activities. Locating a tool on self-efficacy, which is more current than the one used in Yeh et al. (2011) would be suggested.

Through this course, adjunct instructors were to learn the basics of face-to-face teaching including fundamental learning theories and instructional methods, principles of good teaching practice, classroom management strategies, and assessment strategies. Upon course implementation, opportunities to collect data through student and peer observations could identify how the strategies were being employed or to what extent they were being employed. Additionally, data from within the course discussions themselves could also help to inform how the information and activities in the course were contributing to the performance of the course participants. These data could help to
inform future revisions of the content or activities, the implementation plan, or the facilitator guide.

Adjustments could be made to mechanisms included in the design of the professional development course to improve opportunities for or the likelihood of improved success of the training. These adjustments could extend to the specificity of activities included in the design, which were explicitly incorporated to correspond to the phases of the SECI model and the value proffered by these elements. Comparison of these adjustments may also be used in a holistic nature compared to the timing of delivery noted in the researcher’s reflective journal. How these adjustments could influence the value, timing, and context of content delivery or course implementation.

**Summary**

Adjunct faculty comprise a large percentage of part-time faculty for many colleges and universities today. The faculty are hired because of their subject matter expertise in their content areas; however, there is no guarantee that they are skilled in effective classroom management. These instructors can become disconcerted and discouraged because they lack the knowledge and skills necessary to run an effective classroom.

While blended learning has been recognized as an effective modality for students and the adoption this delivery method has become increasingly common in educational organizations, this method has not gained much traction as a way for these organizations to deliver instruction to their own employees. Thus, opportunities exist to use blended learning as a strategy for the delivery of professional development in the workplace for those adjunct faculty who are teaching in face-to-face classrooms. The application of
knowledge management (KM), however, is more common in the workplace. KM is used in organizations to identify, share, and validate knowledge in order to improve individual and organizational performance. Blended learning professional development incorporating KM principles can leverage face-to-face and online instruction delivery methods to give adjunct faculty real-time support as they expand their knowledge of and skills with the employment of specific instructional methods and classroom management techniques in their face-to-face classrooms.

The goal was to construct and validate a blended learning professional development course for adjunct faculty. Design and development research methods (Richey & Klein, 2007) were used to conduct the study in four phases. In phase one, a course design framework incorporating SECI KM principles was developed. The basis for the framework was drawn from Yeh et al.’s (2011) application of the SECI KM model (Nonaka, 1991) in a blended learning pre-service teacher education course. Components from Nonaka et al.’s (1995 & 2000) KM studies including the four modes of the SECI KM model (i.e., socialization, externalization, internalization, and combination), \(ba\), knowledge assets, producers, and enablers were incorporated. In addition, concepts from communities of practice, just-in-time delivery, and Bloom’s taxonomy were integrated to complete the instructional design framework.

The next step was to construct a course based upon the framework. Course goals and outcomes were developed to meet the needs of adjunct faculty. Bloom’s taxonomy was used when looking at the type of outcomes expected by the faculty participating in the course. The course subject matter and identified learning outcomes encompassed tacit and explicit knowledge related to the university, instructional methods, and classroom
management techniques. Viscosity considerations were made when determining the amount and type of information presented and discussed in the course. The just-in-time approach taken was an intentional aspect of the framework and design. The just-in-time strategy helped to inform the identification of additional outcomes which supported the overall course outcomes and which were associated with specific times during the term when specific knowledge was to be acquired, applied, or reflected upon. This approach would influence the velocity at which a learner could progress through the course materials as well. The blended learning method chosen included activities that have been demonstrated as effective in that course modality. Strategic selection of topics and activities would encourage movement along the knowledge continuum and interactions at the times proposed to be the most relevant and valuable. The inclusion of community of practice concepts was to address the sociological needs of the adjunct faculty as adult learners having the shared practice of instruction in face-to-face classrooms.

Included with the framework was a mapping of the learning outcomes, knowledge type, and activities associated with each SECI mode that had been determined for the adjunct faculty audience. In phase two, an expert panel reviewed the framework and mapping. The Delphi technique was used to capture panel members’ feedback. Revisions to the framework and mapping were results of the expert review. A consensus that the items in the mapping were acceptable was achieved after two rounds had been completed.

In phase three, content was further curated to support each week’s activities and the information or knowledge sharing which was needed for those weeks. The online portion of the course was constructed using the Desire2Learn Brightspace learning
management system (LMS). Features of the LMS were used in the construction of the instantiation to support the course design information vetted by the expert panel.

The sequential nature of the phases in which the professional development course was designed and developed resulted in a refined instantiation of the course for the formative evaluation completed in phase 4. The formative evaluation was conducted using focus groups with key stakeholders including faculty, instructional staff, and administrators. The results of the formative evaluation were positive as the components of the framework, especially the integration of the SECI principles, were identified as notable aspects of the course design.

Three research questions guided the investigation: RQ1. How can a SECI-based blended learning model developed to support pre-service teacher education be adapted to support professional development for adjunct professors in a postsecondary environment? RQ2. To what extent does the resulting training course meet adjunct faculty needs and the university’s needs and requirements? and RQ3. What implications do the results have for refinement of the course? All three research questions were successfully addressed through the aforementioned four phases.

Research Question 1

The SECI-based blended learning model developed to support pre-service teacher education could be adapted to support professional development for adjunct professors in a postsecondary environment by the intentional integration of additional development concepts into the design framework and by modifying the content for the new target audience of the training. The SECI principles, course duration, and blended learning modality were consistent with the use in Yeh et al. (2011). Minor adjustments with the
mechanisms (i.e. group discussion, guided practice, observational learning) were made to make each mechanism applicable to this professional development opportunity. Some aspects of Yeh et al.’s (2011) model were not documented in the published article so all the adaptations may not be apparent or noted.

Research Question 2

The findings from the focus group sessions were an indication the training course would meet needs and requirements of adjunct faculty and the university. The adjunct faculty needs met would be in the development of organizational knowledge, knowledge and skills related to pedagogy and good teaching practice, and an increased sense of belonging to and perceived value by the university. Furthermore, the university needs may be met through the increase in collegiality, delivery of a consistent message for the expectations of instructional staff, and meeting the requirements of outside accrediting bodies for staff professional development.

Research Question 3

The focus group formative evaluation resulted in the receipt of constructive feedback valuable in the identification of areas for potential improvement in the course instantiation, extensions of this research, and future research opportunities. The areas of improvement noted were related to the course topics mostly. The diverse perspectives and backgrounds resulted in difference preferences for the value of the topics in the instantiation. The other focal areas of the group evaluation were the details of how the course would be facilitated and implemented. The group echoed concerns about potential obstacles to the implementation of professional development for faculty similar to what has been presented in other research study findings.
Overall, the incorporation of the SECI principles for faculty professional development was determined to be worthy of continued consideration by key stakeholders. See Appendix X for the design document for this blended learning faculty professional development incorporating knowledge management principles. The next steps would be to develop a detailed facilitation guide to accompany the course and to collaborate with stakeholders in the creation of a detailed implementation plan that would be suitable to the institution. Once implemented, summative and confirmative evaluations would be recommended to assess the effectiveness and value of this professional development course, the course facilitation and implementation, and to determine whether the course is viable over time. Additionally, future research focusing on the incorporation of SECI principles into the instructional design of various online and blended learning contexts is recommended.
Appendices
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Orientation Course Goals and Outcomes

Orientation Course Goals

- Familiarize new faculty with University of Wisconsin-Platteville (UW-Platteville), its mission, vision, instructional and student resources, and to reinforce instructor expectations.
- Empower faculty with the tools and resources to facilitate successful, quality learning experiences for all students.
- Provide pertinent information in a timely manner through a variety of face-to-face and online learning experiences.

Orientation Course Outcomes

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

1. **Identify** how your role as an instructor supports the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.
2. **Work collaboratively** with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at UW-Platteville.
3. **Locate and integrate** information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to **create** active learning environments that support career focused learning outcomes and are inclusive of diverse student populations.
4. **Create and evaluate** course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of UW-Platteville as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. **Evaluate** instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.
Orientation Weekly Outcomes

Week 0-1 Outcomes

Upon completing this past two week’s activities, you will be able to:

1a. Articulate the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville
1b. Explain your role as a faculty member at UW-Platteville
1c. List the important instructional dates throughout the term.
3a. Strategic priority of providing an outstanding education that priority
3b. Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at UW-Platteville.
5a. Set classroom expectations that communicate high-expectations for student performance.
5b. Classify instructional methods and techniques with the principles of good teaching practice.
5c. Execute instructional strategies that support the establishment of a good learning environment for your students.
5d. Recognize quality assessments and feedback mechanisms which can be incorporated within the classroom and as an extension of the learning environment.

Week 2 Outcomes

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

5e. Critique the instructional methods applied in your classroom that relate to classroom management.
5f. Determine areas for continued improvement and prospective options for consideration.
5g. Evaluate and discuss the instructional methods applied in the classroom that worked well to establish a quality active learning environment.

Week 3 Outcomes

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

2a. Identify student support resources to whom or to which you may refer students.
4a. Summarize effective student feedback as related to student performance in the classroom and on assessment activities.
4b. Explain the method of feedback selected for academic progress updates for use in the classroom and the rationale for its selection.
**Week 4 Outcomes**

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

4c. **Design** a learning activity that supports the learning outcomes of your course and incorporates active learning principles into its design.

4d. **Summarize** classroom assessment techniques (CATs).

4e. **Incorporate** CATs in your classroom.

4f. **Provide** specific examples of how these techniques were executed in your classroom.

5h. **Discuss** your plan for incorporating the learning activity into your course.

**Week 5 Outcomes**

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

5i. **Analyze** scenarios that may arise in the classroom and **apply** good teaching and classroom management principles to **formulate** a proposed response to each situation.

**Week 6 Outcomes**

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

2b. **Devise** a plan for incorporating a career connection activity into the classroom instructional activities of your course.

2c. **Discuss** how you can support the strategic priority of providing an outstanding education through your course.

**Week 7 Outcomes**

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

2a. **Identify** student support resources to whom or to which you may refer students.

5k. **Critique** the academic progress updates you employed for the week 4 academic progress updates.

5l. **Determine** areas for continued improvement and alternatives methods of feedback for consideration.

5m. **Construct** your plan for disseminating mid-term academic progress updates for students.

**Week 8 Outcomes**

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

1g. **Reflect** on your experiences to date specifically looking at your role as an instructor supporting the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.
Week 9 Outcomes

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

1d. **Outline** your teaching portfolio and **create** an outline in a portfolio tool of your choosing.
2d. **Describe** the purpose and application of a portfolio for students and instructors.
3c. **Classify** assignments which students might use as a part of their career portfolios.
3d. and 3e. **Hypothesize** how the students’ assignments may serve as evidence of their performance and understanding, in addition to how you **reinforce** the importance of each student’s performance on and retention of these identified products for use in their portfolios.

Week 10 Outcomes

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

1e. **Identify** evidence you have collected which can support competencies expected of a UW-Platteville faculty member.
1f. **Compare** the evidence collected to the 7 Principles of Good Practice.

Week 11 Outcomes

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

2a. **Identify** student support resources to whom or to which you may refer students.
5n. **Critique** the mid-term progress updates you employed and **reflect** upon how the informal progress updates of week 4 differed from specific grade feedback of mid-terms.
5o. **Construct** your plan for the disseminating 12-week progress updates for students.

Week 12 Outcomes

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

1g. **Reflect** on your experiences to date specifically looking at your role as an instructor supporting the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.

Week 13 Outcomes

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

4g. **Describe** rigor expectations and their purpose in support of the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.
4h. **Recognize** student academic integrity violations (i.e. plagiarism).
4i. **Summarize** the process for violations of academic integrity.
4j. **Evaluate** an assessment and the respective feedback provided.
4k. **Compare** tools used to provide assessment feedback.
**Week 14 Outcomes**

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

2e. **List** the required end-of-term administrative tasks.

5p. **Execute** final assessments which are aligned to the academic expectations of UW-Platteville.

5q. **Communicate** final grades and performance feedback to students.

**Week 15 Outcomes**

Upon completing this week’s activities, you will be able to:

1g. **Reflect** your role as an instructor supporting the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.

2f. **Prepare** the end-of-term items (i.e. final grades, graded samples, etc.) for submission to the appropriate parties.

2g. **Reflect** on your experiences with the faculty development course.
Table A1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECI Model Phase</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Learning and Development Activities; Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization</strong>&lt;br&gt;(S)</td>
<td>Face-to-Face&lt;br&gt;Online LMS</td>
<td><strong>Introductions</strong> (i.e. names, what they are teaching, interests)&lt;br&gt;Sharing about experiences (i.e. professional and educational background, teaching experience)&lt;br&gt;<em>Designate space(s)</em> to facilitate sharing of feelings, emotions, experiences, and mental models. Informal opportunities have lower stakes, allowing room for the development of trust, rapport, and sense of community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externalization</strong>&lt;br&gt;(E)</td>
<td>Face-to-Face&lt;br&gt;Physical Classroom</td>
<td><strong>Role play</strong> (i.e. classroom management, giving feedback)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Problem Solving</strong> (i.e. working with diverse students, developing assessments, etc.)&lt;br&gt;Sharing practices, anecdotes, and examples (i.e. experiences, resources, assessments and rubrics, scripts, etc.)&lt;br&gt;Direct application to instructional responsibilities (facilitating the learning environment, evaluating student performance, coaching students, etc.)&lt;br&gt;<em>Designate space(s)</em> to facilitate sharing of skills, converted into common terms, and articulated as concepts. The formality increases, but not to the level of combination and feasibility becomes a consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combination</strong>&lt;br&gt;(C)</td>
<td>Online LMS&lt;br&gt;Physical Classroom</td>
<td><strong>Critique</strong> (assessment and feedback)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Online Discussion Questions</strong> related to events and responsibilities that occur during specific times of the term; open-ended activities such as open discussions, inquiries or explorations.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Role play</strong> (i.e. classroom management, giving feedback, working with diverse students)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Problem Solving</strong> (i.e. developing assessments, etc.)&lt;br&gt;Direct application to instructional responsibilities (preparing lessons, providing effective feedback, managing the classroom environment, etc.)&lt;br&gt;<em>Designate space(s)</em> to facilitate the organization and application of varied knowledge bases deliberately and systematically. Formal and the stakes the highest, as the culmination of knowledge is prepared for application or a more public consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalization</strong>&lt;br&gt;(I)</td>
<td>Home Office&lt;br&gt;Online LMS</td>
<td><strong>Reflection activities</strong> about learning that occurred through the formal, informal, and social constructs.&lt;br&gt;Research independently on areas of interest or areas requiring further development&lt;br&gt;<em>Designate space(s)</em> to facilitate action and reflection. Formal or informal, the primary focus is on attaining individual or group insights or deep understandings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from “Sharing and cultivating tacit knowledge in an online learning environment” by M. Tee and D. Karney, 2010, *Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 5, p. 410, with kind permission from Springer Science and Business Media.
Appendix C

Training Tracking Calendar

The training course calendar will include the following information:

- **Week** - Academic Week
- **Start Date** - Start date or introduction to the lesson topic (or when visibility to the item will be granted within the online system)
- **Due Date** – Date information is requested to be submitted to the course, although topics once opened will remain open for the duration of the term should faculty want to revisit the topics or continue their dialogue
- **End Date** – Will not be used, as topics will remain open for the duration of the term should faculty want to revisit the topics or continue their dialogue
- **Topic(s)** - Topic(s) or theme for that lesson component
- **Outcome(s)** - Knowledge, skill, or ability to be attained/reaffirmed during the lesson Aligned to faculty competencies and/or observation/evaluation criteria where available
- **Lead Facilitator** - UW-Platteville point person for the content being delivered that week; will act as the primary guide during that week's lesson Lead person's time commitment is estimated at approx. 2-3 hours for a week's duration.
- **Co-Facilitator(s)** - 1-2 other UW-Platteville staff members are needed to support (or back-up) the lead should the need arise and to provide a greater supportive presence from UW-Platteville leadership and to provide forum coverage for the week Co-facilitator's time commitment is estimated at 1-2 hours for a week's duration.
- **Resource(s)** - Resources required to provide the lesson (i.e. reference materials such as articles, handouts, hyperlinks, audio files, video files, interactive components, etc.)
- **Activities** - Activities that engage the learner and are relevant to their classroom Activities were designed with the KM Model in consideration to create knowledge, thus impacting skills and abilities within the face-to-face classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Topic(s) - Required and Suggested</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Lead Facilitator(s)</th>
<th>Co-Facilitator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Mon, 8/25</td>
<td>Tue, 8/26</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions&lt;br&gt;- Welcome, Overview, Program Goals, Rationale, Topics, Program Schedule, and Important Dates</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Technology Center Staff</td>
<td>Deans, Chairs, Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tue, 8/26</td>
<td>Wed, 8/27</td>
<td>Online learning system - overview (50 minutes)</td>
<td>Test access and be sure that everyone can navigate the online portion of the online learning system</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Technology Center Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Thu, 8/27</td>
<td>Thu, 8/27</td>
<td>New Faculty Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions (30 mins) - Agenda - Role and expectations of faculty at University of Wisconsin (UW)-Platteville</td>
<td>• Articulate the mission, vision, and values of University of Wisconsin (UW)-Platteville&lt;br&gt;• Explain your role as a faculty member at UW-Platteville&lt;br&gt;• List the important instructional dates throughout the term.</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Technology Center Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>The first days of school... (30 minutes)</td>
<td>Understanding of important items for the first days of class; such as having materials prepared, classroom management, etc.</td>
<td>TTC Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>IT Support Systems (60 mins) - Logging in to Desktops/ My Documents/ S-Drive/Instructor stations - Accessing/Reading E-mail - PASS - Attendance/Grade Reporting - Teaching and Technology Center Website - Media and Technology Services - Legal and Ethical Considerations (Copyright, FERPA, ADA, etc.)</td>
<td>• Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at UW-Platteville.</td>
<td>TTC Staff</td>
<td>ITS Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>10:15 AM</td>
<td>BREAK (15 mins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 AM</td>
<td>10:45 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Principles of Good Practice (30 mins) - Using syllabi to establish expectations - Creating safe and respectful environment - Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) - Rubrics - Grading Systems</td>
<td>• Classify instructional methods and techniques with the principles of good teaching practice.&lt;br&gt;• Execute instructional strategies that support the establishment of a good learning environment for your students.&lt;br&gt;• Set classroom expectations that communicate high-expectations for student performance.&lt;br&gt;• Recognize quality assessments and feedback mechanisms which can be incorporated within the classroom and as an extension of the learning environment.</td>
<td>TTC Staff</td>
<td>Deans, Chairs, Coordinators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 15 Week Adjunct Faculty Development Program

Topics in green will be presented during the face-to-face training; follow-up discussions will occur in the online forum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Topic(s) - Required and Suggested</th>
<th>Resource(s)</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0-1  | Mon, 8/23    | Tue, 9/15 | Welcome and Introductions  
Welcome, Overview, Program Goals, Rationale, Topics, Program Schedule, and Important Dates  
Welcome greeting  
Bio  
Classroom structure set-up and basic resources populated | Welcome greeting  
Bio  
Classroom structure set-up and basic resources populated | Online Discussion Question  
-> Introductions Discussion Thread |
|      | Tue, 9/26    | Wed, 9/30 | Online learning system - overview (50 minutes)  
CourseSites LMS  
LMS QuickReference | CourseSites LMS  
LMS QuickReference | -> Verify Login  
-> Brief LMS scavenger hunt |
| 0    | Tue, 9/26    | Tue, 9/28 | New Faculty Orientation                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                              |                                                                                           |
| 8:00 AM | 8:30 AM     |           | Welcome and Introductions (30 mins)  
- Agenda  
- Role and expectations of faculty at University of Wisconsin (UW)-Platteville | Agenda (paper copy)  
Faculty Guide  
FAQs  
Faculty Training Outline | - Review of the agenda for today and review of the role and expectations faculty at UW Platteville |
| 8:30 AM | 9:00 AM     |           | The first days of school... (30 minutes) | FAQs, Campus contact list | Facilitator(s) to model good classroom management for first days of class |
| 9:00 AM | 10:00 AM    |           | IT Support Systems (60 mins)  
- Logging in to Desktops/ My Documents/ S-Drive/Instructor stations  
- Accessing/Reading E-mail  
- PASS - Attendance/Grade Reporting  
- Teaching and Technology Center Website  
- Media and Technology Services  
- Legal and Ethical Considerations (Copyright, FERPA, ADA, etc.) | TTC Website  
- Faculty Support Resources  
ITS Website  
- ITS Knowledgebase | - Introduction of the various IT Support Systems you will be required to use or have access to as an adjunct faculty member  
- Introduction to the support information on the TTC and ITS websites  
-> Hands-on learning activity, testing access to the various systems and resources. |
|      | 10:00 AM    | 10:15 AM  | BREAK, (15 mins)                                                                                                                                               |                                                                              |                                                                                           |
| 10:15 AM | 10:45 AM    |           | 7 Principles of Good Practice (30 mins)  
- Using syllabus to establish expectations  
- Creating safe and respectful environment  
- Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs)  
- Rubrics  
- Grading Systems | Faculty Development Material  
- 7 Principles  
- Assessment Development  
- Syllabus Development, Guide from TTC  
- Rubrics Training  
- Conduct/Academic Dishonesty Process Information | !! Reminder that supplemental syllabus will need to be submitted to your department during by the end of week 1 |
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Delphi Panel Study Timeline

Table A2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Start Date – End Date</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel Recruitment and Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit expert panel members</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>June 18 – June 28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select expert panel members</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>June 29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of design information and Round 1 Questions</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>June 29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing by expert panel members</td>
<td>7 Panel Members</td>
<td>June 29 – July 11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of results</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>July 15 – July 17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of Round 1 Results and Round 2 Questions</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>July 22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing by expert panel members</td>
<td>6 Panel Members</td>
<td>July 22 – July 30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of results</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>July 31 – August 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Achieved, Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update instructional design information; prepare final report for and thank you to panel members</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>August 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of final report and thank you messages</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>August 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time/Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Round 1 Delphi Study - Expert Panel Email

Sent: Sun, Jun 29, 2014 4:28 PM  
Subject: Expert Panel - Round 1 Survey

Dear Expert Panel Member:

Thank you for your willingness to participate as an expert panel member reviewing the instructional design of a blended learning professional development program for adjunct faculty teaching in face-to-face classrooms. A brief summary of the program and program design and an updated timeline for the expert panel reviews has been attached for your review and information. Your insights will be helpful in evaluating components of the instructional design and their relationship to aspects of the SECI model. If you have any questions about the attached documents, the survey, or the research study, please contact me at (xxx) xxx-xxxx (cell) or email me at kimbler@nova.edu.

As previously mentioned, the Delphi technique has been chosen as the method of evaluation to form expert consensus on the design components. Group consensus will be used to refine the program instructional design as a result of each round, specifically the selection of activities and SECI associations used therein. In addition, each panel member will receive a summary of the findings of the panel review as applied for this purpose before each subsequent round and directly following attainment of consensus.

I am providing a link to the round 1 survey designed to solicit your initial feedback on the SECI associations and instructional design framework. Again, it is estimated it will take you 25-30 minutes to review the information and answer the questions. Please complete the survey by Saturday, July 5, 2014 in time for analysis on Sunday, July 6, 2014. Again, I am grateful for your help.

Survey Link: https://s.zoomerang.com/s/HewittDissertationExpertPanelRound1

Kind Regards,

Julie (Kimbler) Hewitt  
kimbler@nova.edu  
xxx.xxx.xxxx (cell)

Attachments  
- Orientation Program Summary.pdf  
- Program Design Summary.pdf  
- Attachment-UpdatedExpertPanelTimeline
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Course Summary

Course Overview
The New Faculty Orientation Course is comprised of several components to support adjunct faculty members and their success in the classroom, teaching for the University of Wisconsin-Platteville (UW-Platteville). Each component provides another opportunity to hone teaching and learning in the classroom and their understanding of the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.

The course consists of the following formal learning components:

- Two face-to-face workshops
  - New Faculty Orientation – Pre-term Workshop
  - Mid-Semester Check-in – Workshop
- 15 week Online Orientation - Development and Support Community

Course Goals
- Familiarize new faculty with UW-Platteville, its mission, vision, instructional and student resources, and to reinforce instructor expectations.
- Empower faculty with the tools and resources to facilitate successful, quality learning experiences for all students.
- Provide pertinent information in a timely manner through a variety of face-to-face and online learning experiences.

Course Outcomes
By the end of this Course, faculty members will be able to:
1. Identify how their role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of UW-Platteville.
2. Work collaboratively with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at UW-Platteville.
3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that support career focused learning outcomes and are inclusive of diverse student populations.
4. Create and evaluate course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of UW-Platteville as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.

Course Topics
- Welcome to The University of Wisconsin-Platteville
- Instructor Expectations and Support
- Student Support Services
- 7 Principles of Good Practice
- Classroom Management
- Academic Quality and Rigor
- Assessment of Learning
- Professional Development
Instructional Design Framework

The course’s instructional design framework functions as a system of interdependent activities and attributes which support the professional development of participants in the course. Several design decisions supported by scholarly literature have been made for the sequencing, learning environment, and participants; however, the activities for use in the blended learning environment are still under development. The figure below is a visual of the framework as a whole.

Figure. Professional Development Instructional Design Framework

Expert Panel Review

An expert panel review has been determined necessary to affirm the SECI modes associated with each outcome, knowledge type, and activity proposed for use in the professional development course. The panel members will review the outcomes, knowledge, and activity (OKA) mapping and determine if the SECI mode associated with each mapping is properly represented. Feedback on the associations will be solicited through the Delphi technique. For this study, it has been determined that when the majority response amongst the panel members is agree or strongly agree and no panel members strongly disagree, these results will indicate a consensus has been ascertained amongst the panel members. Once consensus has been determined, a final determination on the activities to be used to support the outcomes of the course will be made.
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Delphi Expert Panel – Round 1 Survey Information

Delphi Expert Panel - Round 1 Survey

Instructions: Thank you again for your time and feedback. This survey will take approximately 20-25 minutes of your time.

Section 1 Instructions: Begin by reviewing the definitions of the knowledge types and the modes of knowledge conversion being used for the research study. Upon completion of your review, proceed to the next section.

Knowledge Types

Explicit Knowledge

- Explicit knowledge is explained as tangible and able to be codified (Chatti et al., 2007; Jasimuddin et al., 2005).
- “Academic knowledge or “know-what” that is described in formal language, print or electronic media, often based on established work processes, use people-to-documents approach” (Smith, 2001, p. 314).

Tacit Knowledge

- Formed from experience, subjective, and often more challenging to articulate (Chatti et al., 2007; Jasimuddin et al., 2005).
- “Practical, action-oriented knowledge based on practice, acquired by personal experience” (Smith, 2001, p. 314).
  - Technical tacit knowledge can be described as the know-how.
  - Cognitive tacit knowledge ideals, values, perspective, and mental models (Smith, 2001, pp. 314-315).

Modes of Knowledge Conversion

Socialisation (S) - The process of converting new tacit knowledge through shared experiences. Since tacit knowledge is difficult to formalise and often time- and space-specific, tacit knowledge can be acquired through shared experience, such as spending time together or living in the same environment (Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10).

Externalisation (E) - The process of articulating tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. When tacit knowledge is made explicit, knowledge is crystallised, thus allowing it to be shared by others, and it becomes the basis of new knowledge (Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10).

Combination (C) - The process of converting explicit knowledge into more complex and systematic sets of explicit knowledge. Explicit knowledge is collected from inside or outside the organization and then combined, edited or processed to form new knowledge. The new explicit knowledge is then shared with others (Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10).

Internalisation (I) - The process of embodying explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge. Through internalization, explicit knowledge created is shared throughout an organization and converted into tacit knowledge by individuals. Internalisation is also closely related to ‘learning by doing’ (Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10).
**Section 2 Instructions:** Review each outcome, knowledge type, learning activity, and the SECI modes of knowledge conversion identified. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI modes of knowledge conversion that have been associated with each outcome-knowledge type-activity association.

Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Identify</strong> how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of the Bryant &amp; Stratton College (BSC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>Articulate</strong> the mission, vision, and values of BSC.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Fill in the blank activity online on the mission, vision, and values of BSC.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>Explain</strong> your role as a faculty member at BSC.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or complete the pre-term orientation workshop in review module where teaching philosophies and their use at BSC are introduced.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <strong>List</strong> the important instructional dates throughout the term.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or complete the orientation workshop in review module where important instructional date information is presented. <strong>Matching Activity Online</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. <strong>Outline</strong> your teaching portfolio and <strong>create</strong> the outline in Optimal Resume.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question Online</strong> – Outline what might you include or talk to in your teaching portfolio to demonstrate the competencies expected to be demonstrated by a BSC classroom instructor?</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. <strong>Identify</strong> evidence you have collected which can support competencies expected of a BSC faculty member.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question Online</strong> – What artifacts do you have from your course preparation and lessons this term that you could include in your teaching portfolios?</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <strong>Compare</strong> the evidence collected to the 7 Principles of Good Practice.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question Online</strong> – How do these artifacts demonstrate your application of the 7 principles in your courses?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. <strong>Reflect</strong> on your role as an instructor supporting the mission, vision, and values of BSC.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Prompt for journal entry online</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Course Outcomes</td>
<td>Knowledge Type</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>SECI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Work collaboratively</strong> with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at BSC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>Identify</strong> student support resources to whom or to which you may refer students.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activities within the communicating academic progress updates module, mid-term grades module, and effective feedback modules online.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>Devise</strong> a plan for incorporating a career connection activity into the classroom instructional activities of your course.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Reflect on information presented in the employability and career services module. Consider the definition of a ‘career connect’ and devise a plan how one could be incorporated into the classroom instructional activities of your course.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <strong>Discuss</strong> how you can support the employability series goals through your course.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – How might you or have you supported student participation in the employability series or the incorporation of these concepts into the course which you are teaching?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. <strong>Describe</strong> the purpose and application of Optimal Resume for students and instructors.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>True/False activity within the Optimal Resume module online</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. <strong>List</strong> the required end-of-term administrative tasks.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Multiple-choice quiz for week 14.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <strong>Prepare and submit</strong> the end-of-term items (i.e. final grade sheets, graded samples, etc.) for submission to the appropriate parties.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of the required end-of-term administrative tasks by accurate and timely submission of the forms and information to the requested parties.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. <strong>Reflect</strong> on your experience in the faculty development course.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Prompt for journal entry online</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Course Outcomes</td>
<td>Knowledge Type</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>SECI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Locate and integrate</strong> information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that support career focused learning outcomes and are inclusive of diverse student populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>Describe</strong> the employability series and how the series relates to the outcomes set for students of BSC.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop classroom round table activity and/or complete the pre-term orientation workshop in review module where the employability series is explored.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>Categorize</strong> the support resources available to staff and students at BSC.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activity in the introductory module online</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <strong>Classify</strong> assignments which students might use as a part of their career portfolios.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activity within the Optimal Resume module</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. <strong>Hypothesize</strong> how the students’ assignments may serve as evidence of their performance and understanding</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What assignments in your class might students use as part of their portfolio?</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. <strong>Reinforce</strong> the importance of each student’s performance on and retention of these identified products for use their optimal resume portfolios.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – How do you reinforce to students in your courses and/or program the value of quality products to retain and use for their portfolios?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Course Outcomes</td>
<td>Knowledge Type</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>SECI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Create and evaluate</strong> course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of BSC as the framework against which the materials are measured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>Summarize</strong> effective student feedback as related to student performance in the classroom and on assessment activities.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Review the effective feedback module online and consider which techniques you have employed or plan to employ in the future.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>Explain</strong> the method of feedback selected for academic progress updates for use in the classroom and the rationale for its selection.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question</strong> Online – Please share with us which method of feedback you have selected for the week 4 progress updates and your rationale for its selection.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <strong>Design</strong> a learning activity that supports the learning outcomes of your course and incorporates active learning principles into its design.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Development of learning activities for incorporation into his/her classroom environment</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. <strong>Summarize</strong> classroom assessment techniques (CATs).</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question</strong> Online – What have you learned about your students and class thus far? What do you plan to do with that information?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. <strong>Incorporate</strong> CATs in your classroom.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Incorporation of CATs into his/her classroom environment and reflection on that experience.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <strong>Provide</strong> specific examples of how these techniques were executed in your classroom and what you have learned from their application into the classroom.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question</strong> Online – What have you learned about your students and class thus far? What do you plan to do with that information?</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. <strong>Describe</strong> the rigor standards framework and its purpose in support of the mission, vision, and values of BSC.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td><strong>Matching and true/False</strong> activity within the academic quality module.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Create and evaluate</strong> course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of BSC as the framework against which the materials are measured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. <strong>Recognize</strong> student academic integrity violations (i.e. plagiarism).</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>True/false activity within the academic quality module.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. <strong>Summarize</strong> the process for violations of academic integrity.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Order activity within the academic quality module.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. <strong>Evaluate</strong> an assessment and the respective feedback provided.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question</strong> Online – Please post and share one assessment you used this term with the feedback provided. For privacy purposes, please be sure to remove the students name or any personal identifying information. What did you feel were the strengths of this assessment and your feedback? What (if anything) would you like to change for next time?</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. <strong>Compare</strong> tools used to provide assessment feedback.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question</strong> Online – Discuss the tools you favored for use to provide assessment feedback? i.e. Rubrics, narrative, etc.?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Course Outcomes</td>
<td>Knowledge Type</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>SECI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Set classroom expectations that communicate high-expectations for student performance.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Document classroom expectations in the syllabus and other physical classroom materials; reinforced by classroom management techniques applied in the classroom</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Classify instructional methods and techniques with the principles of good teaching practice.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activity in the introductory module online</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Execute instructional strategies that support the establishment of a good learning environment for your students.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Scenarios in the face-to-face pre-term workshop and direct classroom application</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Recognize quality assessments and feedback mechanisms which can be incorporated within the classroom and as an extension of the learning environment.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Review of assessment and classroom assessment techniques during the roundtable discussion at the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or in review of materials in the pre-term orientation workshop in review module.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Critique the instructional methods applied in your classroom that relate to classroom management.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online - What strategies did you implement for your first week of classes to help establish a good learning environment?</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Determine areas for continued improvement and prospective options for consideration.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What do you want to improve for your next class meeting?</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
### Orientation Course Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Evaluate</strong> instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.</td>
<td><strong>g. Evaluate and discuss</strong> the instructional methods applied in the classroom that worked well to establish a quality active learning environment. Tacit Discussion Question Online – What went well the first week?</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>h. Discuss</strong> your plan for incorporating the learning activity into your course. Tacit Discussion Question Online – Please share with us about a learning activity that you have planned for this term and about which you are excited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>i. Analyze</strong> scenarios that may arise in the classroom. Tacit Have faculty review three unique scenarios for reflection and analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>j. Apply</strong> good teaching and classroom management principles to <strong>formulate</strong> a proposed to response each situation. Tacit Discussion Question Online – Identify the scenario to which you chose to respond for the week 5 activity and share with the group how you might you respond to the given situation or what feedback you would provide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>k. Critique</strong> the academic progress updates you employed for the week 4 academic progress updates. Tacit <strong>Discussion Question</strong> Online – Do you have any lessons to share from communicating with your students their 4 week progress updates? What worked well?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>l. Determine</strong> areas for continued improvement and alternatives methods of feedback for consideration. Tacit <strong>Discussion Question</strong> Online – What might you change for next time or take into consideration for your mid-term feedback?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>m. Construct</strong> your plan for the disseminating mid-term academic progress updates for students. Explicit Interactive learning activity that has examples of delivering difficult news.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Evaluate</strong> instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. <strong>Critique</strong> the mid-term progress updates you employed and <strong>reflect</strong> upon how the informal progress updates of week 4 differed from specific grade feedback of mid-terms.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Provide narrative to provoke reflective thoughts and encouragement to critique previous summative feedback provided to date.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. <strong>Construct</strong> your plan for the disseminating 12-week progress updates for students.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Interactive learning activity that has examples of delivering difficult news.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. <strong>Execute</strong> final assessments which are aligned to the rigor standards framework and academic expectations of BSC.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Apply final assessment in the classroom.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. <strong>Communicate</strong> final grades and performance feedback to students.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of providing effective feedback in the classroom through communication of student final grades.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3 Instructions: For any of the items in Section 2 which you identified as Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD), correct the entry using the form below or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this course design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Learning Activity</th>
<th>SECI Mode</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4 Instructions: Identify any outcome, knowledge type, learning activity, and the SECI associations that could also be included in this listing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Learning Activity</th>
<th>SECI Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S E C I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5 Instructions: Please note any additional comments or feedback about the SECI model incorporation into the design of this training course.

Thank you for your participation in Round 1 of Delphi Expert Panel. A summary of results will be sent to you soon with the Round 2 survey.
References


Appendix H

Round 2 Delphi Study - Expert Panel Email

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 22, 2014 11:50 PM
**Subject:** (Dissertation) Expert Panel - Round 2 Survey

Dear Expert Panel Member:

Thank you again for your continued volunteer participation as an expert panel member reviewing the instructional design of a blended learning professional development program for adjunct faculty teaching in face-to-face classrooms. Your feedback has been helpful in the fine-tuning of the learning activity associations and application.

In this round, you will again be reviewing the outcomes- knowledge type-learning activities and their association to phases of the SECI model and the application of these learning activities in the instructional design of the training program. I have attached a summary of the expert panel round 1 findings to this email. As a result, there have been some adjustments to a few of the items from the original information distributed in Round 1.

I am providing a link to the Round 2 Survey designed to solicit your feedback on the revised associations and applications of the learning activities in which no consensus or a weak consensus was achieved. Also an opportunity to review comments on a few of the items which had consensus; however, affirmation is requested in light of the additional information. Please complete the survey by Wednesday, July 30, for analysis to begin Thursday, July 31. Again, I am extremely grateful for your assistance and timely response this survey.


If you have any questions about the attached documents, the survey, or the research study, please contact me at (xxx) xxx-xxxx (cell) or email me at kimbler@nova.edu.

Kind Regards,

Julie (Kimbler) Hewitt
kimbler@nova.edu
xxx.xxx.xxxx (cell)

**Attachments**

- Outcomes-Knowledge-Activity-SECI Mapping - Round1Results.xls
- Orientation Program Summary.pdf
- Program Design Summary.pdf
Appendix I

Delphi Expert Panel – Round 1 Results

Round 1 Results - Excel File, Summary Tab

**Incorporating Knowledge Management into the Design of Professional Development for Adjunct Faculty: A Blended Learning Case** by Julie Hewitt

**Summary of Round 1 - Panel Review**

On the five worksheets following this summary worksheet, each Program Outcome is identified and the corresponding results of the panel review are provided.

While consensus was achieved for a majority of the weekly outcomes, knowledge type, activity, SECI mode mappings, an additional round of review will be required to review the three items (4h, 5f, and 5g) were no consensus was attained and four items (3d, 4f, 4i, and 5e) where a weak consensus was noted. These items have been updated considering the feedback and are to be reviewed again. Two items (5o and 5p) had errors and must be reassessed.

Items that had additional comments and for which consensus was attained will be noted in the Round 2 Survey to provide an opportunity for individuals to reconsider their original response in light of the new/additional information provided.

**Definition of Consensus for the Purpose of this Study**

For this study, it has been determined that when the majority response amongst the panel members is agree or strongly agree and no panel members strongly disagree, these results will indicate a consensus has been ascertained amongst the panel members.
### Round 1 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 1 Tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SECI</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Articulate the mission, vision, and values of Bryant and Stratton College (BSC).</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Assessment: Fill in the blank activity online on the mission, vision, and values of BSC.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Explain your role as a faculty member at BSC.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or complete the pre-term orientation workshop in review module where teaching philosophies and their use at BSC are introduced.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Consensus: 1 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree, 1 Neutral; Neutral requested additional clarification of the face-to-face workshop activity.</td>
<td>Classroom Assessment Techniques will be used in the face-to-face workshop to affirm understanding from participants as to their instructor roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. List the important instructional dates throughout the term.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or complete the pre-term orientation workshop in review module where important instructional dates information is confirmed. Matching Activity</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
<td>One participant noted this activity as not applicable; further clarification below. The matching activity would be to match the instructional dates with the Instructional events covered in the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Outline your teaching portfolio and create the outline in Optimal Resume.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online -- Outline what might you include or talk to in your teaching portfolio to demonstrate the competencies expected to be demonstrated by a BSC classroom instructor?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 4 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Identify evidence you have collected which can support competencies expected of a BSC faculty member.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online -- What artifacts do you have from your course preparation and lessons this term that you could include in your teaching portfolio?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Compare the evidence collected to the 7 Principles of Good Practice.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online -- How do these artifacts demonstrate your application of the 7 principles in your courses?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
<td>One recommendation to change E to S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Reflect on your role as an instructor supporting the mission, vision, and values of BSC.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Prompt for journal entry online</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Round 1 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 2 Tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SECI</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this program, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Identify student support resources to which you may refer students.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activities within the communicating academic progress updates module, mid-term grades module, and effective feedback modules online.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Devise a plan for incorporating a career connection activity into the classroom instructional activities of your course.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Reflect on information presented in the employability and career services module. Consider the definition of a ‘career connect’ and devise a plan how one could be incorporated into the classroom instructional activities of your course.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Discuss how you can support the employability series goals through your course.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – How might you or have you supported student participation in the employability series or the incorporation of these concepts into the course which you are teaching?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Describe the purpose and application of Optimal Resume for students and instructors</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>True/False activity within the Optimal Resume module online</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
<td>One recommendation E not E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. List the required end-of-term administrative tasks</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Multiple-choice quiz for week 14.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Prepare and submit the end-of-term items (i.e., final grade sheets, graded samples, etc.) for submission to the appropriate parties.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of the required end-of-term administrative tasks by accurate and timely submission of the forms and information to the requested parties.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Neutral, Neutral requested additional clarification on evidence of learning in the activity.</td>
<td>The evidence of understanding would come through the complete and accurate submission of the forms and information required by BSC and demonstrating understanding of process and purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Reflect on your experience in the faculty development program.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Prompt for journal entry online</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Round 1 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 3 Tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SECI</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Describe the employability series and how the series relates to the outcomes set for students of BSC.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop classroom round table activity and/or complete the pre-term orientation workshop in review module where the employability series is explored.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus; 1 Strongly Agree, 4 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at BSC.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activity in the introductory module online</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
<td>One recommendation for item C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Classify assignments which students might use as a part of their career portfolios.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activity within the Optimal Resume module</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hypothesize how the students' assignments may serve as evidence of their performance and understanding</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online -- What assignments in your class might students use as part of their portfolio?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Weak Consensus; 1 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree, 2 Disagree</td>
<td>One participant noted not clear; mixed opinion of 1 or 3 due to action verb and activity. One recommendation for Tacit not explicit; also S not E. Item will be adjusted and brought forward for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reinforce the importance of each student's performance on and retention of these identified products for use in their optimal resume portfolios.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online -- How do you reinforce to students in your courses and/or program the value of quality products to retain and use for their portfolios?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While a weak consensus achieved; item will be reviewed again with recommended change.*
Round 1 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 4 Tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SECI</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Summarize effective student feedback as related to student performance in the classroom and on assessment activities.</td>
<td>TacR</td>
<td>Review the effective feedback module online and consider which techniques you have employed or plan to employ in the future.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
<td>No additional comments were provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Explain the method of feedback selected for academic progress updates for use in the classroom and the rationale for its selection.</td>
<td>TacR</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – Please share with us which method of feedback you have selected for the week 4 progress updates and your rationale for its selection.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Design a learning activity that supports the learning outcomes of your course and incorporates active learning principles into its design.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Development of learning activities for incorporation into your classroom environment.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Summarize classroom assessment techniques (CATs).</td>
<td>TacR</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What have you learned about your students and class thus far? What do you plan to do with that information?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
<td>No additional comments were provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Incorporate CATs into your classroom.</td>
<td>TacR</td>
<td>Incorporation of CATs into your classroom environment and reflection on that experience.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Provide specific examples of how these techniques were executed in your classroom and what you have learned from their application into the classroom.</td>
<td>TacR</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What have you learned about your students and class thus far? What do you plan to do with that information?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Weak Consensus*: 2 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree, 2 Disagree</td>
<td>No additional comments were provided. After review, question will be modified to elaborate on the inquiry about CATs employed in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Describe the rigor standards framework and its purpose in support of the mission, vision, and values of BSC.</td>
<td>TacR</td>
<td>Matching and True/False activity within the academic quality module.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
<td>No additional comments were provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Recognize student academic integrity violations (i.e. plagiarism).</td>
<td>TacR</td>
<td>True/False activity within the academic quality module.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree, 3 Neutral, 1 Disagree, &amp; 1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>One participant questioned the SECI designation; suggested internalization. Two participants questioned the Knowledge Type and recommended For Explicit. One recommendation for C not S. Item will be updated and the updated version submitted for the next round of review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Summarize the process for violations of academic integrity.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Order activity within the academic quality module.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Weak Consensus*: 2 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree, 1 Neutral, 3 Disagree</td>
<td>One participant had a question about the application of the order activity. To clarify, the order activity will require the instructor to designate the appropriate process steps for identifying and handling academic integrity violations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Evaluate an assessment and the respective feedback provided.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – Please post and share one assessment you used this term with the feedback provided. For privacy purposes, please be sure to remove the students’ names or any personal identifying information. What did you feel were the strengths of this assessment and your feedback? What (if anything) would you like to change for next time?</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
<td>One recommendation for S not C due to the posting/provision of the assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Compare tools used to provide assessment feedback.</td>
<td>TacR</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – Discuss the tools you favor for use to provide assessment feedback? i.e. Rubrics, narrative, etc.?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While a weak consensus achieved, item will be reviewed again with recommended change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SBE</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.</td>
<td><strong>a.</strong> Set classroom expectations that communicate high-expectations for student performance.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Document classroom expectations in the syllabus and other physical classroom materials; reinforced by classroom management techniques applied in the classroom</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Consensus: 6 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>b.</strong> Classify instructional methods and techniques with the principles of good teaching practice.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activity in the introductory module online</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>c.</strong> Execute instructional strategies that support the establishment of a good learning environment for your students.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Scenarios in the face-to-face pre-term workshop and direct classroom application</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>d.</strong> Recognize quality assessments and feedback mechanisms which can be incorporated within the classroom and as an extension of the learning environment.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Review of assessment and classroom assessment techniques during the roundtable discussion at the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and in review of materials in the pre-term orientation workshop in review module</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>e.</strong> Critique the instructional methods applied in your classroom that relate to classroom management.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online - What strategies did you implement for your first week of classes to help establish a good learning environment?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Weak Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 2 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>f.</strong> Determine areas for continued improvement and prospective options for consideration.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online - What do you want to improve for your next class meeting?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree, 1 Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>g.</strong> Evaluate and discuss the instructional methods applied in the classroom that worked well to establish a quality active learning environment.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online - What went well the first week?</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>No Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>h.</strong> Discuss your plan for incorporating the learning activity into your course.</td>
<td>Tacit-</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online - Please share with us about a learning activity that you have planned for this term and about which you are excited.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>i.</strong> Analyze scenarios that may arise in the classroom.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Have faculty review three unique scenarios for reflection and analysis.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>j.</strong> Apply good teaching and classroom management principles to formulate a proposal to respond each situation.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online - Identify the scenario to which you chose to respond for the week 6 activity and share with the group how you might respond to the given situation or what feedback you would provide.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>k.</strong> Critique the academic progress updates you employed for the week 4 academic progress updates.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online - Do you have any lessons to share from communicating with your students their 4 week progress updates? What worked well?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Determine areas for continued improvement and alternatives methods of feedback for consideration.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion question: What might you change for next time or take into consideration for your mid-term feedback?</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Construct your plan for the disseminating mid-term academic progress updates for students.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Interactive learning activity that has examples of delivering difficult news.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
<td>One recommendation for item C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Critique the mid-term progress updates you employed and reflect upon how the informal progress updates of week 4 differed from specific grade feedback of mid-term.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Provide narrative to provide reflective thoughts and encouragement to critique previous summative feedback provided to date.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Construct your plan for the disseminating 12-week progress updates for students.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Interactive learning activity that has examples of delivering difficult news.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td>Needs to be reassessed: error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Execute final assessments which are aligned to the major standards framework and academic expectations of BSC.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Apply final assessment in the classroom.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td>Needs to be reassessed: error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Communicate final grades and performance feedback to students.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of providing effective feedback in the classroom through communication of student final grades.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While a weak consensus achieved, item will be reviewed again with recommended change.*
Appendix J

Delphi Expert Panel – Round 2 Survey Information

Delphi Expert Panel - Round 2 Survey

Instructions: Thank you again for your time and feedback. This survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes of your time.

Section 1 Instructions: Begin by reviewing the definitions of the knowledge types and the modes of knowledge conversion being used for the research study. Upon completion of your review, proceed to the next section.

Knowledge Types

Explicit Knowledge
- Explicit knowledge is explained as tangible and able to be codified (Chatti et al., 2007; Jasimuddin et al., 2005).
- “Academic knowledge or “know-what” that is described in formal language, print or electronic media, often based on established work processes, use people-to-documents approach” (Smith, 2001, p. 314).

Tacit Knowledge
- Formed from experience, subjective, and often more challenging to articulate (Chatti et al., 2007; Jasimuddin et al., 2005).
- “Practical, action-oriented knowledge based on practice, acquired by personal experience” (Smith, 2001, p. 314).
  - Technical tacit knowledge can be described as the know-how.
  - Cognitive tacit knowledge ideals, values, perspective, and mental models (Smith, 2001, pp. 314-315).

Modes of Knowledge Conversion

Socialisation (S) - The process of converting new tacit knowledge through shared experiences. Since tacit knowledge is difficult to formalise and often time- and space-specific, tacit knowledge can be acquired through shared experience, such as spending time together or living in the same environment (Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10).

Externalisation (E) - The process of articulating tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. When tacit knowledge is made explicit, knowledge is crystallised, thus allowing it to be shared by others, and it becomes the basis of new knowledge (Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10).

Combination (C) - The process of converting explicit knowledge into more complex and systematic sets of explicit knowledge. Explicit knowledge is collected from inside or outside the organization and then combined, edited or processed to form new knowledge. The new explicit knowledge is then shared with others (Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10).

Internalisation (I) - The process of embodying explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge. Through internalization, explicit knowledge created is shared throughout an organization and converted into tacit knowledge by individuals. Internalisation is also closely related to ‘learning by doing’ (Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10).
**Section 2 Instructions:** In light of the additional information/comments about the item below from the Round 1 Survey Results, you are being provided an opportunity to reconsider these items. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI mode, "S", "E", "C", or "I", that has been associated with each OKA mapping by marking the corresponding SA, A, N, D, or SD radio button to the right of the lesson outcome line item.

Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
<th>Add'l Notes /Info from Rnd 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Identify</strong> how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of the Bryant &amp; Stratton College (BSC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>Explain</strong> your role as a faculty member at BSC.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or complete the pre-term orientation workshop in review module where teaching philosophies and their use at BSC are introduced.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Classroom Assessment Techniques will be used in the face-to-face workshop to affirm understanding from participants as to their instructor roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <strong>List</strong> the important instructional dates throughout the term.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or complete the orientation workshop in review module where important instructional date information is presented. <strong>Matching Activity Online</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>One participant noted this activity as not applicable; further clarification below. The matching activity would be to match the instructional date with the instructional events covered in the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <strong>Compare</strong> the evidence collected to the 7 Principles of Good Practice.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question Online</strong> – How do these artifacts demonstrate your application of the 7 principles in your courses?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>One recommendation to change E to S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3 Instructions:** If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.
**Section 4 Instructions:** In light of the additional information/comments about the item below from the Round 1 Survey Results, you are being provided an opportunity to reconsider these items. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI mode, "S", "E", "C", or "I", that has been associated with each OKA mapping by marking the corresponding SA, A, N, D, or SD radio button to the right of the lesson outcome line item. Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Work collaboratively</strong> with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at BSC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add’l Notes /Info from Rnd 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Describe the purpose and application of Optimal Resume for students and instructors.</td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td><strong>True/False activity</strong> within the Optimal Resume module online</td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <strong>Prepare and submit</strong> the end-of-term items (i.e. final grade sheets, graded samples, etc.) for submission to the appropriate parties.</td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Apply knowledge of the required end-of-term administrative tasks by accurate and timely <strong>submission of the forms and information</strong> to the requested parties.</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 5 Instructions:** If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.
Section 6 Instructions: Items with weak consensus from the previous round have had minor adjustments made with the OKA mapping or SECI mode designation. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI mode, "S", "E", "C", or "I", that has been associated with each OKA mapping by marking the corresponding SA, A, N, D, or SD radio button to the right of the lesson outcome line item.

Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that support career focused learning outcomes and are inclusive of diverse student populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hypothesize how the students’ assignments may serve as evidence of their performance and understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – Think about what assignments in your class might students use as part of their portfolio and discuss what evidence of performance and understanding does each assignment provide?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7 Instructions: In light of the additional information/comments about the item below from the Round 1 Survey Results, you are being provided an opportunity to reconsider these items. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI mode, "S", "E", "C", or "I", that has been associated with each OKA mapping by marking the corresponding SA, A, N, D, or SD radio button to the right of the lesson outcome line item.

Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that support career focused learning outcomes and are inclusive of diverse student populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at BSC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activity in the introductory module online</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add’t Notes /Info from Rnd 1

One recommendation for I not C.

Section 8 Instructions: If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.
**Section 9 Instructions:** Items with weak consensus from the previous round have had minor adjustments made with the OKA mapping or SECI mode designation. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI mode, "S", "E", "C", or "I", that has been associated with each OKA mapping by marking the corresponding SA, A, N, D, or SD radio button to the right of the lesson outcome line item.

Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Create and evaluate</strong> course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of BSC as the framework against which the materials are measured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <strong>Provide</strong> specific examples of how these techniques were executed in your classroom and what you have learned from their application into the classroom.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What have you learned about your students and class thus far when applying CATs in your classroom? Discuss which CATs you have used and what you have done with that information or what you plan to do with that information?</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. <strong>Recognize</strong> student academic integrity violations (i.e. plagiarism).</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>True/false activity within the academic quality module in which individuals will identify which are infractions and which are not.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. <strong>Summarize</strong> the process for violations of academic integrity.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Order activity within the academic quality module in which the instructor will designate the appropriate process steps (in order) for identifying and handling academic integrity violations.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section 10 Instructions:** In light of the additional information/comments about the item below from the Round 1 Survey Results, you are being provided an opportunity to reconsider these items. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI mode, "S", "E", "C", or "I", that has been associated with each OKA mapping by marking the corresponding SA, A, N, D, or SD radio button to the right of the lesson outcome line item. Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
<th>Add'l Notes /Info from Rnd 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Create and evaluate course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of BSC as the framework against which the materials are measured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add'l Notes /Info from Rnd 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Evaluate an assessment and the respective feedback provided.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – Please post and share one assessment you used this term with the feedback provided. For privacy purposes, please be sure to remove the students name or any personal identifying information. What did you feel were the strengths of this assessment and your feedback? What (if anything) would you like to change for next time?</td>
<td>C One recommendation for S not C due to the posting/provision of the assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 11 Instructions:** If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.
Section 12 Instructions: There were two items, which had errors in the round 1 survey in which you could not identify a response for each item. These are items are being repeated in this survey. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI mode, "S", "E", "C", or "I", that has been associated with each OKA mapping by marking the corresponding SA, A, N, D, or SD radio button to the right of the lesson outcome line item.

Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Evaluate</strong> instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. <strong>Construct</strong> your plan for the disseminating 12-week progress updates for students.</td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Interactive learning activity that has examples of delivering difficult news.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. <strong>Execute</strong> final assessments which are aligned to the rigor standards framework and academic expectations of BSC.</td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Apply final assessment in the classroom.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 13 Instructions: Items with weak or no consensus from the previous round have had adjustments made with the OKA mapping or SECI mode designation. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI mode, "S", "E", "C", or "I", that has been associated with each OKA mapping by marking the corresponding SA, A, N, D, or SD radio button to the right of the lesson outcome line item.

Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Evaluate</strong> instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. <strong>Critique</strong> the instructional methods applied in your classroom that relate to classroom management.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online - What strategies did you implement for your first week of classes to help establish a good learning environment?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <strong>Determine</strong> areas for continued improvement and prospective options for consideration.</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Reflect upon what you would like to improve for your next class meeting and how you intend upon making those improvements?</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. <strong>Evaluate and discuss</strong> the instructional methods applied in the classroom that worked well to establish a quality active learning environment.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What instructional methods did you apply the first week that contributed to establishing an active learning environment?</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section 14 Instructions**: In light of the additional information/comments about the item below from the Round 1 Survey Results, you are being provided an opportunity to reconsider these items. Indicate your level of agreement with the SECI mode, "S", "E", "C", or "I", that has been associated with each OKA mapping by marking the corresponding SA, A, N, D, or SD radio button to the right of the lesson outcome line item. Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By the end of this course, you will be able to:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Evaluate</strong> instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add‘l Notes /Info from Rnd 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>Set classroom expectations</strong> that communicate high-expectations for student performance.</td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Document classroom expectations in the syllabus and other physical classroom materials; reinforced by classroom management techniques applied in the classroom</td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One recommendation for C not E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>Classify</strong> instructional methods and techniques with the principles of good teaching practice.</td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Matching activity</strong> in the introductory module online</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarification requested; Chickering and Gamson's 7 Principles of Good Practice will be reviewed and instructors will match the activity to the principle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. <strong>Recognize</strong> quality assessments and feedback mechanisms, which can be incorporated within the classroom and as an extension of the learning environment.</td>
<td><strong>Tacit</strong></td>
<td>Review of assessment and classroom assessment techniques during the roundtable discussion at the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or in review of materials in the pre-term orientation workshop in review module.</td>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One recommendation for Explicit not Tacit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. <strong>Apply</strong> good teaching and classroom management principles to <strong>formulate</strong> a proposed to response each situation.</td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion Question Online</strong> – Identify the scenario to which you chose to respond for the week 5 activity and share with the group how you might you respond to the given situation or what feedback you would provide.</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One recommendation for S not C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. <strong>Construct</strong> your plan for the disseminating mid-term academic progress updates for students.</td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interactive learning activity that</strong> has examples of delivering difficult news.</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One recommendation for S not C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 15 Instructions: If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.

Section 16 Instructions: Please note any additional comments or feedback about the results of Round 1.

Section 17 Instructions: Please note any additional comments or feedback about the SECI model incorporation into the design of this training program.
Appendix K

Delphi Expert Panel - Summary Email

**Sent:** Saturday, August 2, 2014 11:10 AM  
**Subject:** (Dissertation) Expert Panel – Summary of Results

Dear Expert Panel Member:

I appreciate your volunteerism as an expert panel member reviewing the instructional design of blended learning professional development program for adjunct faculty teaching in face-to-face classrooms. Your contributions have been very useful in refining the learning activity associations and applications.

I am pleased to report that consensus was achieved after the review of the Round 2 data. I have attached a summary of the expert panel round 2 findings to this email. As a result, there were no adjustments required from what had been distributed in Round 2.

Again, I am extremely grateful for your time and your contribution during this expert panel review.

If you have any questions about the attached documents or the research study, please contact me at (xxx) xxx-xxx (cell) or email me at kimbler@nova.edu.

Kind Regards,

Julie (Kimbler) Hewitt  
kimbler@nova.edu  
xxx.xxx.xxxx (cell)

*Attachment*

- Outcomes-Knowledge-Activity-SECI Mapping - FinalResults.xls
Appendix L

Delphi Expert Panel – Round 2 Results

Round 2 Results - Excel File, Summary Tab

Incorporating Knowledge Management into the Design of Professional Development for Adjunct Faculty: A Blended Learning Case by Julie Hewitt

Summary of Round 2 - Panel Review
On the five worksheets following this summary worksheet, each Program Outcome is identified and the corresponding results of the panel review are provided.

Consensus was achieved.

Definition of Consensus for the Purpose of this Study
For this study, it has been determined that when the majority response amongst the panel members is agree or strongly agree and no panel members strongly disagree, these results will indicate a consensus has been ascertained amongst the panel members.
### Round 2 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 1 Tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SECI</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this program, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of Bryant and Stratton College (BSC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| b. Explain your role as a faculty member at BSC. | Tacit | Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or complete the pre-term orientation workshop in review module where teaching philosophies and their use at BSC are introduced. | I | Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree & 4 Agree  
Neutral requested additional clarification of the face-to-face workshop activity. |
| c. List the important instructional dates throughout the term. | Explicit | Participate in the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or complete the pre-term orientation workshop in review module where important instructional dates information is confirmed. Matching Activity | E | Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree & 3 Agree |
| f. Compare the evidence collected to the 7 Principles of Good Practice. | Tacit | Discussion Question Online – How do these artifacts demonstrate your application of the 7 principles in your courses? | S | Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Disagree |

If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.

Responses: These look fine to me. Clarification helps.

### Round 2 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 2 Tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SECI</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of this program, you will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work collaboratively with others in the college to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at BSC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Describe the purpose and application of Optimal Resume for students and instructors.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>True/False activity within the Optimal Resume module online</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Consensus: 4 Strongly Agree &amp; 2 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Prepare and submit the end-of-term items (i.e. final grade sheets, graded samples, etc.) for submission to the appropriate parties.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of the required end-of-term administrative tasks by accurate and timely submission of the forms and information to the requested parties.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus: 5 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.

Responses: None
### Round 2 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 3 Tab

#### Orientation Program Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that support career focused learning outcomes and are inclusive of diverse student populations.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Matching activity in the introductory module online</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus; 3 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at BSC</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What assignments in your class might students use as part of their portfolio?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Consensus; 4 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hypothesize how the students' assignments may serve as evidence of their performance and understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.

Responses: None

### Round 2 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 4 Tab

#### Orientation Program Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Create and evaluate course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of BSC as the framework against which the materials are measured</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What have you learned about your students and class thus far when applying CATs in your classroom? Discuss which CATs you have used and what you have done with that information or what you plan to do with that information?</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Consensus; 2 Strongly Agree &amp; 4 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Provide specific examples of how these techniques were executed in your classroom and what you have learned from their application into the classroom</td>
<td>Tacit</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consensus; 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Recognize student academic integrity violations (i.e. plagiarism)</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>True/False activity within the academic quality module in which individuals will identify which are infractions and which are not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Summarize the process for violations of academic integrity</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Order activity within the academic quality module in which the instructor will designate the appropriate process steps (in order) for identifying and handling academic integrity violations</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Consensus; 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.

Responses: None
### Round 2 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 5 Tab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge Type</th>
<th>Activities and Assessments</th>
<th>BEGI</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.</td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Document classroom expectations in the syllabus and other physical classroom materials; reinforced by classroom management techniques applied in the classroom.</td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree &amp; 3 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Matching activity in the introductory module online.</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Review of assessment and classroom assessment techniques during the roundtable discussion at the face-to-face pre-term orientation workshop and/or in review of materials in the pre-term orientation workshop in review module.</td>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree &amp; 3 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What strategies did you implement for your first week of classes to help establish a good learning environment?</td>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 4 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Reflect upon what you would like to improve for your next class meeting and how you intend upon making those improvements?</td>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – What instructional methods did you apply the first week that contributed to establishing an active learning environment?</td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 3 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Discussion Question Online – Identify the scenario to which you chose to respond for the week 5 activity and share with the group how you might you respond to the given situation or what feedback you would provide.</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 3 Agree, 1 Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Interactive learning activity that has examples of delivering difficult news.</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 2 Strongly Agree, 4 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Interactive learning activity that has examples of delivering difficult news.</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 4 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Explicit</strong></td>
<td>Apply final assessment in the classroom.</td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Consensus: 4 Strongly Agree, 1 Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Round 2 Results - Excel File, Program Outcome 5 Tab (continued)

If you answered Neither Agree or Disagree (N), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD) to any of the above, please provide the outcome reference(s) and suggested correction(s) or indicate Not Applicable (NA) if you believe it is not representative of any mode or an appropriate selection for this program design.

Responses: None

Please note any additional comments or feedback about the results of Round 1.

Responses: None

Please note any additional comments or feedback about the SEO model incorporation into the design of this training program.

Responses: I have several marked "N" because I don't agree or disagree. Sentences were vague. Suggest updating action words with verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy.
Appendix M

Desire2Learn Learning Management System – Screen Images

The screen images below are samples from the Desire2Learn Learning Management System that will be used in the online portion of the professional development course.

Desire2Learn Course - Sample Course Overview Page

Desire2Learn Course - Sample Course Syllabus Page
Desire2Learn Course - Sample Course Calendar Page

Desire2Learn - Sample Navigation of Week’s Lesson Content
Desire2Learn - Sample Lesson Content

Welcome and Introductions

These first weeks it is our hope to get to know you and your colleagues a little better. It’s our plan that sharing a little about ourselves, our backgrounds, and our commitment to education will enable us all to have a more enriched experience throughout the next 15 weeks and hopefully beyond.

Please visit the Week 1: Introductions forum to introduce yourself and become acquainted with your peers participating in this experience.

New instructors, we are also counting on you to participate in the New Instructor Orientation Workshop being held on August 26 on campus.

Week 1 Outcomes

Upon completing this week’s activities including the new faculty orientation, you will be able to:

1a. Articulate the mission, vision, and values of UN-Plattsville.
1b. Explain your role as a faculty member at UN-Plattsville.
1c. List the important instructional dates throughout the term.

Enrichment Room

The Enrichment Room will be the main forum utilized for discussions in this program. Each week new discussion topics, discussion questions, or activities will be posted. Discussions will remain open for the duration of the program so that you can continue the valuable dialogue as well as revisit threads as needed.

Your active participation is strongly encouraged. It is suggested that you visit the discussion board area a few times a week to stay aware of the developing conversations and engage in the knowledge creation as it is occurring.

Week 1: Introductions

We are very happy that you have successfully accessed the online portion of the orientation program. Welcome! We would like you to take this opportunity to say hello to your peers and the professional development course facilitators.

Please post a brief Introduction, as you may not have had the opportunity to meet everyone during the new faculty orientation workshop or at the faculty In-Service. Tell us your name, the program area or course you will be teaching this term, and any other items you feel of interest.

We request that you respond to at least two of your peers so that you continue expanding your community of peers here at the university.

Week 1: Teaching Philosophy

During the recruitment process and in our meetings to date, a large emphasis has been placed upon teaching and learners. A good educational professional practice is to identify a teaching philosophy
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Nova Southeastern University Institutional Review Board Approval

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
Office of Grants and Contracts
Institutional Review Board

MEMORANDUM

To: Julie Hewitt

From: Ling Wang, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board

Date: June 18, 2014

Re: Incorporating Knowledge Management into the Design of Professional Development for Adjunct Faculty: A Blended Learning Case

IRB Approval Number: wang06151402

I have reviewed the above-referenced research protocol at the center level. Based on the information provided, I have determined that this study is exempt from further IRB review. You may proceed with your study as described to the IRB. As principal investigator, you must adhere to the following requirements:

1) CONSENT: If recruitment procedures include consent forms these must be obtained in such a manner that they are clearly understood by the subjects and the process affords subjects the opportunity to ask questions, obtain detailed answers from those directly involved in the research, and have sufficient time to consider their participation after they have been provided this information. The subjects must be given a copy of the signed consent document, and a copy must be placed in a secure file separate from de-identified participant information. Record of informed consent must be retained for a minimum of three years from the conclusion of the study.

2) ADVERSE REACTIONS: The principal investigator is required to notify the IRB chair and me (954-262-5369 and 954-262-2020 respectively) of any adverse reactions or unanticipated events that may develop as a result of this study. Reactions or events may include, but are not limited to, injury, depression as a result of participation in the study, life-threatening situation, death, or loss of confidentiality/anonymity of subject. Approval may be withdrawn if the problem is serious.

3) AMENDMENTS: Any changes in the study (e.g., procedures, number or types of subjects, consent forms, investigators, etc.) must be approved by the IRB prior to implementation. Please be advised that changes in a study may require further review depending on the nature of the change. Please contact me with any questions regarding amendments or changes to your study.


Cc: Protocol File
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University of Wisconsin-Platteville Human Subjects Research Approval

10/16/2015

Julie Hewitt
Department of School of Education
University of Wisconsin-Platteville

RE: IRB Protocol #2015-16-19

Project Title: Construction and Validation of a Blended Learning Professional Development Course

Approval Date: 10/16/2015
Expiration Date: 10/15/2016

Your project has been approved by the University of Wisconsin-Platteville IRB via an Expedited Review. This approval is subject to the following conditions, otherwise approval may be suspended:

1. No participants may be involved in the study prior to the IRB approval date listed above or after the expiration date.
2. All unanticipated or serious adverse events must be reported to the IRB.
3. All modifications to procedures, participant selection, and instruments used (surveys, consent forms, etc) must be reported to the IRB chair prior to their use.
4. If the project will continue beyond the expiration date, then the researcher must file for a continuation with the IRB at least 14 days prior to the expiration date. If the IRB approval for this project expires before approval for continuation is given, then a new protocol must be filled out and submitted. Federal guidelines allow for no exceptions to this rule. Any data collected after the expiration date cannot be used in the study.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB chair at the address below. Include your protocol # on all correspondence.

Sincerely,

Dr. Barb Barnet
Institutional Review Board Chair
Professor, Mathematics Department
Gardner 451
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
(608) 342-1942
barnetb@uwplatt.edu
Appendix P

Faculty and Administration Introduction and Invitation Letter

Dear [Faculty Member or Administrator]:

I am a full-time academic staff member with UW-Platteville, however, today I am contacting you in my role as a doctoral candidate in the College and Engineering and Computing (CEC) at Nova Southeastern University (NSU) in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. My degree is in Computing Technology in Education and my dissertation topic is *Construction and Validation of a Blended Learning Professional Development Course*.

I would like to invite you to participate in my study.

I will be conducting focus group sessions for faculty and administrators to provide feedback on a professional development course which has been designed and developed as an orientation course for adjunct faculty who are new to teaching at UW-Platteville. I will be asking questions and facilitating discussion about an instantiation of the course which has been developed for review. Your perspective as a faculty member and/or administrator would be a valuable contribution to the data being collected on the course design and development through the focus group activity.

I am holding three focus group meetings in which your participation is requested in only one session, whichever day/time works best for your schedule. The focus group sessions are scheduled for 2 hours and snacks or a light lunch will be provided.

The session options are as follows:
• Friday, October 30, 11:00 am – 1:00 pm
• Wednesday, November 4, 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
• Thursday, November 5, 12:30 pm – 2:30 pm

The focus groups meetings will held be in Ullsvik Room 1136. More information on your consent to participate in this study can be found in the attached letter of consent document.

If you are interested in participating by sharing your insights and providing feedback on this development opportunity, please RSVP to this email. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (608) 342-1524 (campus office) or email me at kimbler@nova.edu.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of my request to participate and for your time.

Sincerely,
Julie (Kimbler) Hewitt
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Letter of Informed Consent – Focus Group

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION OF HUMAN PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN – PLATTEVILLE

1. Purpose:
The goal of this research study is to validate the SECI model incorporated into the framework for the design and development of a blended learning professional development course for adjunct faculty. The aim of the professional development course being developed is to facilitate real-time training for adjunct faculty who teach undergraduate students in a face-to-face environment and that will help these instructors become more efficacious in their classrooms.

2. Procedure:
You have been invited to participate in one of the focus groups for this study because you are currently faculty, instructional academic staff, or academic staff for UW-Platteville who teach in the face-to-face classroom; and/or you are in a leadership role such as deans, directors, chairs, coordinators, or like positions who may oversee teaching staff or the professional development of teaching staff.

As an active participant in one of the focus groups, you will be shown the instructional design of a professional development course for adjunct faculty including information on the course delivery and implementation. As the information is presented, you will be asked a series of questions soliciting input on the design and content. Response and discussion notes will be captured by the researcher and a secondary note-taker if available. Once the notes for each session have been summarized, the notes will be sent out to the participants of that respective group to provide an opportunity for participants to confirm the notes accurately reflect the commentary and/or to provide any additional thoughts they may have on the topic presented.

3. Time required:
Your participation will involve one focus group session lasting approx. 1.5-2 hours; a follow-on opportunity to review the notes from the focus group in which you participated is anticipated to take no more than 15-20 minutes.

4. Risks:
The replacement of identifiable information with pseudonyms and/or unique identifiers where appropriate will occur to minimize the minimal risks associated with subject confidentiality. It is not anticipated that this study will present any other risk to you other than the inconvenience of the time taken to participate.

Benefits:
Your participation in this study will provide you access to information on a course which has been tailored to align with the mission and vision of UW-Platteville and proffers professional development in the area instructional methods and classroom management for face-to-face post-secondary classroom environments. The validation of the SECI model as a framework for the design and development of a blended learning professional development program for adjunct faculty may inform those who are involved with faculty development, assessment, or training program implementation.
5. Your rights as a participant:
The information gathered will be recorded as type-written notes. Data or summarized results will be-de-identified and will not be released in any way that could identify you.

You have the right to leave this study at any time or refuse to participate. If you do decide to leave or you decide not to participate, you will not experience any penalty or loss of services you have a right to receive. If you choose to withdraw, any information collected about you before the date you leave the study will be kept in the research records for 36 months from the conclusion of the study and may be used as a part of the research.

If you have questions after the completion of the focus group sessions, please contact:

Julie (Kimbler) Hewitt, Principal Investigator
School of Business/Distance Learning Center, University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Research/Doctoral Candidate at Nova Southeastern University
(608) 342-1524

Also, once the study is completed, you may request a summary of the results.

6. If you have any concerns about your treatment as a participant in this study, please call or write:
   Barb Barnet, Chair, UW-Platteville IRB
   (608) 342-1942
   barnetb@uwplatt.edu

Voluntary Consent by Participant

I have read the above information and willingly consent to participate in this focus group.

Signed _______________________________ Date __________________
## Appendix R

### Research Questions and Data Collection Instrument Listing

**Table A3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question (RQ)</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *RQ1.* How can a SECI-based blended learning model developed to support pre-service teacher education be adapted to support professional development for adjunct professors in a postsecondary environment? Specifically, how do the following mechanisms including blended learning, guided practice, observational learning, group discussion, peer evaluation, and feedback contribute to the success of the training as described by Yeh et al. in 2011? | • Review of Literature  
• Reflective Journal  
• Focus Group Discussion  
• Notes |
| *RQ2.* To what extent does the resulting training course meet adjunct faculty needs and the university’s needs and requirements? | • Review of Literature  
• Reflective Journal  
• Focus Group Discussion  
• Notes |
| *RQ3.* What implications do the results have for refinement of the course? | • Review of Literature  
• Reflective Journal  
• Focus Group Discussion  
• Notes |
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Focus Group Questions

Focus Group Questions

1. This training course has been designed to be delivered in a blended learning environment which integrates e-learning with classroom instruction.
   a. How might the current content and activities contribute to the improvement of an instructor’s professional knowledge of pedagogy and the seven principles of good teaching practice?
   b. How do you believe this course delivery format might contribute to the improvement in the evidence of application of the seven principles of good teaching practice by your adjunct faculty?
   c. How do you believe this instructional design might contribute to the communications and the development of rapport amongst the adjunct faculty, program coordinators, and other university staff?
   d. How do you foresee this instructional design might impact knowledge sharing and creation?

2. Explain which items stand out that might be the most meaningful to a new or less experienced instructor at UW-Platteville. Explain which items you believe would be the least meaningful to a new or less experienced instructor at UW-Platteville.

3. How does the training course meet adjunct faculty needs? In what areas would you like to see improvements made?

4. How would this training course meet the university’s needs and requirements? In what areas would you like to see improvements made?

(Adapted from Yeh et al., 2011)
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Focus Group Research Participant Descriptive Characteristics

Table A4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Participants</td>
<td>n = 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>n = 17</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience Outside of UW-Platteville or UW-System</td>
<td>n = 17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at UW-Platteville</td>
<td>n = 17</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Teaching Experience</td>
<td>n = 17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>n = 17</td>
<td>New Adjunct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some individuals had multiple roles/perspectives

New = within first four semesters of working with the university.
Adjunct = Part-time Instructor or Lecturer
Faculty = Full-time Tenured or Tenure Track Faculty
Administration = Direct oversight of adjunct and/or faculty
Other Administration = Oversight of teacher professional development
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Focus Group PowerPoint Presentation

CONSTRUCTION AND VALIDATION OF A BLENDED LEARNING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COURSE

Focus Group Presentation
Presented by
Julie Hewitt, Doctoral Candidate
College of Engineering and Computing
Nova Southeastern University

Kelsey Adams, UW-Platteville Graduate Student
Assistant Moderator/Notetaker

AGENDA

► Welcome and Introductions
► Dissertation Project and Design Overview
► Course Information
  ► Goals
  ► Outcomes
  ► Topics
  ► Calendar
  ► Implementation
► Course Demonstration
► Discussion
WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

DISSERTATION PROJECT OVERVIEW

- Background
  - Target Audience for Training
    - Adjunct Faculty
  - Selection of Modality for Course Delivery
    - Blended Learning
  - Knowledge Construction
    - SECI Model, Socialization, Externalization, Internalization, and Combination
- Goal
  - Construct and validate a blended learning professional development course for adjunct faculty
DISSEPTATION PROJECT OVERVIEW (CONTINUED)

- Design and Development Research Methodology
  - Phase 1: Course Design Framework
  - Phase 2: Expert Panel Review of Framework and Mapping
  - Phase 3: Construction of Course in Desire2Learn
  - Phase 4: Evaluation by Stakeholders

PHASE 1: COURSE DESIGN FRAMEWORK
MODES OF KNOWLEDGE CONVERSION

Socialisation (S)
The process of converting new tacit knowledge through shared experiences. Since tacit knowledge is difficult to formalise and often time- and space-specific, tacit knowledge can be acquired through shared experience, such as spending time together or living in the same environment.

Externalisation (E)
The process of articulating tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. When tacit knowledge is made explicit, knowledge is crystallised, thus allowing it to be shared by others, and it becomes the basis of new knowledge, into tacit knowledge by individuals. Internalisation is also closely related to ‘learning by doing’.

(Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10)

MODES OF KNOWLEDGE CONVERSION

Combination (C)
The process of converting explicit knowledge into more complex and systematic sets of explicit knowledge. Explicit knowledge is collected from inside or outside the organization and then combined, edited or processed to form new knowledge. The new explicit knowledge is then shared with others.

Internalisation (I)
The process of embodying explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge. Through internalization, explicit knowledge created is shared throughout an organization and converted into tacit knowledge by individuals. Internalisation is also closely related to ‘learning by doing’.

(Nonaka et al., 2000, pp. 9-10)
PHASE 2: EXPERT PANEL REVIEW

- Expert Panel review using Delphi Technique
  - Multiple Rounds of Review until Consensus Received
- Outcomes-Knowledge-Activity Mapping

PHASE 3: CONSTRUCTION OF COURSE

- Construction of Course in Desire2Learn

UW-Platteville Instructor Orientation

Overview

This Instructor Orientation Course has been developed to support and prepare faculty and academic staff teaching for the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. The course will include opportunities for your instructor knowledge, skills, and behaviors in face-to-face classroom settings. Specific topics will be given to instructional mentors and classroom management techniques. In addition to the improvement of administrative responsibilities related to instructors, the 15-week course has been developed as a blended learning opportunity including live face-to-face meetings and an online component being delivered through Desire2Learn.

Questions about the course can be submitted to the Instructor Orientation Coordinator.
PHASE 4: EVALUATION BY STAKEHOLDERS

- 3 Focus Groups
  - Set of pre-determined questions
  - Group discussion
  - Notes will be compiled at the completion of each focus group session
  - Member checks

COURSE GOALS

1. Familiarize new faculty with University of Wisconsin-Platteville (UW-Platteville), its mission, vision, instructional and student resources, and to reinforce instructor expectations.
2. Empower faculty with the tools and resources to facilitate successful, quality learning experiences for all students.
3. Provide pertinent information in a timely manner through a variety of face-to-face and online learning experiences.
COURSE OUTCOMES
By the end of this course, you will be able to
1. **Identify** how your role as an instructor supports the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.
2. **Work collaboratively** with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at UW-Platteville.
3. **Locate and integrate** information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to **create** active learning environments that support career focused learning outcomes and are inclusive of diverse student populations.

COURSE OUTCOMES (CONTINUED)
By the end of this course, you will be able to
4. **Create and evaluate** course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of UW-Platteville as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. **Evaluate** instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.
COURSE TOPICS

- Instructor Expectations and Support
- Student Support Services
- 7 Principles of Good Practice
- Classroom Management
- Academic Quality and Rigor
- Assessment of Learning
- Professional Development
DESIRE2LEARN COURSE DEMONSTRATION

This Instructor Orientation Course has been developed to support and prepare faculty and academic staff teaching for the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. The course will include opportunities to improve instructor knowledge, skills, and behavior in face to face classrooms settings. Specific focus will be given to instructional practices and classroom management techniques in addition to the reinforcement of administrative responsibilities required of instructors.

The 11-week course has been developed as a blended learning opportunity including two face-to-face meetings and an online component being delivered through Blackboard.

IMPLEMENTATION

- Support of Administration
- University Expectations
- Communication Plan
- Coordination
- Facilitation
- Course Maintenance
FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. This training course has been designed to be delivered in a blended learning environment which integrates e-learning with classroom instruction.
   a. How might the current content and activities contribute to the improvement of an instructor’s professional knowledge of pedagogy and the seven principles of good teaching practice?
   b. How do you believe this course delivery format might contribute to the improvement in the evidence of application of the seven principles of good teaching practice by your adjunct faculty?

(Adapted from Yeh, et al., 2011)
FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS (CONTINUED)

1. This training course has been designed to be delivered in a blended learning environment which integrates e-learning with classroom instruction.
   c. How do you believe this instructional design might contribute to the communications and the development of rapport amongst the adjunct faculty, program coordinators, and other university staff?
   d. How do you foresee this instructional design might impact knowledge sharing and creation?
   (Adapted from Yeh et al., 2011)

2. Explain which items stand out that might be the most meaningful to a new or less experienced instructor at UW-Platteville. Explain which items you believe would be the least meaningful to a new or less experienced instructor at UW-Platteville.
3. How does the training course meet adjunct faculty needs? In what areas would you like to see improvements made?
4. How would this training course meet the university’s needs and requirements? In what areas would you like to see improvements made?
   (Adapted from Yeh et al., 2011)
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Qualitative Data Analysis – Themes and Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Enabler(s)/Facilitator(s)</th>
<th>Knowledge Assets/Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitation – Who</td>
<td>Course Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitation – How</td>
<td>• Process or procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Feedback</td>
<td>• Policies (FERPA, ADA, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Producers/Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>• Seven Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audience</td>
<td>• Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECI Mechanisms/Activities</td>
<td>• Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group Discussion</td>
<td>• Quality/Rigor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observational Learning</td>
<td>• Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guided Practice</td>
<td>• Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engagement</td>
<td>• Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interaction</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer Evaluation</td>
<td>• Resources (People &amp; Places)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflection</td>
<td>• Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba/Context</td>
<td>Potential Barriers/Obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence</td>
<td>• Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceived Value</td>
<td>• Buy-In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relevance</td>
<td>• Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Culture</td>
<td>• Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Modality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blended Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Online Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just-in-Time/Sequencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Community of Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feeling Valued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Association of Focus Group Findings with the SECI Model

- **Observational Learning**: Observe facilitator(s) modelling classroom management techniques (online and face-to-face)
- **Guided Practice**: Describe methods and techniques which demonstrate the seven principles of good practice
- **Peer Evaluation**: Share what has worked well and considerations for tweaks in your methods and techniques applied
- **Group Discussion**: Discuss artifacts created which demonstrate the application of the seven principles in your courses and with students

- **Demonstration**: Development of class syllabus which adheres to university requirements and sets course expectations
- **Group Discussion**: Share assessment methods used which fit into the rigor framework of the college and the course/program you are teaching

- **Group Discussion**: Identification of methods and techniques with the principles of good teaching practice
- **Peer Evaluation**: Critique and discuss evaluations of student work

- **Self-Awareness**: Describe rigor expectations and their purpose in how you support the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville
- **Self-Reflection**: What went well the first week? What do you want to improve for your next class meeting? *Similar self-awareness and reflective questions throughout the course*
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Design Document for Blended Learning Faculty Professional Development

Incorporating Knowledge Management Principles

Instructional Design Framework

The instructional design framework functions as a system of interdependent activities and attributes which support the professional development of participants in the course. Several design decisions supported by scholarly literature have been made for the sequencing, learning environment, participants, and activities. The outcomes-knowledge-activity mapping was vetted by an expert panel through the Delphi technique; the design was further validated by focus groups consisting of faculty and administrators in higher education.

The figure below is a visual of the framework as a whole. Complex aspects required of faculty professional development were addressed through the integration of concepts to form the design framework; notably concepts from the SECI model, blended learning, Bloom’s taxonomy, just-in-time delivery, and communities of practice were integrated.

*Figure. Instructional Design Framework.*
Instructional Design Framework - References


Course Overview

This Instructor Orientation Course has been developed to support and/or prepare faculty and academic staff teaching for the university. The course will include opportunities to improve instructor knowledge, skills, and behaviors in face-to-face classroom settings. Specific focus will be given to instructional methods and classroom management techniques in addition to the reinforcement of administrative responsibilities requested of instructors. The 15-week course has been developed as a blended learning opportunity including two face-to-face meetings and an online component being delivered through Desire2Learn (D2L).

Course Description

This Instructor Orientation Course has been developed to support and/or prepare faculty and academic staff teaching for the university. As a continuation of the commitment to professional development, this 15 week blended orientation course has been created to support just-in-time development opportunities for those who are teaching for the university in the traditional, face-to-face classroom settings. The course has been designed to reinforce and enhance your knowledge, skills, and/or behaviors in face-to-face classroom instruction and course administration as well as increase your understanding of the philosophy and practices of the profession and at our university.

Course Outcomes

By the end of this program, you will be able to:

1. **Identify** how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of the university.
2. **Work collaboratively** with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled.
3. **Locate and integrate** information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that support career focused learning outcomes and are inclusive of diverse student populations.
4. **Create and evaluate** course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of the university as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. **Evaluate** instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.

Course Subject Matter Scope

The scope of the course is limited to fundamental knowledge and skills for new adjunct faculty who are teaching in face-to-face classrooms for the university. The course topics have been selected which are crucial for meeting minimum instructor expectations in the classroom for instructional procedures and processes and basic instructional methods.

The topics covered in this orientation course are noted below. These topics will be covered here in the online course community and in the face-to-face workshops. The topics are presented in a
just-in-time manner throughout the term and designed in a manner for knowledge construction as the term proceeds.

- Welcome to the University
- Instructor Expectations and Support
- Student Support Services
- *Seven Principles of Good Practice*
- Classroom Management
- Academic Quality and Rigor
- Assessment of Learning
- Professional Development

**Target Audience**

The primary target audience is adjunct faculty who are new to the university or who have taught for the university for less than three terms. Full-time faculty who are new to the university may also benefit from participation in this course.

**Prerequisites**

There are no pre-requisite requirements for this faculty development opportunity other than an active teaching assignment with the university.

**Course Human Resources**

- Course Lead – Staff member designated to lead the design, development, delivery, assessment, and on-going maintenance of the orientation course
- Course Facilitation – Experienced faculty member (s) and/or staff from the Teaching and Technology Center top facilitate the course
- Subject Matter Expert(s) – Staff from the Teaching and Technology Center to design, develop, and maintain the course materials
- Instructional Design – Staff from the Teaching and Technology Center or the Distance Learning Center for instructional and course design support
- Technical Support Staff – Set up the course and users in the Learning Management System; address users technical issues which may arise
- Course Champion(s) – Tenured faculty and administrators who help promote faculty buy-in of and active participation in the orientation course

**Active Participation and Evaluation Strategy**

Faculty are expected to participate in open discussions with classmates and the course facilitator through the Desire2Learn discussion board. There are one to two topics/questions required in most weeks; other weeks consist of simply completing some check-for-learning assessments or provide time for reflection with the opportunity to reflect using the ePortfolio tool. Information to create informed discussion posts and responses can be drawn from the lesson overviews and other resources such as the suggested readings, videos, and scholarly literature, and/or personal experience.
Participants who are active in and successfully complete 70% or greater of the course activities, will receive a certification of successful completion of the training program at the conclusion of the program. Faculty will be provided updates as to their individual progress towards meeting that goal as the program progresses.

Active participation will be determined by the successful completion of the activities as described in each section. In a general sense, 70% correct on checks for learning (quizzes) and substantive discussion board participation will be noted as successes. The course facilitator is responsible for completing the evaluation and providing timely, constructive feedback to the faculty participants. Dialogic communication is encouraged.

Faculty Participant Resources

Resources are listed in the sections in which subject matter is presented; resources are to be confirmed and or updated once per year to be sure the information included in the training course is current. Resources consist of links to university webpages (e.g. school/department and program pages, the university’s Teaching and Technology Center, campus knowledgebase, and so forth). Additional resources include scholarly literature available through the university library or open source materials. Other anticipated resources are the artifacts shared by the participants for knowledge sharing or peer review.

Facilitator Resources

Resources are listed in the sections in which subject matter is presented; these resources are to be confirmed and or updated once per year by the course facilitator(s) to be sure the information included in the training course is current. Additional supplementary resources are captured in the course notes area, which is not visible to faculty participants. While some facilitation notes have been captured in this notes area, the development of a comprehensive facilitator guide is encouraged.

Participant Required and Optional Technology

Adjunct faculty and the course facilitator(s) will need to have access to a computer, the internet, and have a university network ID to be able to log in to the online portion of the course delivered through the Desire2Learn learning management system and to communicate with the training course facilitators through their university.edu email account. Media components are included for which participants may wish to have a headset to listen to the audio versus using their computer’s speakers.

For interactive or discussion elements, use of the Kaltura video is an option. For these activities, participants may wish to have a headset with microphone and webcam. Additional virtual meeting options exist with the Desire2Learn Online Rooms (Blackboard Collaborate) or the University’s subscription to Office 365, which includes Skype for Business. Those individuals who wish to experiment with or use those technologies are also encouraged to have webcam and headset with microphone to optimize those experiences.
Technical Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Minimum Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating System (Windows)</td>
<td>Windows XP (Windows 7 recommended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating System (Macintosh)</td>
<td>Mac OS X 10.6 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Internet connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56K, DSL or Cable modem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Speed connection recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browser</td>
<td>Chrome (latest version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firefox 26 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safari 6.1 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browser Plug-ins</td>
<td>JAVA (latest version) required for some Business Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Reader 10 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adobe Flash Player 10 (Active X) or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>You must have the ability to check e-mail from your computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Suites</td>
<td>Microsoft Office 2007 (Windows); Microsoft Office: 2011 (Mac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least Word, PowerPoint, and Excel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science courses require versions containing Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia</td>
<td>Monitor capable of 1024 x 768 resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some components may require a headset with an attached microphone. Sound card and speakers/headphones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corporate and Personal Firewalls

Many corporations and individuals have installed firewalls to protect the computers on their networks. Firewalls can serve two purposes:

1. Prevent unwanted intrusion of the network (e.g., from hackers, viruses)
2. Control unwanted traffic to unapproved sites

If you are at work and encounter a firewall-related error message or have problems accessing restricted resources, you may need to contact your corporate IT group for assistance.

If you are using your personal computer and have installed and/or activated firewall or security software, you will need to verify the course sites are not blocked and that ports 80 (standard Web port) and 443 (secure sockets port) are open to your Web browser. Information on how to check this should be in the documentation provided with the software involved.
Course Organization

Activities that encourage the timely sharing of information and reinforcement of quality teaching principles have been developed for each week of the program. The modules have been carefully designed to support faculty in their teaching role for the university and to prepare each faculty member to successfully meet the orientation program outcomes. Each outcome has been carefully considered as to the knowledge type and has been strategically paired with specific mechanisms with encourage knowledge creation or conversion.

The online orientation will span the 15 week term. Topics of additional importance will be presented throughout the term at a time appropriate for direct application to teaching and learning in on-campus courses. Special focus will be given to good practices for teaching and learning, especially effective feedback. On occasion topics may be revisited that were covered in the face-to-face workshops to reinforce the concepts discussed and address any additional questions that may come up related to these topics throughout the term. This practice of revisiting the topics is an intentional aspect of incorporating knowledge principles and movement along the knowledge continuum.

Each week there will be introductory commentaries with links to brief development activities for the participant to complete. These activities have been designed to complete within 60-90 minutes throughout the week. The discussion board area is used frequently in this course.

Discussion Board

There are three main Discussion Forum Topic Areas. A brief explanation of each as shown to participants is provided below. As the class progresses, items would be added to the Enrichment Room that would provide instruction for materials to look at in the content section, small activities to complete, and to encourage additional sharing and asking of questions. Note there is something almost each week to attempt to maintain momentum and value.

- **Questions for the Facilitators**
  We know there will be questions, please use the Questions for the Facilitators area to let us know what questions you have. Course facilitators will be checking this forum frequently to address questions posed.

- **The Lounge**
  The Lounge has been set up as an area for personal sharing or topics that may have segued from the intent of the course development topics.

- **Enrichment Room**
  The Enrichment Room will be the main forum utilized for discussions in this program. Each week new discussion topics, discussion questions, or activities will be posted. Discussions will remain open for the duration of the program so that you can continue the valuable dialogue as well as revisit threads as needed.
For those participants new to participating in online discussion boards, discussion board guidelines and tips are to be made available in the Active Participation and Discussion Board folder of the online course.

Learning Activities

The activities selected in this design were vetted by an expert panel and are reflective of the application of strategic instructional strategies incorporating knowledge management principles. Focus groups consisting of faculty and administrators also reviewed the design and indicated value in the design. See an example of activities associated with the SECI mode in the following graphic. If the framework or mechanisms therein were to be modified, the KM principles would need to be revised.
Course Structure/Content Outline

A basic structure has been set up for the course reinforcing the just-in-time approach to the delivery of the course materials in conjunction with knowledge management principles that support the knowledge creation and conversion needed support participants in their achievement of the course learning outcomes.

See below a course outline as it would be shown to participants in the online portion of the course describing each week. The face-to-face (F2F) learning activities are designated in green text.

Week-by-Week Overview

F2F New Instructor Orientation and Workshop
Wednesday, August 26, 8:00 am - Noon (followed by lunch and the new employee resource fair)

Week 0-1: Welcome and Introductions - Let's get started! (8/25 - 9/6)

Welcome to the course! We hope that you will find benefit in networking with your peers, sharing ideas, and continuing to refine your face-to-face instructional practices with the university.

In this first week, we will become acquainted with one another through introductions and activities, an overview of the program will be provided, important dates throughout the term will be presented, and we will discuss the topics relevant to getting off to a successful start for the term.

Week 1: Community Development & the Pre-term Workshop in Review (8/31 - 9/6)

This week we take a moment to step back and process what we discussed in the pre-term workshop and continue our community development through the sharing of our teaching philosophies.

Week 2: Classroom Management Revisited (9/7 - 9/13)

We will take a look at the methods and techniques you have applied during the first two weeks of the term and discuss your plans for future lessons. We will discuss what went well and areas for improvement, in addition to exploring in greater detail active learning concepts which could be incorporated into your lessons.

Week 3: Teaching and Learning, Part I (9/14 - 9/20)

An exploration of providing effective feedback to the traditional and non-traditional learners which comprise our classrooms will ensue. We will participate in activities to prepare you for the academic progress updates which are recommended to be provided to students in weeks 4 and 5 of the term.
Week 4: Teaching and Learning, Part II (9/20 - 9/27)

Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) will be further discussed and you will learn how to select and incorporate CATs into your classroom. Active learning has proven to engage and motivate learners in the classroom, we will continue to review the many possibilities for incorporation into the design and delivery of your course.

Week 5: Teaching and Learning, Part III (9/28 - 10/4)

You have been in your classroom now for a several weeks (or more). It's a great time to step back and reflect on situations that may still arise or have arisen in your classroom. This week we will take a look at a variety of scenarios and formulate proposed responses which apply good teaching and classroom management principles.

Week 6: Employability Preparation (10/5 - 10/12)

We have many opportunities to help establish connections to the workplace from our classrooms. This week we are going to devise a plan for incorporating a career connection or development activity into your classroom activities and how employability preparation might be supported throughout your course.

Week 7: Teaching and Learning, Part IV (10/13 - 10/18)

As a part of the teaching and learning process, the need for difficult discussions are bound to happen. This week we will focus on techniques to use when preparing for those discussions and additional support resources to which you might refer students for support beyond the classroom. In addition as we approach mid-term, feedback is expected to be provided once again in the form of mid-term grades. We will discuss expectations for the provision of academic progress information to students and how you might prepare for the upcoming weeks.

F2F Mid-Semester Check-in Workshop
Saturday, October 17, 8:30 am - 11:30 am

Week 8: Mid-Term Reflections and Preparation (10/19 - 10/26)

With mid-term upon us, it's a busy time for grading and preparing the feedback we discussed in previous week. We count on you to take time this week to prepare effective, quality feedback for your students and to do some self-reflection on your classroom and program experience to date.

Week 9: Student and Staff Portfolios (10/26 - 11/2)

Let's take a look at various tools for portfolios and their potential use at our institution for staff and students. This week we will explore how students' work in the classroom can be used as evidence for their portfolios and your work in the classroom as well.
Week 10: Seven Principles of Good Practice (11/2 - 11/8)

The 7 Principles of Good Practice (Chickering and Gamson, 1987) is a common grounding point for quality, effective educational experiences expected from instructors. By continuing to reflect upon our own classroom practices, we can identify how we support the competencies expected of ourselves as faculty and compare the evidence, which we have collected to these principles of good practice.

Week 11: Academic Progress Updates Revisited (11/9 - 11/15)

As we close in on the end of the term, continued knowledge of student progress is important to the student and the instructor. It is not uncommon for the need for difficult discussions to again arise. This week we will take a look at how the progress updates and difficult discussions may differ from those earlier in the term and how you might prepare for each.

Week 12: Academic Quality and Rigor Revisited (11/23 - 11/29)

The ability to describe the academic and rigor standards to which the university’s programs prescribe and in which they take great pride is important for the members of the instructional team. This week, we will take a look at how you supported the standards through your classroom assessments, feedback, and insuring academic integrity within your classroom.

Week 13: Seven Principles of Good Practice - Are we there yet? (11/16 - 11/22)

Another week for reflection and time-on-task grading and providing quality feedback to students. Happy Thanksgiving!!

Week 14: Preparing for the end... (11/30 - 12/6)

The end of term is a busy time with many administrative tasks to be completed beyond the classroom. This week we are here to help make sure you don't miss any, answer questions that you have, and support you as you prepare to wrap up the term.

Week 15: Orientation Wrap-Up (12/7 - 12/23)

It's the last week of the term and a great to reflect on all that you have accomplished throughout the term, in your classroom, and within this course. With that, it's not a bad time to begin looking ahead at what's next, so we will give you a quick preview!

Printable Course Calendar

A printed copy of the course calendar will be distributed at the first F2F workshop and be available for download as a PDF document within the online course. See the following pages for an example of the layout of a printable course calendar. The Desire2Learn date features are also to be used to provide participants the opportunity to view dates in their D2L calendar.
### 15 Week Adjunct Faculty Development Program

**Topics in green will be presented during the face-to-face training; follow-up discussions will occur in the online forum.**

**Topics in purple are optional, however, strongly encouraged**

**Course Outcomes**

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

1. Identify how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of UW-Platteville.
2. Work collaboratively with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at UW-Platteville.
3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that
4. Create and evaluate course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of UW-Platteville as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0-1  | Tue, 8/25 | Sun, 9/5 | Welcome and Introductions  
Welcome, Overview, Course Goals, Rationale, Topics, Program Schedule, and Important Dates | Ta. Articulate the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.  
Tb. Explain your role as a faculty member at UW-Platteville.  
Tc. List the important instructional dates throughout the term. | Online Discussion Question:  
> Introductions Discussion Thread |
|      | Tue, 8/25 | Wed, 9/26 | Desire2Learn LMS Overview @ Tech Mash-up (50 minutes) | Db. Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at UW-Platteville. | Verify Log-in  
> Brief LMS scavenger hunt |
|      | Wed, 9/26 | Wed, 9/26 | New Instructor Orientation and Workshop  
8:00 AM - 8:30 AM | Ta. Articulate the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.  
Tb. Explain your role as a faculty member at UW-Platteville.  
Tc. List the important instructional dates throughout the term. | Icebreaker |
|      | 8:30 AM - 9:30 AM | 9:30 AM - 10:00 AM | The first day of school... (30 minutes) | Sc. Execute instructional strategies that support the establishment of a good learning environment for your students. | Observe facilitator(s) modeling classroom management techniques for first day of class and discussion |
| 9:00 AM | 10:00 AM | 11:00 AM | IT Support Systems (60 mins)  
- Logging in to Desktops/ My Documents/ S-Drive/Instructor stations  
- Accessing/Reading E-mail  
- PASS - Attendance/Grade Reporting  
- Teaching and Technology Center Website  
- Media and Technology Services  
- Legal and Ethical Considerations (Copyright, FERPA, ADA, etc.) | Db. Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at UW-Platteville. | Hands-on learning activities, confirming access to the various systems and resources. |
| 10:00 AM | 11:00 AM | 11:15 AM | BREAK (15 mins) | Sa. Set classroom expectations that communicate high-expectations for student performance.  
Sb. Classify instructional methods and techniques with the principles of good teaching practice  
Sc. Execute instructional strategies that support the establishment of a good learning environment for your students.  
Sd. Recognize quality assessments and feedback mechanisms which can be incorporated within the classroom and as an extension of the learning environment.  
Se. Remind that supplemental syllabus will need to be submitted to your department during the end of week 1. |  |
| 10:15 AM | 11:00 AM | 11:15 AM | Principles of Good Practice (30 mins)  
- Using syllabi to establish expectations  
- Creating safe and respectful environment  
- Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs)  
- Rubrics  
- Grading Systems |  
1b. Explain your role as a faculty member at UW-Platteville. | Introduction to creating teaching philosophies  
> Introduce teaching (philosophy) statement workshops |
| 10:45 AM | 11:15 AM | 11:15 AM | What is a teaching philosophy? (25 minutes) |  |  |
## Course Outcomes

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

1. Identify how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of UW-Platteville.
2. Work collaboratively with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at UW-Platteville.
3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that
4. Create and evaluate course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of UW-Platteville as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11:10 AM</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Classroom Management (20 mins)&lt;br&gt;- Structuring your class time</td>
<td>5b. Classify instructional methods and techniques with the principles of good teaching practice.&lt;br&gt;5c. Execute instructional strategies that support the establishment of a good learning environment for your students.</td>
<td>Classroom management scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>11:40 AM</td>
<td>Health and Safety (10 mins)</td>
<td>5b. Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at UW-Platteville.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:40 AM</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>Other Need-to-Know (20 mins)&lt;br&gt;- ADA Resources&lt;br&gt;- Academic and Career Advising Center&lt;br&gt;- Library&lt;br&gt;- WATR&lt;br&gt;- Academic Dishonesty/Plagiarism&lt;br&gt;- Classroom Observations &amp; Student Evaluations&lt;br&gt;- Governance&lt;br&gt;- University Planning</td>
<td>5b. Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at UW-Platteville.</td>
<td>Introductory presentation of the other need-to-know topics and where to find resources in support of these topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Network with other new faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>New Employee Resource Fair</td>
<td>5b. Categorize the support resources available to staff and students at UW-Platteville.</td>
<td>Opportunity to visit tables and meet staff from different departments and also community services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon. 8/21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development and the Pre-term Workshop In Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Discussion Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>1b. Explain your role as a faculty member at UW-Platteville</td>
<td>2a. Introduction Discussion Thread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module: New Faculty Orientation Pre-Term Workshop In-Review</td>
<td>Same outcomes as the workshop</td>
<td>Checks for Learning&lt;br&gt;2a. True-False&lt;br&gt;2b. Multiple Choice&lt;br&gt;2c. Matching&lt;br&gt;2d. Fill in the blank&lt;br&gt;2e. Ordering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Discussion Question&lt;br&gt;2a. Teaching Philosophy Discussion Thread</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Course Outcomes

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

1. Identify how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of UW-Platteville.
2. Work collaboratively with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at UW-Platteville.
3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, campus resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that
4. Create and evaluate course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of UW-Platteville as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practices and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mon. 9/7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revisiting Classroom Management</td>
<td>5a. Critique the instructional methods applied in your classroom that</td>
<td>Online Discussion Questions: 1. What strategies did you implement for your first week of classes to help establish a good learning environment? 2. What went well the first week? What do you want to improve for your next class meeting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relate to classroom management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5f. Determine areas for continued improvement and prospective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>options for consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5g. Evaluate and discuss the instructional methods applied in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>classroom that worked well to establish a quality active learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mon. 9/14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching and Learning, Part I</td>
<td>2a. Identify student support resources to whom or to which you may</td>
<td>Checks for Learning: 1. True/False 2. Matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing Effective Feedback</td>
<td>refer for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4a. Summarize effective student feedback as related to student</td>
<td>Online Discussion Question: 1. Please share with us which method of feedback you have selected for the week 4 progress updates and your rationale for its selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>performance in the classroom and on assessment activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4b. Explain the method of feedback selected for academic progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>updates for use in the classroom and the rationale for its selection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mon. 9/21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching and Learning, Part II</td>
<td>4d. Summarize classroom assessment techniques (CATs).</td>
<td>Online Discussion Question: 1. What have you learned about your students and class thus far? What do you plan to do with that information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Module</td>
<td>4e. Incorporate CATs in your classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4f. Provide specific examples of how these techniques were executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in your classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4c. Design a learning activity that supports the learning outcomes of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Engagement and Motivation</td>
<td>your course and incorporates active learning principles into its design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5a. Discuss your plan for incorporating the learning activity into your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mon. 9/26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching and Learning, Part III</td>
<td>5: Analyze scenarios that may arise in the classroom and apply good</td>
<td>Online Discussion Question: 1. Identify the scenario to which you chose to respond for the week 5 activity and share with the group how you might you respond to the given situation or what feedback you would provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing Effective Feedback</td>
<td>teaching and classroom management principles to formulate a proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>to respond to each situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## 15 Week Adjunct Faculty Development Program

**Topics in green will be presented during the face-to-face training; follow-up discussions will occur in the online forum.**

**Topics in purple are optional, however, strongly encouraged**

---

### Course Outcomes

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

1. Identify how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of UW-Platteville.
2. Work collaboratively with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at UW-Platteville.
3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments that
4. Create and evaluate course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of UW-Platteville as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mon, 10/16</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Employability Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Employability Preparation Module</strong></td>
<td>2b. Devise a plan for incorporating a career connection activity into the classroom instructional activities of your course.</td>
<td>Online Discussion Question 1. How might you or have you supported student participation in the employability series or the incorporation of these concepts into the course which you are teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2c. Discuss how you can support the strategic plan priority of providing an outstanding education through your course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mon, 10/22</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teaching and Learning, Part IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Difficult Discussions</strong></td>
<td>2a. Identify student support resources to whom or to which you may refer students.</td>
<td>Checks for Learning - True/False + Multiple Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2b. Identify student leadership potential among the students in your course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid-Term Grades</strong></td>
<td>5b. Critique the academic progress updates you employed for the week 4 academic progress updates.</td>
<td>Online Discussion Question 1. What lessons did you learn this week? What did you change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5c. Determine areas for continued improvement and alternative methods for feedback for consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5d. Construct your plan for disseminating mid-term academic progress updates for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid-Sem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat, 10/27</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid-Semester Check-in Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Debrief - How are things going?</strong></td>
<td>1a. Reflect on your experiences to date specifically focusing on your role as an instructor supporting the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.</td>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b. Reflect on your experiences to date specifically focusing on your role as an instructor supporting the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Portfolios - What are they? Who needs them?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>- Teaching Portfolios</strong></td>
<td>2d. Describe the purpose and application of a portfolio for students and instructors.</td>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>- Student Portfolios</strong></td>
<td>2e. Identify and discuss potential benefits to students and instructors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Classroom Management</strong></td>
<td>5e. Critique the instructional methods applied in your classroom that relate to classroom management.</td>
<td>Scenarios and Role Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5f. Determine areas for continued improvement and prospective options for consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Student Work</strong></td>
<td>2a. Identify student support resources to whom or to which you may refer students.</td>
<td>Critique and Discuss Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2b. Identify student leadership potential among the students in your course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Module: Mid-Semester Check-in Workshop In-Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same outcomes as the workshop.</td>
<td>Checks for Learning - True/False + Multiple Choice + Matching + Fill in the blank + Ordering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mon, 10/29</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid-Term Reflections and Preparation</strong></td>
<td>1a. Reflect on your experiences to date specifically focusing on your role as an instructor supporting the mission, vision, and values of UW-Platteville.</td>
<td>Self-Reflection Encouraged Mid-Term Grade Prep/Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

New Instructor Orientation 8/25/15, 8:00 am - Noon

Start of Fall Term 9/2/2016, 8:00 am

Mid-Semester Check-in 10/15/15, 8:00 am - 11:00 am

End of Fall Term 12/18/15, 5:00 pm

Final Grades Due 12/22/2015, 4:00 pm
15 Week Adjunct Faculty Development Program

Topics in green will be presented during the face-to-face training; follow-up discussions will occur in the online forum.
Topics in purple are optional, however, strongly encouraged

Course Outcomes
By the end of this course, you will be able to:
1. Identify how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of UW-Platteville.
2. Work collaboratively with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at UW-Platteville.
3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personally collected data, to create active learning environments.
4. Create and evaluate course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of UW-Platteville as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9    | Mon. 10/23 |      | Student and Staff Portfolios | 23. Describe the purpose and application of a portfolio for students and instructors.  
30. Classify assignments which students might use as a part of their lesson plan.  
34. Hypothesize how the students' assignments may serve as evidence of their performance and understanding, in addition to how the instructor can use this information to improve instruction. | Checks for Learning  
- True/False  
- Multiple Choice  
Activity: Create your optimal resume portfolio and share with your program coordinator and the training program facilitators.  
Online Discussion Question  
1. What assignments in your class might students use as part of their portfolio? How do you reinforce to students in your courses and your program coordinator the value of quality products to retain and use for their portfolios?  
2. Online Discussion Question  
Outline what might you include or talk to in your teaching portfolio to demonstrate the competencies expected to be demonstrated by a UW-Platteville classroom instructor? |
| 10   | Mon. 10/30 |      | Teaching Portfolio | 10. Outline your teaching portfolio and create an outline in a portfolio tool of your choosing. | Online Discussion Question  
1. What artifacts do you have from your course preparation and planning that you could include in your teaching portfolio? How do these artifacts demonstrate your application of the 7 principles in your courses? |
| 11   | Mon. 11/6 |      | 7 Principles of Good Practice | 1. Identify evidence you have collected which can support competencies expected of a UW-Platteville faculty member.  
2. Compare the evidence collected to the 7 Principles of Good Practice. | Online Discussion Question  
1. What artifacts do you have from your course preparation and planning that you could include in your teaching portfolio? How do these artifacts demonstrate your application of the 7 principles in your courses? |

9. Academic Progress Updates Revisited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12   | Mon. 11/13 |      | Academic Progress Updates Difficult Discussions | 2a. Identify student support resources to whom or to which you may refer students.  
5b. Critique the mid-term progress updates you employed and relied upon for your instructional and student support resources.  
5c. Construct a plan for disseminating 12-week progress updates for students. | 12 Week Academic Progress Updates Prep/Delivery  
- Scenario Activity for Difficult Discussions |
### 15 Week Adjunct Faculty Development Program

**Topics in green will be presented during the face-to-face training. Follow-up discussions will occur in the online forum. Topics in purple are optional, however, strongly encouraged.**

#### Course Outcomes

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

1. Identify how your role as an instructor supports the mission and vision of UW-Platteville.
2. Work collaboratively with others in the university to provide high-quality, successful learning and career development experiences for students enrolled at UW-Platteville.
3. Locate and integrate information from instructional and student support resources, community resources, and personalized collected data to create active learning environments that...
4. Create and evaluate course materials using the academic quality and rigor expectations of UW-Platteville as the framework against which the materials are measured.
5. Evaluate instructional methods against the principles of good teaching practice and determine areas of proficiency and areas for continued improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities &amp; Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Quality and Rigor Revisited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Quality and Rigor Standards Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Quality and Rigor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Critique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seven Principles of Good Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are we there yet?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAPPY THANKSGIVING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoy the holiday!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing for the end...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculating and Communicating Final Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade Submission (Paper and Electronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graded Samples Textbook Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>End of Course Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation Wrap-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>On-Going Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mon. 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you and Great Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### New Instructor Orientation

- **Start of Fall Term**: 9/2/2015, 8:00 am - Noon
- **Mid-Semester Check-in**: 10/18/15, 8:30 am - 11:30 am
- **End of Fall Term**: 12/18/15, 5:00 pm
- **Final Grades Due**: 12/22/2015, 4:00 pm
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