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This study was designed to obtain an increased understanding of faculty members’ perceptions of faculty-development activities offered by the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) at one location of a multicampus, regionally accredited, private, nonprofit university. This study was necessary to help with administrative and academic decisions regarding faculty development. The first of the four research questions addressed participants’ perceptions of the TLC’s professional development through workshops to prepare and assist faculty with teaching. The second research question addressed participants’ perceptions of their mentoring experience to support faculty members during their initial teaching assignments. The third and fourth research questions addressed the influence of experience and demographic factors on participants’ overall perceptions of activities offered by the TLC.

Survey methodology was utilized to obtain quantitative data. Because the researcher designed the instrument, the questionnaire utilized was validated by a formative and a summative committee and pilot tested. The instrument included questions that were formatted and ordered to address each of the research questions. The first sequence of questions addressed the first research question and offered an opportunity for comments on the overall TLC experience. The second sequence of questions addressed the second research question and allowed an opportunity for comments on mentoring. The third sequence of questions addressed the third and fourth research questions.

Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The analysis revealed that respondents’ perceptions of the TLC were positive; it adequately prepared them for initial teaching assignments at the university. However, respondents’ comments indicated the need for a variety of topics they would like to have presented at workshops. Participants’ perceptions of mentoring experiences were mixed; however, there was a general indication that there were problems with mentoring experiences and relationships that needed to be addressed. Analysis also indicated that demographic and experience factors had very little impact on respondents’ perceptions of the TLC workshops and mentoring.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

According to McKee and Tew (2013), faculty members are crucial to a dynamic and growing educational entity. Therefore, faculty development should be viewed as a necessary component and not a mere detail. Within higher education, there have been many societal shifts of enormous proportion, and faculty members must be fully prepared and engaged to handle such changes. Faculty members must be equipped through ongoing enhancement of their capabilities and intellect to lead their educational institutions through the quagmire of uncertainty brought about by cultural, national, and worldwide changes. Developmental programs are foundational to the world of education, and it is feasible as well as necessary to authenticate their effectiveness to an organization (McKee & Tew, 2013).

With these different changes occurring in education, stakeholders must rise and meet these challenges. Honan, Westmoreland, and Tew (2013) noted that, in recent times, there has been a dramatic shift from decades of support to a place in which policy makers, media, parents, and students are now questioning the value and meaning of higher education. The continuous emergence of new technologies, the upsurge of information, and the increased appreciation for differences in student learning styles come together to challenge hoary teaching methods. Engaged faculty members are a developed faculty, and developmental initiatives are key to creating and supporting a culture that appreciates and rewards effective teaching within any educational organization (Honan et al., 2013; McKee, Johnson, Ritchie, & Tew, 2013).

Many faculty members have the necessary educational background and qualifications to teach, and some even have previous instructional and professional
experience; however, the university at which this study took place has recognized that ongoing faculty development is necessary regardless of experience and academic qualifications. The purpose of the faculty-development workshops of the teaching and learning center (TLC) at the university is to facilitate training and information on various academic topics and instructional techniques. The university’s ability to develop faculty through faculty-development initiatives of the TLC serves to enhance the school’s ability to provide high-quality education, meet student needs, and strengthen the overall institution. The faculty-development workshops began in May 2012; however, there has been no formal examination conducted to assess its usefulness at this point. Thus, the problem identified was that no evidence existed to show that the faculty-development initiatives of the TLC were useful to the faculty of the university.

**The topic.** The area of interest was to explore the effectiveness of the university’s TLC on faculty development. Plank and Mares (2013) commented that teaching centers provide a range of services, which can include teaching orientations, workshops, and more indepth programs, such as learning communities or individual consults. Individuals involved in these centers have various academic and professional disciplines, and the centers themselves vary from institution to institution. Although these centers offer a variety of services, most of them have common categories of offerings and a set of expectations by the individuals served (Plank & Mares, 3013).

**The research problem.** The TLC conducts several workshops a year for faculty development; however, there has been no formal examination to assess its usefulness of the activities to faculty at the university. This necessitates further investigation for the benefit of faculty and administration.

**Background and justification.** Institutions of higher education have many
challenges in today’s academic climate that included regulatory agencies, such as accrediting bodies and government offices. Therefore, the need to demonstrate that faculty development is taking place and positively affecting learning and teaching outcomes is essential. Persellin and Goodrick (2010) noted that, although professors may have content knowledge, many do not possess the necessary skills and understanding to disseminate their expertise and improve their pedagogical skills. Centers such as the TLC serve to bridge this gap and help to meet the needs and understanding of the students.

Schumann, Peters, and Olsen (2013) commented that the beginning of faculty-development centers and programs focused on the improvement of teaching skills and increased comprehension of student learning concepts. Centers started as a support mechanism for faculty members to grow and mature over time and become more effective. The TLCs have the responsibility of keeping up with the latest teaching trends, bringing about change, and moving faculty and institutions from traditional pedagogical models to modern ones. It is necessary for a TLC to recognize and promote the value provided to the stakeholders. They are necessary to facilitate faculty maturation and serve as change agents of higher education (Schumann et al., 2013).

Honan et al. (2013) concurred that higher education institutions with effective and continual faculty-development plans provide the formation of an institutional culture of student learning and support for faculty to achieve improved outcomes and goals. Faculty-development programs provide an opportunity for implementing institutional goals for student learning outcomes, expressing the desired outcomes, and encouraging faculty members to become better leaders for students in achieving their goals (Honan et al., 2013). Much in the same way courses are developed and adopted for students, colleges and universities can also adopt systematic approaches to professional
development for faculty.

Honan et al. (2013) stated that the development of improved teaching skills throughout members of the faculty requires resources. Institutions should not view investments in resources as a burden. These expenses or investments, whether large or minimal, for professional faculty-development activities should lead to improved learning outcomes. Additionally, McGowan and Graham (2009) noted that assisting faculty members to advance active and practical learning, improving student interactions, clarifying course expectations, and learning outcomes are elements of effective teaching that are readily enhanced through faculty development.

**Deficiencies in the evidence.** Although there has been an increase in faculty-development programs, there has not been much research regarding the effectiveness of these programs once implemented. According to Barrett, Butler, and Toma (2012) previous evaluation studies conducted on the effectiveness of professional-development programs assumed a normal distribution of participants. The authors noted that participation in professional development is usually focused or voluntary, suggesting that previous evaluations for effectiveness of professional development might be biased, resulting in premature policy recommendations. The recognition of the importance of professional development as it relates to teacher knowledge improvement and student outcomes has only just begun to examine the effectiveness of professional-development programs. Limited numbers of studies have examined the effects of professional development on student outcomes; however, there is even less research on the effects of such initiatives on faculty development (Barrett et al., 2012).

The level of increasing accountability warrants a demonstration of needs and improvements with learning centers. With the increase of transparency and accountability
in higher education, TLCs have sought different methods to provide evidence of their impact on teaching and learning (Nadler, Shore, Taylor, & Bakker, 2012). According to Bélanger, Bélisle, and Bernatchez (2011), a study conducted nationally by Chism and Szabo in 1997 demonstrated that TLCs usually evaluate their services with the aim of improvement; however, the results are seldom published, and the data are strictly for internal utilization. This information will prove useful once published and shared so other learning centers can model successful structures and design while seeking improvement.

Bélanger et al. (2011) stated that learning-center evaluations are a necessity to demonstrate accountability of quality teaching from educational-development activities. Such evaluations serve to reinforce the relevance and presence of a TLC in higher education institutions and could demonstrate need in the event of budget cuts. A methodological and continuous evaluation of services offered by a TLC is necessary to ensure that activities developed and provided correspond to the perceptions of the community, and the services actually meet their needs (Kalish & Sorcinelli, 2007).

**Setting for the study.** The setting that was used to conduct this study was a 4-year proprietary, statewide, nonprofit career university that currently offers 37 associate degree programs, 27 baccalaureate programs, 17 master’s degree programs, five doctoral degrees, and two educational specialist programs. The student population is approximately 16,713, of which 15,842 are undergraduate students. The university has 975 full-time faculty members and 701 part-time faculty members. The university has a diverse offering of programs within a southeastern state in the United States and has 14 campuses. The university is a regionally accredited institution.

In 1984, the institute of technology applied for accreditation through the Commission on Occupational Educational Institutions of the Southern Association of
Colleges and Schools, and it was successful. The institute subsequently developed general education courses to provide students with a more rounded education. In 1986, the institute of technology received approval from the state board of independent colleges and universities to offer associate of science degrees. Again, the name was changed to reflect its offerings more accurately and became a college.

In 1989, the college received candidacy for accreditation with the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to award the associate degree. In 1991, the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accredited the college to award associate degrees. Between 1991 and 2010, the college expanded by establishing 14 campuses throughout the state and one overseas, and, between 2010 and 2013, the university added three more campuses. In 2002, the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accredited the college to award baccalaureate degrees.

In 2006, the college was accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to award master’s degrees and changed its name once again to reflect its offerings and became a university. In 2009, the university attained Level V approval from the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to award doctoral degrees. In 2012, the university attained Level VI recognition from the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Level VI is the highest classification awarded to institutions offering four or more doctorate degrees.

The key developments at the university demonstrated the institution’s commitment to meeting the needs of a growing and advancing society while continuously striving for self-improvement as an organization. The university noted that, in today’s
society, there is a genuine need for a university that offers quality academic and career education in a personalized setting. The university offers career educational programs that prepare students to enter into their chosen career field upon graduation.

The TLC of the university serves to enhance faculty development as well as student learning. The TLC has a direct relationship to the university’s mission to uphold quality teaching, learning, and research. For the university to fulfill its mission, both faculty members and students have continual access to academic services, such as (a) faculty teaching and learning seminars; (b) student success sessions on test taking, time management, and learning and comprehension strategies; and (c) department consultations. These services are available at all campuses. The TLC’s core mission is to provide faculty members with methodologies to develop their skills as reflective learners through context-rich learning environments.

Audience. To continue to maintain instructional and academic excellence, the university must continue to evaluate its institutional effectiveness. An increased understanding of the efforts of the TLC’s faculty-development workshops will enable the university to be better equipped to prepare faculty members to meet the challenges and expectations of the university itself, as well as provide quality instruction and support to students. The university will be able to utilize the feedback from faculty members regarding the usefulness of the faculty-development workshops to improve the initiatives of the TLC. Constructive workshops should enable faculty members to continue to develop professionally on various topics and better meet the needs of students, which is necessary for retention and student satisfaction. With increasing growth of the university, it is essential that the university continue to improve and evaluate efforts relating to faculty development and academic excellence. The information obtained from this study
will benefit the TLC, faculty members, administration, and students of the university.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this applied dissertation, the following terms are defined.

**Adult learner.** This term refers to an individual over the age of 25 pursuing postsecondary studies at a higher education institution.

**Andragogy.** This term refers to the theory of adult learning; it encompasses the art and science of teaching adults (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011).

**Associate dean.** This term refers to an academic official over allied health, general studies, or technology departments.

**Dean of academic affairs.** This term refers to the senior official over the academic department at a campus.

**Faculty development.** This term refers to professional development in the form of workshops offered by the university on various instructional and academic topics.

**Higher education.** This term refers to the “study beyond secondary school at an institution that offers programs terminating in an associate, baccalaureate, or higher degree” (Snyder & Dillow, 2011, p. 680).

**Higher education institutions.** This term refers to an institution that possesses legal authority to offer and offers at least a 4-year college level degree that is creditable toward a baccalaureate degree (Snyder & Dillow, 2011). This also includes 2-year college programs with the same or similar stipulations of authority to transfer credits toward a baccalaureate degree (Barber, Donnelly, & Rizvi, 2013).

**Mentor.** This term refers to a “one-on-one relationship in which an experienced faculty member guides and supports the career development of a new or early career faculty member” (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007, p. 58).
**Nontraditional learner.** Choy (2002) defined a nontraditional learner as having one or more of the following characteristics: (a) did not pursue postsecondary education in the same year of high school completion, (b) attends school part time, (c) works full time, (c) is financially independent, (d) has dependents, (e) is a single parent, or (f) has a general educational development certificate.

**Teaching and learning center.** This term refers to a department of the university that serves to enhance student learning and faculty development.

**Traditional age.** This term refers to individuals between the ages of 18 and 24 pursuing postsecondary studies at a higher education institution.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of the usefulness of the TLC’s initiatives related to faculty development with a focus on various instructional and academically related topics. New faculty hires are required to attend an educator seminar conducted by the university’s TLC. These educator seminars are typically held on alternating months at two different locations within the state. Seasoned faculty members are encouraged to attend this specific seminar as a form of professional development in addition to other professional-development activities conducted on the various campuses by the TLC. This examination was designed to identify strengths, limitations, and inefficiencies of the TLC’s faculty-development initiatives at a nonprofit, proprietary, career university.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Before the commencement of this study to determine the perceptions of the faculty on the TLC’s initiatives related to faculty development, it was first useful to establish a theoretical framework. This chapter provides a theoretical framework and context for the examination of the effectiveness of the faculty-development workshops offered on a particular campus of a statewide university. In addition, the extensive literature review provides insight into TLCs, the increase in diversity, changing faculty characteristics, the need for faculty-development workshops, and the future of faculty development.

Theoretical Framework

The theories utilized for the conceptual framework of this study include a combination of the social-cognitive theory, adult learning theory, and experiential-learning theory. These theories assess the extent of possible barriers that may influence the faculty-development workshops offered by TLC of the university.

Social-cognitive theory. According to Bandura (1986), social-cognitive theory is the combination of personal, environmental, and behavioral factors to influence goals and actions. This theory was initially postulated as a social-learning theory, but the cognitive aspect became more pronounced over time, and it later became known as the social-cognitive theory. Merriam, Caffarella, and Baumgartner (2007) noted that the terminology of the theory explains itself in that the social part refers to the social origin of human thought and action, and the cognitive part addresses the causal influence of thought processes to action, motivation, and effects.

Social-cognitive theory has significant relevance to adult learning as it addresses the learner and the environment. Merriam et al. (2007) stated that behavior is a result of
the interaction of learner with their surroundings. Bandura (1986) noted that this concept has reciprocity in that learners influence their environment, which, in turn, influences their behavior. This results in a three-dimensional model of learning, and the social context is the foundation in which learning takes place. According to Merriam et al., variations in behavior under the same conditions are a result of idiosyncratic personality characteristics and their interaction with the environment.

**Adult learning theory.** One must be able to comprehend adult learners and their needs. Malcolm Knowles’ theory of adult learning stated that adult learners thrive in a safe environment that accepts, supports, and respects their individual needs, capabilities, and achievements. Adult learners want an atmosphere that promotes creativity, experimentation, and intellectual freedom (Billington, 2007; Knowles, 1980). When the adult learner invests in the learning process and is able to connect and apply new knowledge, he or she learns more. Frequent methodical feedback on learning assists the adult learners to adjust to ensure they meet their learning needs and personal goals (Billington, 2007).

Merriam et al. (2007) noted that many frameworks and models exist that contribute to one’s understanding of adult learners, and the most common concept is that of andragogy introduced by Malcolm Knowles in 1968. Knowles (1980) stated that andragogy is the art and science of facilitating adult learning. Adults have autonomy and are self-directed with the ability to determine their own learning goals. Self-directed adult learners decide what to learn, determine which projects to participate in, and figure out how to utilize the application of knowledge acquired. Knowles noted that the andragogy theory is based on the characteristics of an adult, such as skills, knowledge, and learned behaviors, which are necessary in the training and learning process. Billington (2007)
agreed that adult learners are self-directed, and they prefer to control their own learning through educational experiences that align with personal goals.

According to Knowles et al. (2011), adult learners undergo obstacles in their drive to learn and have personal and professional requirements that must be balanced along with the strain of learning. The authors mentioned that prior educational and professional experiences might present obstacles to learning if new knowledge clashes with prior educational or personal experiences. These issues must be addressed before adult learners begin the learning process.

**Experiential learning.** Yardley, Teunissen, and Dornan (2012) noted that David Kolb was a widely recognized experiential learning theorist. Kolb (1984) proposed that learning from experience requires four abilities: (a) openness and willingness to engage in new experiences, (b) observational and reflective skills to see different views, (c) analytical skills to create new ideas and concepts and decision making, and (d) problem-solving skills for practical application. Kolb noted that the simple acquisition or transmission of subject matter does not change an individual. The transformation occurs as the individual interacts with the subject matter inside an experience and upon reflection of learned concepts. Yardley et al. added that experiential learning is the construction of knowledge and meaning through life experiences with learning occurring within multidimensional interactions. Consequently, higher education organizations must take into consideration these theories when planning and facilitating faculty-development activities.

**Teaching and Learning Centers**

A discussion of TLCs and their functions is necessary to comprehend its origins, purpose, structure, and initiatives. Schwartz and Haynie (2013) noted that, as TLCs
developed across the nation, they had names such as “center for teaching excellence, teaching enhancement center, or the center for teaching and learning” (p. 101). The initiation of faculty-development centers, such as TLCs, dates back to the 1960s (Schumann et al., 2013). Lee (2010) stated that the first teaching center in the nation materialized at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor in 1962 and was called the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.

The University of Massachusetts at Amherst soon followed with the Clinic to Improve University Teaching. Since this time, there has been a steady rise in the number of educational development centers across the nation and abroad (Lee, 2010). All the centers had the same ideas that were focused on improved teaching skills in combination with increased comprehension of student learning theories (Schwartz & Haynie, 2013). Such centers realized that allowing faculty members to become effective takes time and growth, and some require a support system to aid in this process.

The TLCs materialized to aid faculty members in dealing with students who were underprepared, and the centers focused on methods for effective engagement and student learning assessment. Clark and Saulnier (2010) noted that increased undergraduate enrollment combined with sharp declines in college preparation necessitated the formation of remedial learning centers and faculty development centers to support students. The response in academia to the increasing lack of student college preparation was partly propelled by a study conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Boyer (1981) discussed the quality of American public high school education in the study. The report resulted in a surge of faculty-development centers such as TLCs in an effort to aid faculty members to hone in on curricula and help students learn. One of the first faculty-development centers was created at Miami
University in Ohio, and it served to support instructors (Clark & Saulnier, 2010).

Bélanger et al. (2011) contended that, as instructors participate in the learning activities, such as workshops and consultations offered by TLCs, these activities are an inherent part of the obligation to educational development. Schumann et al. (2013) stated that TLCs usually focus on one-on-one contact with faculty members to help improve teaching methods and impart information regarding student learning; thus, faculty-development centers encourage the use of teaching methodologies appropriate for individual disciplines to advance student learning. The TLCs keep faculty members updated with modern teaching trends and represent the mechanism to initiate change and transform the faculty and school toward new pedagogical models and institutional culture (Clark & Saulnier, 2010; Schumann et al. 2013; Schwartz & Haynie, 2013).

New TLC recruits need continuous mentoring as they become acclimated with faculty-development work and are socialized to ensure staff training and retention (Schumann et al., 2013). It would be necessary for the staff members of a TLC to have a variety of skills and training to address essential needs. Every center will vary in composition and size but should at least have a faculty director, instructional designers, support staff, student workers, and an advisory board (Lee, 2010; Schwartz & Haynie, 2013). This type of structure appears to be very formal and requires a dedicated budget for operation, which many institutions may not be able to afford. The benefit of having a faculty director means that the individual understands the needs and concerns of the faculty, is open to diverse methodologies, and can design programs around the faculty (Schwartz & Haynie, 2013). Many institutions may choose to run a more informal type of TLC without having to deal with bureaucracy.

Lee (2010) commented that learning centers have a variety of programs and
services, most commonly consisting of workshops, consultations (i.e., student and faculty), and classroom observations. Learning centers might also participate in the identification of teaching excellence through the coordination and planning of teaching awards but not the selection process. Additionally centers possess resources on teaching and learning, such as books, periodicals, newsletters, journals, websites, and links to additional resources. The TLC programs have changed with the times, but they have maintained their niche from the origin of their existence (Lee, 2010). Schumann et al. (2013) noted that the survival and success of TLCs in a fluid higher education environment is dependent upon their ability to recognize and endorse the value provided. Thus, centers need to demonstrate successful outcomes because of their efforts.

**Faculty Development**

Faculty development in higher education was already beginning when the nation’s schools dealt with intricate social issues and economic turbulence of the late 1950s and 1960s, such as war opposition and female liberty, and the African American power movement of the 1970s (Bergquist, 1992; Clark & Saulnier, 2010; Gillespie & Robertson, 2010; Rice, 2007; Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). Gillespie and Robertson (2010) noted that the advent of the movement for student rights within higher education allowed students to have more control over their choice of studies. In addition, students wanted the ability to provide feedback and input on courses (Gaff & Simpson, 1994).

Fink (2013a) defined faculty development as combinations of activities that engage faculty members in ongoing professional development and enhance their instruction and curriculum design to meet the educational needs of students and greater society while fulfilling the mission of the higher education institution. Faculty
development serves to help faculty members to develop student- or learner-focused teaching methods. These methods focus on other modes of delivery rather than the traditional lecture style. Although one needed formal training to teach at the primary and secondary levels, there was no rigorous training intended for teaching in higher education (Fink, 2013a, 2013b; Schwartz & Haynie, 2013). The realization that training was necessary materialized in the mid-20th century, but efforts to address the need were not very successful. If there is no formal training available, one tends to resort to the traditional method of lecture or adapt the style one experienced as a student. This essentially resulted in the presentation of knowledge via lecture and lab for sciences and classroom discussions for humanities subjects (Fink, 2013a, 2013b).

As higher education continued to experience changes and student-centered learning became the focus, there was a strong need for change in faculty approaches in the classroom. Traditional methods were becoming dull and defeated the purpose of student success. With this in mind, new professors needed to develop new and improved methods of delivery (Fink, 2013a). This meant that these professors had to have a means to obtain these skills either through special graduate training programs or on-the-job training. The availability of graduate training was limited, so many higher education institutions sought to provide their own internal training via TLCs. These centers, armed with various teaching and learning philosophies, would improve student-learning outcomes due to the faculty development that was provided (Fink, 2013a).

Estepp, Roberts, and Carter (2012) opined that many critics in higher education claimed that graduates of higher education do not have the necessary skills to enter the workforce. These critics believe that instructors hold the key to students’ success and should concentrate on effective teaching strategies that involve students and foster
learning. Although many faculty are hired for research expertise, they possess minimum skills in pedagogical techniques; therefore, faculty-development programs are necessary to help faculty members develop effective teaching and delivery methods (Beckerman, 2010; Estepp et al., 2012). The National Research Council (2009) noted that higher education is tasked with the responsibility of preparing and producing competent human capital, which is the next generation of workers, leaders, and scientists. The Council demanded changes in the way undergraduates were taught due to globalization, science, consumerism, and environmental and demographic changes, as well as politics. The best place to enforce such changes in education would be with teachers and providing the most appropriate resources for them to be successful.

Nandan and Nandan (2012) noted that the changing expectations of society warranted ongoing faculty development for institutions to remain globally competitive and not just achieve institutional success. Higher education faculty members need faculty development to support continuous learning. This learning will help faculty members adapt to changing work conditions, technologies, research, and pedagogies. At the beginning of a faculty member’s career, such changes need to be instilled and cultivated, demonstrating continuous learning and improvement over one’s academic lifetime. Faculty-development programs serve to orient faculty members toward recent developments in their academic fields in a timely manner (Nandan & Nandan, 2012).

**Mentoring.** Sorcinelli and Yun (2007) defined mentoring as a “top-down, one-on-one relationship in which an experienced faculty member guides and supports the career development of a new or early career faculty member” (p. 58). According to Beane-Katner (2014), new faculty members often present with a variety of challenges when transitioning into academia, and the ever-changing environment of higher
education makes the ground seem unsteady. New faculty members need creative and deliberate mentoring to help construct professional competencies in academia. Beane-Katner suggested using a mentoring network as the foundation for new faculty-development programs that respond to new faculty needs and expectations while helping to them to reach their full potential and encourage institutional change.

In modern academia, the traditional mentoring method of an experienced faculty members guiding an inexperienced faculty member is no longer applicable with changing faculty characteristics, changes in the academia workplace, and overall competence (Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007; Zellers, Howard, & Barcic, 2008). The expectation of an individual to have time, skills, and knowledge to conduct comprehensive mentoring in today’s academic environment is difficult. In the past, new faculty mentoring was conducted informally in an unstructured and unplanned way without involvement of the institution (Chao, 2009). Mentoring arrangements are not ideal for today’s faculty, as women and underrepresented faculty members encounter challenges with the informal mentoring process (Chao, 2009; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008). Old methods of mentoring require a makeover with creativity and time management crucial for successful mentoring.

Turner et al. (2008) added that minorities and faculty members of diverse backgrounds experience diminished networking opportunities and collegial support. Sorcinelli and Yun (2007) agreed that mentoring is critical to a successful career in academics, especially for faculty members of minority and diverse backgrounds. Thus, a more formal approach to mentoring will ensure accessibility and equity for everyone. New faculty members want learning experiences that are challenging, interactive, integrative, collaborative, and inspiring (Black, 2010). For academia to attract and retain
ideal candidates, mentoring opportunities need to be supported for new faculty members, along with their needs, prospects, and learning preferences (Beane-Katner, 2014).

**Faculty-Development Programs**

Many institutions of higher learning utilize a variety of approaches to faculty development. These approaches may consist of training workshops, mentoring, and general professional development. Hill, La Kim, and Lagueux (2007) noted that Columbia College in Chicago offers a variety of opportunities for professional development to meet the needs of its diverse faculty body. Columbia College’s Center for Teaching Excellence views faculty development as an ongoing reflective process for faculty members at all stages in their careers. The center is not focused solely on new faculty or remediation measures; the center address practices and principles of teaching at all levels, facilitates communication, and promotes an academic environment supportive of teaching and learning. When possible, events and occasions are created so faculty members can learn from other faculty members. The center designs seminars and workshops to allow faculty members to participate in a variety of ways such as initiators, facilitators, and leaders. The center promotes collaboration across the college with different departments, offering weekly workshops and seminars per semester of teaming up with other departments and offices to cosponsor sessions (Hill et al., 2007).

Thomas and Goswami (2013) noted that strong and well-designed professional-development programs can help first- and second-year faculty members to be successful in academia. Texas A&M University has an extended faculty-development program that was implemented when the university’s leadership recognized the need for a professional-development program that offered more than just an orientation but also continued nurturing for success. The Center for Teaching Effectiveness at Texas A&M
designed and conducted a trial run of a new faculty investment program for 1 year to assist new faculty members to be productive and move toward tenure. The goals of the program were to design effective learning experiences for students with integration of technology and to identify policies and procedures for securing funding for research (Thomas & Goswami, 2013).

The program was offered weekly to new tenure-track faculty members regardless of previous university experience, and it also addressed teaching and grant writing. The expectation was that the participants would also engage in the conference on the scholarship of teaching and learning at the institution. In addition, the center ensured that each new faculty member was assigned a mentor who was usually from the same department. The new faculty members were given one course release per semester, which allowed them to participate and added to the program’s success (Boyer, 1990; Thomas & Goswami, 2013).

The weekly sessions took place every Friday for 2 hours beginning at noon and incorporated a 30-minute portion for networking and lunch. Each session facilitated the path toward promotion and tenure through initiation of all parts of the university, such as policies, resources, organization, and personnel. The initiation also included professional development in teaching, grant writing, and meeting the local community. Attendance was required, but some faculty members missed sessions due to personal reasons; the final session had the lowest attendance (Thomas & Goswami, 2013). At the conclusion of the program, the participants were required to reflect on their teaching and regard it as scholarship. The participants also had to submit and present proposals at the center’s conference on the scholarship of teaching and learning at the institution.

Thomas and Goswami (2013) noted at the completion if the first, second, and
third year of the new faculty investment program, each group was asked to share personal perspectives. The weekly meetings allowed faculty members to build relationships with faculty members from other disciplines creating unity. Members of each cohort commented that the program demonstrated the university’s commitment to professional development and growth, with many other positive remarks. The most useful teaching activities from the program included tips from more experienced faculty members, reading books on teaching, and peer classroom observation. The many discussions that resulted from these activities offered an opportunity for participants to reflect on their personal beliefs on teaching (Thomas & Goswami, 2013).

Thomas and Goswami (2013) stated that the perceptions of participants demonstrated the overall impact of individual activities and the new faculty investment program was valuable to new faculty members as they navigated through academia. One change that was implemented in the program to offset any negative attitudes was to clearly communicate the university’s expectation and reinforce the support the program offers. Faculty time is invested; therefore, faculty members must recognize the benefits of participation. To aid with this, the deans and provosts attended the first session to emphasize the importance, especially in preparing for tenure as well as to express their expectations. Prior to the start of the program, new faculty members reported their skills and needs, with new sessions added as necessary. Participants had the opportunity to evaluate all the sessions, and those with low ratings were changed or replaced in succeeding sessions. Since the inception of the program in 2009, the lunch sessions have become more structured to keep faculty members on topic. Additionally, the deans requested that meetings be held biweekly in the fall and spring semesters (Thomas & Goswami, 2013).
In the second year of the program, participants are able to focus on teaching or grant writing and publishing. At this time, participants select a mentor from their department in one of these areas. In the event that none is available, an interdepartmental member is utilized. The participants meet monthly with their mentors at a lunch session organized by the center. At the first session, goals are established and future topics for discussion. Mentors can receive up to $300 toward professional expenses as a form of reward and recognition for their involvement (Thomas & Goswami, 2013).

Thomas and Goswami (2013) noted that the program was in its fourth year and continues to receive support from administration as new faculty are seen as productive and offer collegiality. Department chairs find the structure of the program to be beneficial as a recruitment tool with the release time and a means to establish research plans. It is still soon to determine tenure, but the retention rates are 81% for the first cohort, with progress toward tenure, and the second and third cohorts have a 100% retention rate. There were no available data for earlier years. The program continues with the current activities that faculty members find beneficial and will seek to enhance these activities by offering a choice of tracks during the second semester of the first year. The tracks will consist of active learning practices, use of technology, publishing, grant writing, and a transcultural program (Thomas & Goswami, 2013).

Fox (2012) noted that Curry College in Milton, Massachusetts, offers a faculty peer-support program for all faculty members to connect for professional development that is more personalized. The program allows participants to select a partner or partners and arrange meeting times, places, and the topics for discussion. All activities are self-directed between mentor status and session times. The program allows faculty members to connect with each other and support professional development determined by
themselves. Some of the groups consist of two or more individuals, and the sessions take place three or more times in an academic year; however, a minimum of 5 hours is required. Program participation is private and voluntary, and informal handshake confers confidentiality and trust (Fox, 2012).

Fox (2012) further stated that the program is fairly simple and uncomplicated, making it inviting to faculty. Every fall semester, e-mails go out to faculty members, and those interested in participating connect with each other. This information is provided to the volunteer coordinator, and arrangements for meeting are set up. Guidelines are provided, along with an evaluation questionnaire regarding goals, organization, and relationship roles. Participants who complete both the questionnaire and the program receive a certificate of participation as proof of participation and can be included in faculty portfolios. This information continues to contribute to longitudinal program research spanning 11 years (Fox, 2012).

Fox (2012) observed that the program began in 2000 with a move away from typical faculty-development offerings of workshops, retreats, and speakers. The faculty peer-support program offers minimal boundaries and less external management influence. The program began when one faculty member reached out to another due to frustration by the inability to ask questions after a presentation. The other faculty member needed assistance and support with reading problems experienced by students. Each one offered the other reflective support for individual concerns. Other faculty members were asked if mutual peer support would be beneficial to them, and their feedback resulted in a loosely structured program without force to participate. With leadership permission, the faculty peer-support program was offered as a pilot study to 33 faculty members within the same department for 6 years. Of these participants, 97% wanted to participate again, and this
caused the chief academic officer to sanction the program for full implementation. The program has seen 228 participants and continues to be successful.

In addition, Fox (2012) noted that the faculty peer-support program utilizes mutual mentoring, reflective practice, adult learning theory, self-direction, individualized learning, active learning, and equality. The data collected over a period of 11 years consistently revealed a high degree of satisfaction, with 99% of faculty members saying they would participate again. The faculty peer-support program is an effective faculty-development model for faculty members who are disciplined and self-directed, and it can transform professional-development goals into action. The participants expressed satisfaction and desire for human connection that supports faculty work. With participants accountable for their own goals and success, there may be a deep personalized investment.

The faculty peer-support program can be easily implemented in other institutions, and the results indicate that it can be successful. When there is a high degree of self-motivation, there is minimal need for institutional oversight. The author believed that, even though numerous faculty-development workshops exist, not many are personalized or cognizant of the different learning styles of faculty members. Additionally, some workshops are not open to all faculty members; they are private and do not provide the opportunity for autonomy. The faculty peer-support program offered by Curry College addresses these needs while enhancing traditional offerings of the institution (Fox, 2012).

Schechner and Poslusny (2010) described the model of faculty development used at Widener University and the program benefits to new faculty members as they develop as teacher scholars and contribute to governance at the university in a varied academic community. Widener University provides a 1-day orientation for all new faculty members
at the university. Faculty members are provided with information on policies, procedures, benefits, and governance at the university. The orientation provides a synopsis of issues encountered in the first year. This can be overwhelming for new faculty members and often inadequate. The 1-day session does not allow for the formation of a collegiate community. There is minimal time for sharing and reflection on the information presented by administrators, and it simply cannot prepare new faculty for the issues they will face in the initial years of academic employment (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010).

Schechner and Poslusny (2010) stated the college acknowledged the limitations of the orientation and recognized the need for an ongoing faculty-development program and implemented a faculty-development program with four components. The first portion now consists of the faculty orientation. The program spans the first several years of employment and is spearheaded by the dean and assistant of the college. The second portion of the program consists of a one on one mentoring between tenured and non-tenured faculty. The third portion consists of coaching sessions for faculty members who have needs such as assistance with their dissertation. The final portion consists of workshops targeted to faculty members employed 5 years and more (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010).

Schechner and Poslusny (2010) explained that the main goal of the new faculty-orientation program is to help transition the new faculty members entering the college of arts and science into the overall larger institution. At its inception, the program provided timely and consistent information about the policies, procedures, and opportunities of the university to the new faculty. It also provides mentoring services, promotes work-life balance, fosters a collegiate community through interdisciplinary bridges, and provides insight to the culture of the institution and the recruitment and retention of teacher
scholars. As the program progressed and evolved, the objectives were also refined and grew to meet the changing needs of new faculty members (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010).

Schechner and Poslusny (2010) commented that the faculty-development program started in 2006 and sought to provide information in a timely and consistent manner to new faculty. The original thought was to offer two or three workshops per semester during the first year of hire. At the conclusion of the first year of the program, the first group requested that the workshops continue because it was a good avenue to disseminate information and they wanted more information. The first group provided many ideas for future workshops and, because it was impossible to cover everything in the first year, the program expanded to a second year. Three workshops are offered each semester during the first 3 years of hire, and the program has added more objectives. Other faculty members heard of the program, and there were requests for development of workshops for tenured faculty and faculty members about to receive tenure. To respond to these expressed needs, workshops were developed specifically for this group of faculty members (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010).

Schechner and Poslusny (2010) commented that the first-year faculty-development workshops included topics aimed to jumpstart faculty members as teacher scholars, provide orientation, offer insider tours of the campus with an opportunity for questions, and give information on campus funding, learning-management resources, new course proposals, course design, research, service, and work-life balance. The first year ends with a luncheon in which first-year faculty members meet with third-year faculty members. The second-year program consists of workshops that address increased responsibilities of faculty members as they become more involved in the university community, advising and identification of at-risk students, developing research agendas,
finding off-campus funding, and learning about governance and administration. The second-year faculty members have an opportunity to meet with new faculty members at the beginning of the year and share their first year experiences. The second-year faculty members also have lunch with a faculty member who has won the award for excellence in teaching from the college of arts and sciences at the end of the second year (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010).

Schechner and Poslusny (2010) added that the third-year program entails a series of workshops that serve to broaden the outlook of faculty members on issues at the college of arts. Sessions include topics on general education, active learning, student engagement, assessment, strategic planning, opportunities for faculty, and tenure planning. Third-year faculty members are able to share their experiences with the first-year faculty members through the luncheon previously mentioned. The faculty members who have tenure or are about to receive tenure can attend workshops to help make the transition smooth. Workshops on grant writing, leadership, research, and sabbaticals are rotated, presenting the opportunity to attend if one is missed (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010).

Schechner and Poslusny (2010) noted that the workshops were designed with certain objectives initially, and these objectives have been enhanced, expanded, and continuously revamped to be engaging. The workshops have been very beneficial to the faculty members and have had more success than initially anticipated. The development program has been and continues to be upgraded with a focus on faculty scholarship and the recruitment of past participants to facilitate future workshops. This model works for Widener and can be successfully implemented at institutions that recruit 10 to 12 new faculty members per year as small cohorts of four to six are preferred by faculty.
members, as the small groups provide a positive atmosphere (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010).

**Increasing Diversity and Multiculturalism**

Austin and Sorcinelli (2013) stated that increased access to higher education has also created diverse characteristics in student populations. Students vary by age, academic background, and academic aspirations. Several are first-generation students who possess little knowledge of academic organizational culture, and some are international, representing a variety of ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds and affiliations. Austin and Sorcinelli added that students seek colleges that provide easily accessible and relevant educational opportunities, offer opportunities in the labor market, and are flexible enough to accommodate their personal and professional lives. These changes have led to an increased offering of courses at more convenient times such as evenings and weekends, new formats, and new delivery modes within higher education. Faculty members must acknowledge changes that support learning with diverse student needs and cultivate curricula and teaching methods suitable for diverse learning environments (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013).

Lee (2010) noted there were increased student enrollments in tertiary education along with a set democratization of higher education. There were more first-generation students, minority students, nontraditional students, and international students than in previous years. This necessitated changes in the delivery of higher education. McKee and Tew (2013) stated that, to address the different learning styles and the increasing number of adult learners in higher education, complementary delivery systems are being developed and implemented that seek to eliminate the physical classroom experience. Numerous of these blended or fully online classes and degree programs are student
friendly, financially feasible for educational entities, and geared toward increasing higher education access (McKee & Tew, 2013).

Krutky (2008) noted that, as higher education becomes more diverse, internal and external agencies necessitate higher education prepare students to be globally cognizant citizens. The traditional White, upper class, male student is no longer commonplace; there are now more students of color, more nontraditional students, and more females. Many nontraditional students include gay, bisexual, or transgender students with disabilities, and others have characteristics impacted by nationality, religion, or class. Stanley (2010) indicated that the challenges presented by diversity force faculty members to critically examine their traditional style of teaching and develop different methods that serve the needs of a diverse learning population. Culturally diverse classrooms represent a teaching and learning atmosphere in which respect is given to interdependence, race, and general differences. Community is valued, knowledge comes with varied perspectives, and there is a sense of equality and social acceptance (Stanley, 2010).

Stanley (2010) asserted that many higher education institutions look to faculty-development centers, such as a TLC, to help face instructional challenges and support teaching and learning values of the institution. Such changes in both the faculty and student populations require faculty-development programs that address multiculturalism. There should be a cross-section of differences in human, academic, and teaching traits to express diversity and multicultural teaching within the development program. This demonstrates the impact that diversity has on teaching and learning and serves to provide methods of improvement for students (Stanley, 2010).

Stanley (2010) cautioned that, when considering designing a faculty-development
program that addresses diversity, there should be institutional commitment, strong facilitation, and ongoing professional development. This program should be continuous, as there is always new research and model to enhance diversity. All activities should have a foundation in theory and pedagogical models. Multicultural faculty development serves to expand the social and cultural experiences of educators within higher education while meeting the teaching and learning needs of faculty members and students (Stanley, 2010). The increasing diversity within higher education warrants training and faculty development that is ultimately beneficial to all involved.

Ouellett (2010) explained the importance for faculty developers to deepen their understanding of diversity and multiculturalism. Centers such as the TLC require awareness and understanding of how campuses and the wider community are affected by diversity and multiculturalism (Ouellett, 2010). Faculty-development centers, such as a TLC, have the ability to provide new resources and improved teaching and learning practices. Centers have the opportunity to help students, faculty members, and leaders embrace and implement practices that represent and support increasing diversity and multiculturalism.

Changing Faculty Characteristics

Beane-Katner (2014) noted that the roles and responsibilities of faculty members are changing as campuses maneuver through cultural, political, social, and economic pressures. Addressing these challenges is important for the success of the faculty and the institution, and it may necessitate a change of faculty culture. Beane-Katner emphasized the need for both administration and faculty to recognize that new incoming faculty members are not an immature version of themselves. Beane-Katner referred to these faculty members as next-generation faculty. The next-generation faculty is composed of
more women and is more ethnically and racially diverse than ever before.

Maxwell (2009) also noted that these new generations of faculty share the characteristics of the generation born between 1982 and 2002, also referred to as millennials or Generation Y. The next-generation faculty members are different in their personal expectations, those of the institution, workplace culture, and the role of work in their life (Maxwell, 2009). These changing characteristics of faculty members also include the expression of increasing dissatisfaction with the traditional work environment in academia, and concerns of unclear policies and procedures related to practice, research, and tenure, as well as leadership and work-life balance (Cullen & Harris, 2008).

According to Austin and Sorcinelli (2013), new generations of professors are entering academia, bringing fresh perspectives compared to their senior professors. New professors are seeking opportunities that offer flexibility for work and personal life balance. The authors noted that, in addition to shifting perspectives on work in academia, appointment models are changing. Nationally, the numbers of both nontenure-track faculty and part-time faculty members are steadily rising, as universities and colleges seek more cost-efficient strategies (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013).

McKee and Tew (2013) noted there has been a reduction of the general education core courses in favor of courses that prepare students for specific careers in the labor market. With such changes taking place, career-driven majors have simultaneously implemented alternative delivery systems. This has left many faculty members submerged in traditional teaching methods and programs to determine if these trends are diminishing the value and status of the degree or if these trends present an opportunity to educate a new generation of students. McKee and Tew commented that these shifts in curriculum present questions of what will be taught and by whom because not all faculty
members possess the same sets of skills. The authors noted that matching the teaching strengths of faculty members to courses of study that are relevant and broad based within the discipline could enhance learning environments. McKee and Tew stated that good instructional methods matched to student learning should be a primary focus in the academic assignment process.

**Increase of Faculty-Development Initiatives**

Austin and Sorcinelli (2013) noted that, in the past, educational leaders and faculty members may have viewed faculty development as an option and not an integral part of the actual work within the organization. In the current academic climate, faculty development serves as a strategic force for organizational excellence and quality. Faculty development is an important tool for developing institutional readiness and change in the face of the various complex demands that universities and colleges face (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013).

McKee and Tew (2013) mentioned that faculty development has enabled the academic community to acknowledge that the academic environment on many campuses has changed and requires new ways of looking at education in the 21st century. The authors stated that academia must understand that campus life has changed and faculty members need to be committed to understanding new campus cultures and be prepared to meet the needs of students. Varela (2012) added that professional development must be continuous, and planning time should examine student data and gather teachers’ input on weak areas. Varela commented that building a community of learning practitioners is necessary due to the changing educational standards that require teamwork, data analysis, goal setting, and accountability at every level. Varela commented that teachers have actual knowledge of strategies and programs carded for implementation and are an
invaluable resource when planning professional-development activities.

According to McKee and Tew (2013), many educational activities have been implemented without assurance that student-learning outcomes were equal to or greater than that in the traditional delivery systems or that faculty were appropriately prepared and supported to deliver content to changing student populations. The authors added that the balance in the face of such dynamics could only be accomplished with the faculty at its best, and faculty development assists in preparing faculty to meet these challenges. Such changes with hints of subtleties provide the opportunity for higher education to continue to shape society by influencing the future leaders.

**Future of Faculty Development**

Austin and Sorcinelli (2013) commented that faculty development has been steadily changing in focus and form over the last 50 years. The authors noted that faculty development was originally organized around sabbatical leaves; however, faculty development currently offers various programs involving an increasing number of dedicated professionals. Austin and Sorcinelli noted that faculty development is a critical strategic maneuver to maintain institutional quality while supporting institutional changes within higher education.

According to Austin and Sorcinelli (2013), with such pressures and changes, faculty members continue to face new expectations, roles, and responsibilities. The authors further noted that there is a need for professional development, specifically for mid-career, senior faculty, and department chairs. Austin and Sorcinelli commented that there has been little research and practice toward understanding and responding to the needs of faculty at these levels. The authors added that there are some centers offering faculty-development programs that cater for mid-career and senior faculty. These
programs include preparation for sabbatical seminars, promotional professor workshops, new department chair training, and senior faculty mentoring.

Austin and Sorcinelli (2013) noted that faculty appointments now entail more responsibilities, scheduling considerations, and methods of program delivery for faculty and faculty developers. The authors added that some campuses offer face-to-face or online tutorials, on-campus resources, and pedagogical tools to accommodate faculty schedules. Austin and Sorcinelli added that there has been increased expansion in webinars on teaching, student learning, chair leadership, and a variety of other topics, often led by highly regarded faculty, academic leaders, or faculty developers.

Fink (2013b) explained that faculty development has established itself as an integral activity within higher education worldwide. There is a solid foundation of ideas on teaching and learning compared to the past but still needs expansion. There is still much work needed, especially with a major shift toward online learning and teaching. Challenges exist in faculty development, but the past and present can be used to shape and determine the future of faculty development. Dedicated centers and training will provide necessary transparency and skills for those teaching in higher education (Fink, 2013b).

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were established to guide this applied dissertation:

1. How do faculty members at a nonprofit university perceive TLC workshop activities that provide tools, training, and tips for success in teaching?

2. How do full-time faculty members at a nonprofit, proprietary university perceive their participation in mentoring upon hire?
3. To what extent do academic experience factors of previous teaching experience, program discipline, and education level contribute to faculty perceptions of the TLC?

4. What impact do the demographic factors of age, gender, and race have on faculty perceptions of their success after attending TLC workshops?
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter served to outline the steps needed to complete a cross-sectional quantitative study. Hewson and Laurent (2008) defined methodology in three ways: (a) as a body of rules and suggestions utilized by researchers in a particular field of study, (b) defined procedures, and (c) the investigation of the principles of methods of inquiry developed by researchers in a field of study. The study utilized survey research to determine the perceptions of faculty on the usefulness of the TLC initiatives related to faculty development at a regionally accredited, nonprofit, statewide university. This chapter focused on participants in the research, the survey instrument utilized, and procedures.

Participants

Full-time faculty members who participated in TLC workshops between May 2012 and May 2014 at one campus of a statewide, multicampus, proprietary, nonprofit university served as participants for this study. The university’s full-time faculty population was not possible to ascertain, as many campuses employ full-time faculty members based on size and need. The campus in this survey employs approximately 40 full-time faculty members. The group was further limited to approximately 22 full-time faculty members at the campus to control for variances in TLC workshop activities and initiatives at different campuses.

These participants were full-time faculty members from the time that the TLC began in 2012 through May 2014. The participants selected met the limitations of university’s approval for carrying out the study and allowed the faculty members of the campus to form a convenience sample. According to Levy and Ellis (2011), participants
are individuals or groups who agree to participate in a research study. Participants are also referred to as subjects, focus-group members, respondents, interviewees, and informants. A participant’s role in research is to contribute data via interviews, questionnaires, focus groups, personal health records, direct observation and experiments.

The participants for this investigation were invited through an invitation to participate and were required to respond anonymously to an online questionnaire, which was completely confidential. Sensitive information was not collected, but the questionnaire included questions related to previous teaching, faculty mentoring, and faculty-development experiences. The questionnaire provided demographic information such as age, gender, and race.

**Instrument**

The university currently does not have a method to determine faculty perceptions of faculty-development activities delivered via the TLC so the methodology design for this study consisted of quantitative research utilizing an investigator designed survey instrument (see Appendix A). According to Creswell (2012), survey research has many applications, especially in education, and provides valuable information to evaluate programs within schools. The survey design that was used for this study was a cross-sectional design.

The survey instrument was validated through a formative and a summative committee with pilot testing conducted on newly hired faculty at the campus that did not have the necessary participant requirements at the campus. The survey instrument contained 32 questions in three domains. The first domain contained 13 questions that addressed the first research question regarding the perception of the TLC workshop activities, which full-time faculty members had attended at the university in this study.
The first domain also contained three open-ended questions for participants to answer regarding the topic. The second domain contained 10 items that addressed the second research question regarding mentoring.

The principal researcher designed these questions based on information contained in the literature review. The second domain also contained a comment area for participants to express themselves regarding the topic. The third and final domain was designed to collect demographic and instructional experience. The researcher designed these questions to address the third and fourth research questions. Of the 32 questions in the survey instrument, 23 were Likert-type items with five possible responses ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Three questions were open ended, and the remaining six questions elicited demographic and instructional experience data.

Before administering the survey for this study, a formative committee was established through invitations (see Appendix B) to two potential committee members. Both individuals accepted the invitation, their qualifications and background could be found in Appendix C. Committee members were able to meet physically and were provided with the survey and feedback form (see Appendix D). The members reviewed the survey and provided constructive feedback. Formative committee members suggested that the questions be rearranged in the first domain to address specific aspects more comprehensively and minimize confusion from one question to the next. The recommendations were implemented, and the revised instrument was provided to the formative committee members to review. There were no additional recommendations after this.

Once the formative committee was satisfied with the survey and approved it, the researcher established a summative committee to review and validate the questionnaire.
A letter of invitation (see Appendix E) was sent to two potential summative committee members, and they accepted their qualifications and background can be found in Appendix F. The summative committee members were able to meet physically once and were provided with the survey and feedback form (see Appendix G). The summative committee members approved the questionnaire and did not have any recommendations for change.

**Procedures**

**Design.** Creswell (2012) stated that survey designs are procedures used in quantitative research that dispenses a survey or questionnaire to a sample to help distinguish tendencies in attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of a much larger population. The design of this study utilized a cross-sectional approach, which served to uncover attitudes and opinions (Creswell, 2012). The primary investigator of this research administered the survey ex post facto, as the professional-development activities being examined have already been conducted. Thus, there will be no manipulation of variables. All new faculty members are required to attend the educator seminar, and experienced faculty are encouraged to attend at least once per year as part of a professional-development activity.

Throughout the year, the TLC conducts workshops as part of professional development for faculty. New faculty members are also encouraged to work with program directors and deans prior to and during their first teaching assignment. Faculty members would not have prior knowledge of the effectiveness of these workshops until they begin teaching or complete their first teaching assignment. The survey was administered ex post facto. According to Silva (2010), an ex post facto study involves research design in which the investigation takes place after the fact without researcher
intervention.

The survey instrument was used to obtain data from full-time faculty to determine whether the TLC’s activities sufficiently prepared them to teach and provided ample and useful professional-development activities. The survey also sought to gather information on full-time faculty members’ interactions and communications with mentors to determine if support provided helped them achieve their goals with teaching in their courses. Additionally, the survey collected data on demographic and teaching experience to ascertain whether participants’ backgrounds influenced their satisfaction with the TLC.

Creswell (2012) noted that steps in a study need to be identified prior to initiating a research project. After having a variety of experiences with the TLC, the researcher initiated discussions with the academic administration in regard to conducting a study to determine faculty members’ perceptions of the TLC and its professional-development activities. The university approved the study, and the researcher was able to pursue the research project. The research study began with a thorough review of the literature and development of a survey instrument. An already existing instrument was adapted and utilized with permission from the author. The research study sought approval from the Institutional Review Board for implementation, analysis, reporting, and recommendations based on the survey. The first step of this research consisted of a literature review. Literature on the concepts of TLCs were reviewed to provide a clear understanding of its foundation and purpose. Literature on the need for faculty development, various faculty-development approaches, mentoring, the changing faculty roles, expectations, and the future of faculty development were also discussed.

The second portion addressed the survey instrument. There were no valid or reliable survey instruments found from the literature review or through a search for
applicable instruments for the study, and, thus, the researcher had to develop an instrument. A study was conducted with some similar components and the instrument from that study was used, but it was adapted and adjusted with permission from the author. Ballou (2008) noted that survey research is a method utilized by many social scientists to scientifically and empirically study information about individuals and social experiences. Surveys are scientific, as there is a customary process that is thorough and systematic that has to be monitored, documented, and reproduced.

The researcher created the survey, but it had to be reviewed for reliability and validity, and, therefore, formative and summative committees were required for this task. The formative and summative committees provided feedback and input on the design and structure of the questions and any improvements and changes necessary. The communication regarding the survey took place through a series of mainly e-mails and one meeting until both committees agreed the questionnaire was set for implementation.

Additionally, for further validation of the questionnaire, the researcher conducted a pilot study. There were six full-time faculty members at the campus where the study was carried out who were invited to participate because they were hired after the TLC initially began on the campus. Five of the six participants responded to the pilot survey and suggested that an additional question regarding level of education be included. There were no other suggestions to the survey. Approximately 22 full-time faculty members at the location under study were invited to participate. All of these full-time faculty members have attended the Keiser Educator Seminar and participated in the TLC professional-development activities.

The third step of the research project required submission of appropriate documentation to the Institutional Review Board, which reviewed the study to ensure
compliance with federal guidelines to protect the participants of the study and granted approval to proceed with the study. After this process had been completed, the survey was implemented. Hewson and Laurent (2008) noted that the use of e-mail for surveys can be viewed as the easiest and provides accessibility because most Internet users are familiar with e-mail, and either own or use an e-mail account. According to Sue and Ritter (2007), when using e-mail, the preferred method is to incorporate a link in the e-mail for the survey.

This ensures accessibility and consistent design. Offering a web-based survey can also be utilized, as this method is personal, interactive, and anonymous. The researcher asked the dean of academic affairs for the e-mail addresses of full-time faculty members who attended the Keiser Educator Seminar and TLC workshops between May 2012 and May 2014 so an invitation to participate in the study could be sent. The invitation included a statement explaining the nature of the study, the significance, voluntary participation, the anonymous nature of responses, and a link to Survey Monkey, the online survey tool that was utilized to collect data.

The fifth step involved analysis of the data. After the survey responses were collected, the data were analyzed. The investigator utilized the assistance of a statistician to assist with the data analysis. The sixth step included a report of the findings and a discussion of the data obtained from the study. The seventh step of this research included a report with a statement of the findings. The investigator focused on quantitative data. The discussion section included a summary of findings, any implications of the findings, limitations, and future research recommendations.

**Data analysis.** The investigator utilized survey methodology to determine faculty perceptions of the TLC on faculty development and mentoring activities and if these
activities effectively prepared them to instruct their first class at the university and subsequent classes thereafter. Ritter, Jong, Morgan, and Carlson (2013) stated that descriptive statistics describe data through means and various measures that demonstrate the average value of data, standard deviations combined with other measures that demonstrate the variability of data, and correlations and regressions that demonstrate the relationships among variables. Pierce (2008) added that descriptive statistics seek to work out complexity through summarizing and constricting data to represent essential characteristics that provide a correctly reflect a true effect on the observer. Waterman (2008) noted that inferential statistics are typically used to answer through testing specific hypotheses. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to organize and evaluate the data, and analyses were completed via the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Research Question 1 addressed how faculty members at a nonprofit university perceive the TLC workshop activities that provide tools, training, and tips for professional development and success in teaching. This question was analyzed utilizing descriptive statistics. The participants of the study were asked to respond to a variety of questions related to success in their teaching assignments, and they were able to choose a response based on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This question was analyzed with descriptive statistics. Participants were asked to respond to a series of statements covering factors related to success in teaching blended classes, and they had the ability to choose a response ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The null hypothesis that was tested for Research Question 1 was stated as the following: No difference exists in faculty members who participated in the TLC’s workshops versus faculty members who did not participate.
Research Question 2 addressed full-time faculty members’ perceptions of their participation in mentoring when hired. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the second research question. The survey asked participants to respond to a sequence of statements related to success in teaching and addressed mentoring relationships. Participants were able to choose a response ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). For these statements, mean and standard deviation scores were calculated and the statements ordered in rank. This allowed the researcher to examine and gain clarity of the areas that participants felt the least or most prepared for. The null hypothesis that was tested for Research Question 2 was stated as the following: No difference exists in efficacy between faculty members who had mentoring versus faculty members who did not.

Research Question 3 addressed how the influence of academic experience, such as previous teaching experience, program discipline, and academic background, contribute to faculty perceptions of the TLC. For the demographic variable of teaching experience, the survey provided four separate items on years of teaching experience at the university: (a) 1 to 5 years, (b) 6 to 10 years, (c) 11 to 15 years, and (d) 16 to 20 years. These independent variables served to provide different aspects of the same concepts and were analyzed using multiple linear regression to predict the dependent variable of the previously mentioned dependent variable of preparation for teaching.

The second academic experience factor was degree level earned, and the third academic experience was teaching specialty. An aggregate variable of perception of preparation for teaching was calculated by summing responses received in Domain 1 and dividing the number of valid responses to keep the same 1 to 5 scale that served as the dependent variable. This measured potential differences in academic experience in
relation to the preparation for teaching; thus, the independent variables were level of education achieved and teaching specialty.

The faculty degree-level factor was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics by way of a t test, as there are four possible levels in the variable. The dependent variable in this statistical test was the measurement of overall success. The final academic factor was teaching discipline, which had six possible categorical selections. For this statistical test, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to test for differences. The null hypotheses tested for Research Question 4 were stated as the following:

1. No predictive relationship exists between prior teaching experience and Domain 1 aggregate responses.

2. No difference in Domain 1 responses exist between participants of different degree levels.

3. No difference in Domain 1 responses exist between participants of different teaching specialties.

Research Question 4 asked about the influence of demographics, such as age, gender, and race, on faculty perceptions after attending TLC workshops. This question was addressed using inferential and descriptive statistics, and the dependent variable was the overall degree of success. An aggregate variable of the perception of preparation was calculated by adding up the responses in Domain 1 and then dividing the responses to maintain a 1 to 5 scale, which served as the dependent variable. This served to analyze and measure differences in the levels of perception as the information related to professional development by the TLC that could possibly be clarified by various demographic categories. The age category had seven possible choices. The same method
was applied to ethnicity. Three individual inferential tests were conducted to determine the differences in the above-mentioned dependent variables by the independent variables of age, gender, and ethnicity. For two- or three-level independent variables, an independent $t$ test was run to determine the differences in gender, age, and race. The null hypotheses tested for Research Question 4 were stated as the following:

1. No differences in average combined responses exist between male and female participants.

2. No differences in average combined responses exist between participants of different age categories.

3. No differences in average combined exist between participants of different ethnic groups.

**Limitations**

According to Creswell (2012), limitations are possible weaknesses or problems associated with a study. Limitations included inadequate measurement of variables, minimal or absent participation in the study, small sample size, measurement errors, and additional elements related to analysis and data collection. Limitations in a study are useful for future studies with similarities, as well as providing a connection for future research (Creswell, 2012). It is important and relevant to identify and report any limitations of a study. This study had several limitations that can be generalized to other investigative studies. General limitations are assumptions the researcher made during the research process. One such assumption is that the literature was reviewed accurately and thoroughly and social desirability bias may have existed. More limitations became apparent as the study was conducted and this was reviewed and discussed in later chapters.
Summary

This chapter discusses the necessary steps for completion of the cross-sectional quantitative study with the use of a survey to determine faculty perceptions of professional-development efforts at one campus location of a regionally accredited, nonprofit, proprietary university (i.e., the TLC and mentoring practices upon hire). Full-time faculty members present between May 2012 and May 2014 were invited to complete a survey via Survey Monkey. Responses to the survey provided data that were analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics.
Chapter 4: Results

University faculty members, because of their educational training and experience, have content knowledge of their discipline (Persellin & Goodrick, 2010). However, they may not have the adequate pedagogical skills to be effective instructors, and, as such, ongoing faculty development is necessary regardless of faculty members’ experience and academic qualifications (Persellin & Goodrick, 2010). The purpose of this study was to determine and assess faculty perception and quality of the TLC’s faculty-development workshops at the university under study. As part of this study statistical analyses were conducted to determine if faculty-based factors, including years of teaching experience and demographics, were significantly associated with faculty members’ perceived instructional effectiveness because of participation in the TLC workshops.

The purpose of this chapter is to review the statistical results conducted for the study’s four research questions. The chapter begins with a presentation of participant demographic and university-related variables, which are among the independent variables for this study. The remaining independent variables are then presented as the dependent variable of perceived instructional effectiveness. The chapter then addresses the bootstrapping procedure used in this study to address the small sample-size issue. The results for each research question are presented in the remaining sections of the chapter. Included in these sections are the results from the inferential statistical analyses conducted from the responses to the survey for hypothesis testing. A statistician with 20 years of professional experience conducted the analysis of the data using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Based on statistical findings, a determination to reject or retain the null hypothesis for the specific research question was made.
Participants

The study sample consisted of 18 full-time faculty members who participated in university-sponsored TLC workshops between May 2012 and May 2014 at one campus of a statewide, multicampus, proprietary, nonprofit university. Descriptive statistics regarding participant gender, age, and ethnicity are presented in Table 1. These demographic variables were also the independent variables for the fourth research question. Of the 18 participants, 10 (55.6%) were female and eight (44.4%) were male. Nine (50.0%) of the participants were 50 years or over, and most of the participants (n = 10, 55.6%) were Caucasian.

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics of Participant Gender, Age, and Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were collected from participants on their highest level of education, years of
teaching experience, and the university department in which they taught, all of which were the independent variables for the third research question. Results from these data are presented in Table 2. Three participants (16.7%) had an associate’s degree, and four participants (22.2%) had a bachelor’s degree. Ten participants (55.6%) had a master’s degree, and only one participant (5.5%) had a doctoral degree.

Eleven participants in the study (61.1%) had 6 to 10 years of teaching experience, and seven participants in the study (38.9%) had 1 to 5 years of experience. Regarding the department in which the faculty members taught, 10 participants (55.6%) taught in the health-sciences department, although four participants (22.2%) each taught in the information and technology and liberal arts and sciences departments of the university, respectively.

Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics of Participant Education Level, Experience, and Program Discipline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts and sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Variables

The study had eight independent variables. The three demographic variables of age, gender, and ethnicity were the independent variables for the fourth research question. The variables of level of education, years of teaching experience, and the university department in which the faculty members taught were the independent variables for the third research question. The two remaining independent variables for the study were participants’ perceptions of workshop effectiveness for the first research question and mentoring experiences for the second research question.

Of the 18 participants who attended a TLC workshop, three participants (16.7%) neither disagreed nor agreed that the workshop was effective, nine participants (50.0%) agreed that the workshop was effective, and six participants (33.3%) strongly agreed that the workshop was effective. The independent variable for the second research question was whether or not the participants had a faculty mentor during their first year of teaching. Four participants (22.2%) reported that they did have a faculty mentor, and 14 participants (77.8%) reported that they did not have a faculty mentor during their first year of teaching at the university.

Dependent Variables

The focus of this study was to determine, via the four research questions, if faculty training and experience factors were significantly associated with their perceived instructional effectiveness resulting from participation in the TLC workshop. The Perceived Instructional Efficacy (PIE) scale was derived from six items that pertained to faculty members’ perceived skills to utilize instructional techniques reviewed in the TLC workshop. These six items addressed faculty members’ ability to understand and construct classroom lesson plans that incorporated (a) the various levels of Bloom’s
taxonomy, (b) various learning styles of students, and (c) learner-centered activities for classes.

A Cronbach’s alpha was computed to determine the interitem reliability of the PIE scale. The Cronbach’s alpha was $\alpha = .90$, which demonstrated excellent interitem reliability (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). The PIE scale scores were computed by summing these six items and dividing by six to align with the scaling of the items. The possible range of scores for the PIE scale was 1.00 to 5.00, with a higher score denoting higher levels of perceived instructional effectiveness.

Descriptive statistics were computed for the PIE scale. As stated previously, the scale had excellent interitem reliability, with a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha = .90$. The mean PIE scale score was $M = 4.14$ ($SD = 0.63$) and the range of PIE scale scores was 3.00 to 5.00 points. The high mean score and the truncated range of scores indicated that the participants had relatively high levels of perceived instructional effectiveness. Despite the restricted range of scores, the PIE scale displayed normality, as evidenced by a skewness value that was less than 1.00 (i.e., 0.62) and a nonsignificant Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, $K-S(18) = 0.14, p = .200$ (Levy & Ellis, 2011).

**Bootstrapping**

In this study, statistical bootstrapping was employed in all analyses to address the concern of the small sample size of 18 participants. Bootstrapping is a statistical technique that adjusts for statistical biases in small samples by generating independent replicates (i.e., resampling) the existing data (Qumsiyeh, 2013). In this study, 1,000 samples were used to create the bootstrapped data set. Although bootstrapping addresses the statistical estimation biases inherent in small sample sizes, the sample from which the bootstrapped data set is derived must show similar distributions to the population...
(Qumsiyeh, 2013). Therefore, it is recommended that the original data set have at least a sample size of 15 (Qumsiyeh, 2013), which was met in this study.

**Research Question 1**

The first research question examined how faculty members at a nonprofit university perceived the TLC workshops. This research question was addressed in three ways. First, faculty members’ perceptions of the TLC workshop were examined by conducting descriptive statistics on items that pertained to the quality of the workshop. Second, participants’ responses on the open-ended question on how the TLC workshop could be improved were coded and summarized. Third, a one-way ANOVA with bootstrapping was conducted to determine if perceived instructional effectiveness significantly differed across participant groups who neither agreed nor disagreed ($n = 3$), agreed ($n = 9$), or strongly agreed ($n = 6$) that the TLC workshop was effective.

**Results from descriptive statistics.** The mean, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum scores were calculated on the five survey items on the perceived quality of the TLC workshop and are presented in Table 3. Participants noted the highest level of agreement, based on the mean score of 4.44 ($SD = 0.62$), that the workshop enhanced their understanding of what the university expected of them as instructors. Participants reported the lowest level of agreement, based on the mean score of 3.94 ($SD = 0.73$), that the supplemental materials provided by the workshops were useful. The mean item scores ranged between 3.94 to 4.44 points and indicated a general level of agreement among participants that the workshop was informative and helpful.

**Participants’ recommendations for the TLC workshop.** Participants were asked to provide a maximum of three recommendations for the TLC workshop. Eleven of the participants provided responses, with nine of the 11 participants providing two
recommendations and two of the 11 participants providing one recommendation. Seven participants did not respond to this question.

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Participants’ Perceived Quality of Workshop*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After completing the workshop, I understood the mission of the university.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After completing the workshop, I understood the university’s expectation of me as an instructor.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication regarding the workshop was clear and timely.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop was offered at a convenient time and place.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental materials provided by the workshop were useful.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty members’ responses were reviewed and then grouped according to category. Six participants (33.3%) recommended that the workshop be used to help faculty develop effective instructional approaches. Fewer participants requested that the workshop focus on building faculty computer and technology skills (n = 4, 22.2%). Two of the recommendations dealt with student issues, with a group of three participants (16.7%) each requesting that the workshop help faculty enhance students’ academic skills and course engagement and deal with difficult students, respectively. One participant (5.6%) recommended that the university mission statement be clarified during workshops.

**Results from the one-way ANOVA.** A one-way ANOVA with bootstrapping was conducted to determine if perceived instructional effectiveness significantly differed across participant groups who neither agreed nor disagreed (n = 3), agreed (n = 9), or
strongly agreed \((n = 6)\) that the TLC workshop was effective. The result from the one-way ANOVA was significant, \(F(2, 15) = 7.98, p = .004\). The Tukey’s post hoc test showed that participants who strongly agreed that the workshop was effective \((n = 6)\) had a significantly higher PIE mean score \((M = 4.75, SD = 0.33)\) than did participants who neither disagreed nor agreed \((n = 3, M = 3.67, SD = 0.58)\) and participants who agreed \((n = 9, M = 3.89, SD = 0.51)\) that the TLC workshop was effective.

**Null hypothesis for Research Question 1.** The null hypothesis for the first research question was that no significant difference existed between faculty members who participated in the TLC workshop and found it effective and faculty members who did not. Based on the significant result from the one-way ANOVA, the null hypothesis was rejected for the first research question.

**Research Question 2**

The second research question examined full-time faculty members’ perceptions of their participation in mentoring upon hire. This research question was addressed in two ways. First, descriptive statistics were computed on survey items that inquired about the mentoring relationship for those participants who reported having a mentor during their first year of teaching at the university. Second, an independent-samples \(t\) test was conducted to determine if participants who did or did not have a mentor during their first year of teaching significantly differed with regard to perceptions of instructional effectiveness.

**Results from descriptive statistics.** Four of the 18 participants \((22.2\%)\) reported that they had a faculty mentor during their first year teaching at the university. The means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum scores were computed on the eight faculty mentoring items and are presented in Table 4 for these four participants. As
seen in the results, all but one item had a mean of 2.75 ($SD = 2.06$), which indicated that
the four participants who had a mentor during the first year of teaching reported some
disagreement to the mentoring items. One item, which stated that the faculty members
had regular communication with their mentor during their first teaching assignment,
received a mean of 3.00 ($SD = 2.00$), indicating that faculty members neither agreed nor
disagreed to this statement.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Participants’ Perceived Quality of Mentoring Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to my first teaching assignment at the university, my mentor and I established goals for the mentoring relationship.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to my first teaching assignment at the university or during my first teaching assignment, I observed my mentor’s or another faculty member’s classes.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During my first teaching assignment at the university, There was a regular communication (e.g., weekly or Biweekly) between my mentor and myself.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During my first teaching assignment at the university, my mentor observed and provided feedback on my teaching.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During my first teaching assignment at the university, my mentor’s feedback helped improve my teaching skills.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During my first teaching assignment at the university, my mentor assisted me with administrative procedures.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with my mentor at the university helped me to have a successful teaching experience.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with my mentor at the university helped me to feel connected to the university.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from the independent-samples t test. An independent samples t-test
with bootstrapping was conducted to determine if PIE mean scores significantly differed
between participants who did ($n = 4$) and did not ($n = 14$) have a mentor during their first
teaching year. The independent-samples $t$ test was significant, $t(16) = 2.78, p = .013$. Participants who did have a mentor during their first teaching year ($n = 4$) had a significantly higher PIE mean score ($M = 4.79, SD = 0.42$) than did participants who did not have a mentor during their first year of teaching ($n = 14, M = 3.95, SD = 0.56$).

**Null hypothesis for Research Question 2.** The null hypothesis for the second research question was that no difference in perceived instructional effectiveness existed between faculty members who did and did not have a mentor during their first teaching year. Based on the significant result from the independent-samples $t$ test, the null hypothesis was rejected for the second research question.

**Research Question 3**

The third research question examined if faculty factors of years of teaching experience, level of education (i.e., master’s or doctoral degree), and program discipline (i.e., department in which the faculty member taught) were significantly associated with perceived instructional effectiveness from participating in the TLC workshop. Analyses were conducted for each independent variable and dependent variable relationship. As results showed that participants were classified into 2 years of teaching experience groups (i.e., 1 to 5 years versus 6 to 10 years), a bootstrapped independent-samples $t$ test was conducted with this variable and the dependent variable of perceived instructional effectiveness. A bootstrapped independent-sample $t$ test was also conducted with the independent variable of highest level of education (e.g., master’s or doctoral degree) and the dependent variable of perceived instructional effectiveness. As the study participants taught in three university departments (i.e., health sciences, information and technology, and liberal arts and sciences), a one-way ANOVA was conducted with this independent variable and the dependent variable of perceived instructional effectiveness.
Results from the independent-samples t test for years of teaching experience.

An independent-samples t test with bootstrapping was conducted to determine if PIE mean scores significantly differed between participants with 1 to 5 years of teaching experience \((n = 7)\) and participants with 6 to 10 years of teaching experience \((n = 11)\). The independent-samples t test was not significant, \(t(16) = -1.14, p = .271\). Although participants with 1 to 5 years of teaching experience \((n = 7)\) had a lower PIE mean score \((M = 3.93, SD = 0.41)\) than did participants with 6 to 10 years of teaching experience \((n = 11, M = 4.27, SD = 0.72)\), this difference was not significant.

Results from the independent-samples t test for highest level of education. An independent-samples t test with bootstrapping was conducted to determine if the levels of perceived instructional effectiveness significantly differed between participants with a master’s degree \((n = 5, 27.8\%)\) and participants with a doctoral degree \((n = 13, 72.2\%)\). The result from the independent-samples t test was not significant, \(t(16) = -0.02, p = .982\). Participants with a master’s degree \((n = 5)\) and participants with a doctoral degree \((n = 13)\) had similar PIE mean scores, \(M = 4.13 (SD = 0.52)\) and \(M = 4.14 (SD = 0.69)\), respectively.

Results from the one-way ANOVA for university department. A one-way ANOVA with bootstrapping was conducted to determine if PIE mean scores significantly differed across participants in the three university departments: Health sciences \((n = 10)\), information and technology \((n = 4)\), and liberal arts and sciences \((n = 4)\). The result from the one-way ANOVA was not significant, \(F(2, 15) = 0.80, p = .468\). There were no significant differences in PIE mean scores among participants in health sciences \((n = 10, M = 4.27, SD = 0.72)\), participants in information and technology \((n = 4, M = 4.17, SD = 0.43)\), and participants in liberal arts and sciences \((n = 4, M = 3.79, SD = 0.55)\).
Null hypothesis for Research Question 3. The null hypothesis for the third research question was that no significant differences in perceived instructional effectiveness existed with regard to faculty factors of years of teaching experience, highest level of education, and program discipline (i.e., department in which the faculty member taught). None of the statistical analyses conducted for the third research question were significant. The null hypothesis was thus retained for the third research question.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question examined if perceived instructional effectiveness significantly differed across the age, gender, and ethnicity groups of full-time faculty members. Due to the small numbers of participants across the age groups of 26 to 30, 31 to 35, 36 to 40, and 41 to 49 age groups, the age variable was dichotomized into the ages of 26 and 49 \( (n = 9) \) group and age 50 or older \( (n = 9) \) group. Ethnicity was dichotomized due to the small sample of participants who were not Caucasian, with a Caucasian ethnicity group \( (n = 10) \) and participants from other racial or ethnic groups \( (n = 8) \). Three separate independent-samples \( t \) tests were conducted with each respective independent variable and the dependent variable of perceived instructional effectiveness.

Results from the independent-samples \( t \) test for age group. An independent-samples \( t \) test with bootstrapping was conducted to determine if PIE mean scores significantly differed between participants in the age group of 26 to 49 years \( (n = 9) \) and participants in the age group of 50 and older \( (n = 9) \). The result from the independent-samples \( t \) test was not significant, \( t(16) = 0.93, p = .365 \). Participants in the age group of 26 to 49 \( (n = 9) \) and participants in the age group of 50 and older \( (n = 9) \) had similar PIE mean scores, \( M = 4.28 (SD = 0.47) \) and \( M = 4.00 (SD = 0.76) \), respectively.

Independent-samples \( t \) test for gender group. An independent-samples \( t \) test
with bootstrapping was conducted to determine if PIE mean scores significantly differed between participants who were female \((n = 10)\) and participants who were male \((n = 8)\). The result from the independent-samples \(t\) test was not significant, \(t(16) = -0.16, p = .873\). Female participants \((n = 10)\) and male participants \((n = 8)\) had similar PIE mean scores, \(M = 4.12 (SD = 0.70)\) and \(M = 4.17 (SD = 0.57)\), respectively.

**Results from independent-samples \(t\) test for ethnicity.** An independent-samples \(t\) test with bootstrapping was conducted to determine if PIE mean scores significantly differed between participants who were Caucasian \((n = 10)\) and participants from other racial or ethnic groups \((n = 8)\). The result from the independent-samples \(t\) test was not significant, \(t(16) = -0.16, p = .873\). Caucasian participants \((n = 10)\) and participants of other ethnicities \((n = 8)\) had a similar PIE mean scores, \(M = 4.12 (SD = 0.57)\) and \(M = 4.17 (SD = 0.73)\), respectively.

**Null hypothesis for Research Question 4.** The null hypothesis for the fourth research question was that no significant differences in perceived instructional effectiveness existed with regard to faculty factors of age, gender, and ethnicity. None of the statistical analyses conducted for the third research question were significant. The null hypothesis was thus retained for the fourth research question.

**Summary**

This chapter presented the statistical analyses results for the four research questions in the study. The purpose of this study was to determine faculty perceptions regarding the professional-development activities of the TLC at one campus of a regionally accredited, multicampus, nonprofit university. Letters of invitations to participate in the study were sent to 22 faculty members who participated in TLC workshops between May 2012 and May 2014. There were 18 respondents.
Analysis of the results addressing Research Question 1 demonstrated that respondents were in general agreement that the TLC workshops were effective. Participants reported that the workshops enhanced their understanding of the university’s expectations of them as instructors ($M = 4.44, SD = 0.62$). The participants also agreed that the supplemental materials provided by the workshop were useful ($M = 3.94, SD = 0.73$). Only 11 respondents provided comments regarding any recommendations for the TLC workshops of the 18 respondents. The suggestions included helping faculty members to develop instructional approaches, improve technological skills, deal with student issues, and improve students’ academic skills, as well as clarify the mission statement of the university. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if perceived instructional effectiveness significantly differed across respondents regarding the effectiveness of the workshops $F(2, 15) = 7.98, p = .004$. The Tukey’s *post hoc* test then demonstrated that participants who strongly agreed the workshops were effective had higher PIE scores ($M = 4.75, SD = 0.33$) than participants who neither agreed nor disagreed ($M = 3.67, SD = 0.58$) and participants who agreed ($M = 3.89, SD = 0.51$).

From the 18 respondents, only four reported having a mentor and, thus, responded to questions addressing Research Question 2. An analysis of the results demonstrated that there was some disagreement with the mentoring items. Of the four respondents to this question, one reported that the quality of the mentoring relationship was poor ($M = 2.75, SD = 2.06$). The respondents did not agree or disagree regarding regular communication with their mentor ($M = 3.0, SD = 2.0$). Items did not differ significantly from one respondent to another.

Analysis of the results addressing Research Question 3 demonstrated that respondents with 1 to 5 years of teaching experience had a lower perception of
instructional effectiveness ($M = 3.93, SD = 0.41$). Factors included years of teaching experience, level of education, and program discipline. Respondents with 6 to 10 years of teaching experience had a higher perception of instructional effectiveness ($M = 4.27, SD = 0.72$). The differences in years of teaching experience were not significant. A $t$ test was conducted to determine the instructional effectiveness between different degree levels of respondents. Respondents with associate and bachelor degrees had lower PIE mean scores ($M = 3.93, SD = 0.35$) than respondents with master’s or doctoral degrees ($M = 4.27, SD = 0.74$), and the difference was not significant. To address the differences regarding university departments, a one-way ANOVA, $F(2, 15) = 0.80, p = .468$, indicated no significant difference in perception of instructional effectiveness among survey respondents in different program disciplines.

Analysis of the results of Research Question 4 demonstrated that there were no significant differences in PIE mean scores regarding age, gender, or ethnicity. The $t$ test for age, $t(16) = 0.93, p = .365$, indicated no significant difference between older and younger survey respondents. The $t$ test for gender, $t(16) = -0.16, p = .873$, indicated no significant difference between male and female survey respondents. The $t$ test for ethnicity, $t(16) = -0.16, p = .873$, indicated no significant difference between Caucasian and non-Caucasian survey respondents.
Chapter 5: Discussion

To assist the reader, this final chapter of this dissertation restates the research problem and reviews the research methods utilized in the study. The main sections of this chapter summarize the results, the implications, and findings of this study. The purpose of this study is to determine faculty perceptions of the usefulness of the TLC’s initiatives related to faculty development at one campus of a regionally accredited, multicampus, nonprofit university. One of these activities, the Keiser Educator Seminar, must be completed prior to new faculty members teaching their initial classes or during their initial teaching assignment at the university.

Another activity offered by the TLC is mentoring, which is supposed to be conducted with new faculty members during their initial teaching assignments at the university. The results of this study provided the necessary information to administrators at the campus location to make strategic decisions regarding the TLC activities and a more formal process for mentoring. The research questions utilized for this study were formulated after a thorough review of the literature on TLCs, faculty, mentoring, and faculty development as well as social-cognitive theory, adult learning theory, and experiential-learning theory that provided the theoretical context for the study.

Invitations to participate in the study were sent to 22 faculty members who participated in the activities of the TLC between May 2012 and May 2014. Of the 22 invitees, 18 responded, yielding a response rate of 81.8%. According to Toledo et al. (2015) the chief advantages of online surveys are that information is collected in real time, they are low cost, they connect scattered groups, and they make result analysis easier.

The survey instrument contained 32 questions and was designed for this study. It
was validated through formative and summative committees and then pilot tested prior to being sent to participants. The survey was divided into three domains. The first domain contained 16 questions, which addressed how faculty members at a nonprofit university perceived the TLC workshops. The second domain contained 10 questions that addressed full-time faculty members’ perceptions of their participation in mentoring when hired. The first domain included three open-ended questions that allowed participants to share personal comments on the TLC workshops, and the second domain contained an open space for comments on mentoring. The third domain contained six questions, which addressed the third and fourth research questions based on instructional experience and demographic factors of participants.

Most of the study participants were female (55.6%) and Caucasian (55.6%); 50% were 50 years of age or older. The majority of participants held a master’s degree (55.6%) and had 6 to 10 years of teaching experience (61.1%). Health-science faculty members (55.6%) were overrepresented in the sample, and the remaining faculty members came from only two other departments: information and technology (22.2%) and liberal arts and sciences (22.2%). The rest of this chapter presents the survey findings related to the research questions, implications of the findings, limitations of this study, and recommendations for future research.

The primary dependent variable in this study was perception of instructional effectiveness, which was measured by the PIE scale. This scale was derived from six items that assessed faculty members’ ability to understand, construct, and utilize classroom lesson plans that (a) were guided by Bloom’s taxonomy, (b) incorporated students’ learning styles of students, and (c) involved learner-centered experiential learning activities. The normal distribution of scale scores and the excellent interitem
reliability (i.e., Cronbach’s alpha = .90), especially in a study with only 18 participants, attests to the psychometric quality of the PIE scale. The range of scores on the PIE as well as the mean score (i.e., M of 4.14 of a possible 5.00) indicated that the faculty members in this study had high levels of perceived instructional effectiveness.

The study had four research questions, which were addressed via descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. Independent-samples t tests and one-way ANOVAs were conducted for hypothesis testing. The small sample size required that bootstrapping be performed so that the sample estimates data were reflective of population estimates and that adequate power was achieved (Qumsiyeh, 2013; Salganik, 2006).

Summary of Findings

Data from the survey responses were presented in Chapter 4. The following paragraphs present a discussion of the findings.

Discussion of Research Question 1. The first research question addressed faculty members’ perceptions of the quality of the TLC workshop and their recommendations for future workshop topics. The null hypothesis for the first research question was that no significant difference existed between faculty members who participated in the TLC workshop and found it effective and faculty members who did not. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if levels of perceived instructional effectiveness differed across groups who neither agreed nor disagreed, agreed, or strongly agreed that the TLC workshop was effective.

Participants were asked to rate, using a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), five items on the quality of different aspects the workshop. The mean item scores indicated a general level of agreement among participants that the workshop was informative and helpful. Participants reported that the participation in the workshop
was most effective in enhancing their understanding of the university’s expectations of
them as instructors but was least effective in utilizing workshop materials that were
useful. Eleven participants provided recommendations for future workshop topics. The
top two faculty recommendations were that the workshop focus on enhancing faculty
instructional approaches and computer and technology skills.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if faculty members’ perceived
instructional effectiveness differed according to faculty perceptions of workshop
effectiveness. The result from the one-way ANOVA was significant. The Tukey’s post
hoc test revealed that participants who strongly agreed that the workshop was effective
had a significantly higher PIE mean score than did participants who neither disagreed nor
agreed and participants who agreed that the TLC workshop was effective. Based on the
significant result from the one-way ANOVA, the null hypothesis was rejected for the first
research question.

**Discussion of Research Question 2.** The second research question focused on the
tenured faculty mentoring component of the university’s faculty-development program.
The null hypothesis for the second research question was that no difference in perceived
instructional effectiveness existed between faculty members who did and did not have a
mentor during the first teaching year. This research question was addressed in two ways.
First, participants answered eight questions on the quality of their mentoring relationship,
and descriptive statistics were then computed to gauge the level of satisfaction that
faculty members had with regard to their mentoring experience during their first year of
teaching. The second analysis was an independent-samples \( t \) test, which determined if
perceptions of instructional effectiveness differed between faculty members who did or
did not have a mentor during the first year of teaching.
Only four of the 18 participants (22.2%) reported having a faculty mentor during the first teaching year, and the small sample size should be considered when interpreting findings. The investigator ran the descriptive statistics of the eight items on perceived quality of the mentoring relationship that the four participants answered. Seven of the eight items had a mean score of 2.75, which can be interpreted that the four participants who had a mentor during the first year of teaching perceived the mentoring relationship to be of poor quality. Having regular communication with the faculty mentor was the one item that had a mean score of 3.00 (i.e., equivalent to *neither disagree nor agree*).

An independent-samples *t* test was conducted for hypothesis testing, with the null hypothesis being that perceived instructional effectiveness will be significantly higher among participants who did have a mentor during their first teaching year and those who did not. Results from the independent-samples *t* test were significant, and, thus, contrary to the null hypothesis. Participants who had a faculty mentor had significantly higher levels of perceived instructional effectiveness than those who did not. Based on the significant result from the independent-samples *t* test, the null hypothesis was rejected for the second research question.

**Discussion of Research Question 3.** The third research question assessed if PIE mean scores significantly differed across faculty years of teaching experience, degree, and university department groups. In the original methodology, a linear regression was to be conducted to examine associations between years of teaching experience and perceived instructional effectiveness. Descriptive analyses showed that faculty members reported either 1 to 5 or 6 to 10 years of experience, making this independent variable a dichotomous variable and requiring the use of an independent-samples *t* test.

The null hypotheses for the third research question were that levels of perceived
instructional effectiveness would not significantly differ across levels of teaching experience, degree, and university department. Three separate analyses were conducted. As faculty years of teaching and degree were dichotomous, independent-samples t tests were conducted. The university department variable had three categories, which required the use of a one-way ANOVA. Perceived instructional effectiveness was the dependent variable for all analyses. Results from these analyses showed that PIE mean scores did not significantly differ across teaching experience, degree, and university department groups. Due to the lack of significance, the null hypothesis was retained.

**Discussion of Research Question 4.** The fourth research question assessed if PIE mean scores significantly differed across age, gender, and ethnicity groups. The small samples sizes in some of the age and ethnicity groups required recoding the variables as dichotomous, with age groups being 26 to 49 and 50 and older and ethnicity groups being Caucasian or other racial or ethnic groups. The null hypotheses for the third research question were that levels of perceived instructional effectiveness would not significantly differ across levels of age, gender, and ethnicity groups. As the independent variables were dichotomous, three independent-samples t tests were conducted. Perceived instructional effectiveness was the dependent variable for all analyses. Results from these analyses showed that PIE mean scores did not significantly differ across age, gender, or ethnicity groups. Due to the lack of significance, the null hypothesis was retained.

**Implications of Findings**

This study was conducted to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of faculty members’ perceptions of the professional-development activities of the TLC at one campus location of a multicampus, nonprofit university in the southeastern United States. The following paragraphs present a discussion of data collected that have
theoretical implications, implications related to prior research, and applied implications.

Social-learning theory and andragogy are two theories that play a role in the
development of both the intervention and the research hypotheses. According to Webster-Wright (2009), over the last 20 years, empirical research has shown that effective
professional learning continues long term in a supportive learning community. An
increasing amount of empirical research has demonstrated that professional development
based on the concept that professional learning is continuous, active, social, and relevant
to practice. The applied and empirical relevance of theory are both important and are
discussed according to the theory in the following sections:

1. Social-cognitive theory provides the theoretical foundation for many higher
education interventions. It is, therefore, surprising that very few studies have used the
social-cognitive theory to inform research. In their review of the literature on faculty-
development programs, Akyol and Garrison (2008) found that a limited amount of the
faculty-development programs reviewed were theoretically driven. This is a flaw but can
be remedied using existing theories, such as social-cognitive theory (Akyol & Garrison,
2008). This study was unique in that it (a) was an evaluation of a faculty-development
initiative that was guided by the social-cognitive theory framework and (b) led to the
research hypotheses that workshop participation and faculty mentoring would lead to
increases in perceived instructional effectiveness.

2. The adult learning theory of andragogy has been extensively used to inform the
planning, development, and implementation of instructional practices that promote
learning and academic success in adult nontraditional students (Knowles et al., 2011).
Examinations of its use in informing faculty-development initiatives have been less
extensive. Recommendations made by faculty members (i.e., enhancing instructional and
computer or technology skills) seen in the results reiterated the importance of andragogy. However, Meyer and Murrell (2014), in their national study of 39 American universities, found that just 59% of the university administrators reported that andragogy was used as the theoretical base for their faculty-development initiatives. It is, therefore, not surprising that few professional-development studies have utilized the theory of andragogy to frame the study and research hypotheses. This study is unique, as the faculty member as an adult learner, would benefit from professional-development activities that utilize the principles of andragogy, including the use of experiential learning activities relevant to the adult’s profession as well as a focus on problem solving and critical thinking rather than content learning (Johnson, Wisniewski, Kuhlemeyer, Isaacs, & Krzykowski, 2012).

3. Yardley et al. (2012) noted that experiential learning embraces the creation of knowledge and meaning through experiences with learning. Thus, respondents made suggestions regarding the topics and concepts they would like to have training and education on based on their own learning experiences and interactions with teaching. Higher education organizations, such as the university under study and the TLC, facilitators must take this into consideration when planning and developing faculty-development workshops.

The need for faculty training and development, including mentoring, is sufficiently documented in the literature review (Estepp et al., 2012; Nandan & Nandan, 2012; Sorcinelli & Yun, 2007; Zellers et al., 2008). Although many higher education institutions provide an orientation and training for new faculty and experienced faculty, these activities may not always meet the needs of faculty members (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010). The overall survey data indicated that the respondents were satisfied
with the workshops carried out by the TLC. Six participants recommended that the workshops be utilized to assist faculty with developing instructional approaches, and three respondents recommended that the workshop feature methods to enhance students’ academic skills, course engagement, and methods to deal with difficult students. This implies that faculty members would benefit from such activities in their teaching.

When planning and creating professional-development activities, consideration must be given to both new and experienced faculty members (Beckerman, 2010) and their learning styles (Zachary, 2012). Aside from any formal training, activities such as discussions, lectures, and ongoing mentoring should be incorporated, include practices and principles of teaching at all levels, promote communication, and encourage an academic environment that is supportive of teaching and learning (Hill et al., 2007).

The need for faculty support is found in mentoring, which typically occurs prior to the initial teaching session in which mentoring opportunities were provided to faculty members at this location of a multicampus, nonprofit university in the state. Of the 18 survey respondents, only four respondents indicated they had a mentor; this is a disturbingly small number. This poses questions as to why more mentoring did not take place at the campus. The survey data revealed that the mentoring relationships that actually did take place were not sufficient in providing support to faculty. According to Zachary (2012), mentoring programs are successful when mentoring is learner centered and considers theories of adult learning, different learning styles, collaboration, reflection, engagement, and a commitment to common goals. Therefore, the mentoring program at the campus should be examined and revised to be more beneficial to faculty members and, ultimately, the students who are instructed by them.

The literature review completed for this study included a discussion of four
examples of faculty development and mentoring programs, two of which would be suitably replicated at this university in this study. One is the mentoring program at Curry College in Milton, Massachusetts, which offers a faculty peer-support program for all faculty members (Fox, 2012). The program utilizes mutual mentoring, reflective practice, adult learning theory, self-direction, individualized learning, active learning, and equality. The program consistently had a high degree of success, with 99% of faculty indicating they would do it again. The program is an effective faculty-development model for faculty members who are disciplined, self-directed, and can transform professional development goals into action (Fox, 2012).

Another faculty-development program is currently in use at the college of arts and science at Widener University (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010). The university provided a 1-day orientation for all new faculty members at the university, but it had limitations and the administration recognized the need for an ongoing faculty-development program. The workshops have been very beneficial to faculty and have had more success than was initially expected. The development program has been and continues to be upgraded with a focus on faculty scholarship and the recruitment of past participants to facilitate future workshops (Schechner & Poslusny, 2010).

The administrators at this campus location should work collaboratively with the TLC and faculty members to revise the mentoring and faculty-development programs so it has a theoretical foundation based on social cognitive, adult learning, and experiential theories. Zachary (2012) noted that training for mentors, expectations of mentors and mentees, feedback, reflection, and evaluation are necessary in this process.

Experience factors of years of teaching experience, educational level, and program discipline were analyzed to determine whether they contribute to faculty
members’ perceptions of the TLC. Of the 18 study respondents who responded to questions regarding teaching experience, seven respondents had 1 to 5 years of teaching experience, and 11 respondents had 6 to 10 years teaching experience. Thus, more than 50% had over 6 years of teaching experience. Survey respondents with more than 6 years of teaching experience had slightly higher PIE mean scores, as compared to respondents with 6 or less years of teaching experience; the difference, however, was not significant. This also presents an opportunity for more experienced faculty to work with less experienced faculty in a mentoring role that can be included in the mentoring program. According to Beckerman (2010), senior and mid-career faculty members, together with administrators, need to provide support to more inexperienced faculty members, emphasizing the importance of excellence in teaching.

With respect to the education level, respondents with associate and bachelor degrees had lower PIE mean scores, as compared to faculty members with master’s and doctoral degrees; however, the difference was not significant. With respect to program discipline, respondents came from three departments: health sciences, information technology, and liberal arts and sciences. Again, there was no significant difference in the results between respondents from different program disciplines. However, the 10 respondents who taught courses in the allied health disciplines had slightly higher PIE mean scores than respondents from the discipline of information technology.

The discipline of liberal arts and sciences had the lowest level of perceived instructional effectiveness. The responses from the survey participants were analyzed to determine if there were any correlations between years of teaching experience, level of degree attainment, and program discipline to see if these factors could clarify differences in perceptions of the TLC, but there were no correlations to be found. The results implied
that the faculty members had success after attending the TLC workshops regardless of educational degree level or program discipline.

The demographic factors in the study, which included gender, age, and race, were analyzed to determine if these factors had any effect on faculty members’ perceptions of the TLC workshops. Descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to test for differences. With respect to age, respondents in the 50 and older age group had a slightly higher perception of success than the 49 and under category; the difference was insignificant. With respect to gender, females reported a slightly higher perception of success than males; however, the difference was insignificant. With respect to race, respondents in the other racial or ethnic group reported a slightly higher perception of success than did respondents in the Caucasian group. Again, the difference was insignificant.

**Summary**

This study provided valuable information for the local and executive administrators at this campus of the statewide, multicampus, nonprofit university. The participants of the survey reported general satisfaction with the TLC workshops, but brief comments indicated that they would like workshops on topics they thought were relevant. The mentoring program associated with the TLC demonstrated that few faculty members had a mentoring experience, but those who did found it to be beneficial. The findings of the study demonstrated no significant impact of age, gender, or ethnicity on the participants’ perceptions of the TLC workshops or mentoring activities. Additionally, the findings indicated that teaching experience, level of education, and teaching disciplines did not have a significant impact on study participants’ perceptions of the TLC and mentoring.
Limitations of the Study

According to Creswell (2012), there are limitations in all research and statistical approaches, and it is necessary to report these limitations. There were several limitations in this study that could be generalized to many studies and two limitations that were specific to this particular study. The general limitations of this study included suppositions made during the actual research process. One supposition was that the literature review was thorough, accurate, and sufficient. Other suppositions were that the data collection was appropriate and that the data-analysis methods were valid. Another supposition was that there was no social desirability bias and participants were truthful in their responses.

A key limitation of this study was the small sample size. The study was conducted at one campus location of a multicampus university. The participants were full-time faculty members who participated in the TLC workshops during a specific period at this particular location, resulting in a small convenience sample. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) noted that small samples are often sufficient for studies conducted to support management-based decisions; however, due to the small sample size of this study, there could be diminished opportunities for generalizations of results to full-time faculty at other universities. An additional limitation was the response rate of the sample. Responses in small sample sizes can significantly affect findings. The 81.8% response rate was acceptable; however, it was inconclusive as to whether or not if all participants had responded that the results of the study would be different.

The other key limitation was the actual survey instrument. Due to the nature and setting of the TLC’s activities, a specific survey instrument was created for this study. The survey instrument was evaluated and approved by a formative and a summative
committee respectively; however, the researcher’s analysis of feedback provided may have limited the instrument’s reliability and validity. In addition, because the instrument was so specific, generalizations to other campus locations of this multicampus university and other universities may be limited.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The findings of this study are based on the data obtained from a convenience sample at one location of a multicampus, nonprofit university. According to Gall et al. (2003), replicating the study will serve to strengthen the validity and generalizability of the results to larger populations. This warrants a recommendation that the study be replicated at other campus locations throughout the multicampus university, providing opportunities for executive management and the local campus administrators to identify and address specific needs and changes at those campuses. The replication could generate opportunities for the executive administration to identify areas of the TLC that require changes and improvements. A replication would serve to identify the differences in the TLC across campuses. This study replication would also contribute to the existing body of knowledge on faculty, faculty development, and TLCs.

Another recommendation for future research includes mentoring programs. The mentoring program in this study is administered by the TLC members at the campus. Study results revealed that many faculty members did not experience any mentoring and implied that faculty members would be open to it to improve instructional strategies. Thus, it is recommended that campus administrators examine the reasons for the deficiency in mentoring practices with faculty. Campus administrators should review successful mentoring programs at similar institutions and collaborate with the TLC to revise the current mentoring program for reimplementation. After this has been
completed, another study can be carried out to determine whether the improved mentoring program is meeting the needs of faculty members, and this can also be deployed at other campus locations throughout the university.

Additional opportunities for research exist outside of this university, such as conducting a quantitative study on faculty perceptions of faculty development at other private nonprofit universities. Additional studies can also be conducted at public and private universities and a meta-analysis of other studies regarding full time faculty members. All of the aforementioned studies can contribute to the existing body of knowledge on faculty, faculty development, professional development, and mentoring.

**Conclusion**

This purpose of this study was to determine faculty perceptions of the TLC’s activities on professional development at one location of a multicampus nonprofit university. Both local and executive administration required quantitative data as a foundation for strategic managerial and leadership decisions regarding faculty development at the university. A literature review regarding professional-development activities for faculty members determined that these activities were necessary along with mentoring relationships.

The literature review also revealed that these types of activities vary from one educational institution to the next, taking different forms and formats, and that limited quantitative studies on these activities exist. This study supports previous studies addressing the need for faculty-development initiatives and activities. This study contributed quantitative data on professional development for faculty to include mentoring and faculty development as a whole, contributing to the body of this type of research within higher education.
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Appendix A

Survey
Survey

This questionnaire contains 3 sections and should not take more than 15 to 20 minutes to complete. After each question in Domain 1 and 2, you will have an opportunity to add comments.

**Domain 1: Teaching and Learning Center Professional Development Activities**

Please mark your response to each statement according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After completing the Keiser Educator Seminar and TLC workshops,

1. The workshop was offered at a convenient time and place.
2. Communication regarding the workshop was clear and timely.
3. In general the format of the workshop was effective.
4. I understood the concept of learner-centered classroom activities.
5. I was able to incorporate suggested components into my class.
6. I understood the various levels of Bloom’s taxonomy.
7. I understood various learning styles.
8. Supplemental materials provided by the workshop were useful.
9. I was able to prepare learner-centered activities for classes.
10. I was able to construct lessons to incorporate various learning styles.
11. I was able to construct lessons based on the various levels of Bloom’s taxonomy.
12. I understood the university’s expectations of me as an instructor.
13. I understood the mission of the university.

What topics would you like to see covered in upcoming TLC workshops?

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

Identify 2 - 3 components of the TLC workshops that you found most helpful.

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

Identify 2 - 3 components of the TLC workshops that you found least helpful.

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________
Domain 2: Mentoring

1. Prior to my first teaching assignment at the university, I was assigned a mentor.
   _____Yes     _____No

   If you did not have a mentor, skip items 2 through 10 and click the Next button to
   proceed to the Demographics section.
   If you were assigned a mentor, please select a response to each statement according to the
   following scale:

   . . . . . 1 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2 . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3 . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4 . . . . . . . . . . .5 . . .
   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree

2. Prior to my first teaching assignment at the university, I met with my mentor.

3. Prior to my first teaching assignment at the university, my mentor and I established
   goals for the mentoring relationship.

4. Prior to my first teaching assignment at the university or during my first teaching
   assignment, I observed my mentor’s or another faculty members’ classes.

5. During my first teaching assignment at the university, there was regular
   communication between my mentor and myself (e.g., weekly or biweekly) basis.

6. During my first teaching assignment at the university, my mentor observed and
   provided feedback on my teaching.

7. During my first teaching assignment at the university, my mentor’s feedback helped
   improve my teaching skills.

8. During my first session of teaching at the university, my mentor assisted me with
   administrative procedures.

9. Interactions with my mentor at the university helped me to have a successful teaching
   experience.

10. Interactions with my mentor at the university helped me to feel connected to the
    university.

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Domain 3: Demographics and Teaching Experience

Please mark the appropriate response to each statement.

1. My gender is
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

2. My age falls into the following range of years:
   _____ 25 and under
   _____ 26-30
   _____ 31-35
   _____ 36-40
   _____ 41-45
   _____ 46-49
   _____ 50 and over

3. My ethnicity is
   _____ American Indian/Native American
   _____ Asian
   _____ Black/African American
   _____ Hispanic
   _____ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
   _____ Caucasian
   _____ Other

4. Years of teaching experience at this university,
   _____ 1-5
   _____ 6-10
   _____ 11-15
   _____ 16-20

5. Highest degree earned,
   _____ Associate
   _____ Baccalaureate
   _____ Masters
   _____ Doctorate

6. The classes I teach at this university are in the _______. (check all that apply)
   _____ Business & Management
   _____ Information & Technology
   _____ Health Sciences
   _____ Liberal Arts & Sciences
   _____ Social Media & Communication
   _____ Criminal Justice, Homeland Security, Forensics, & Legal Studies
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Formative Committee Invitation

Dear:

I am currently in the dissertation phase of doctoral work in the Higher Education Leadership at Nova Southeastern University and seek your assistance with one aspect of this study.

The title of my applied dissertation is Faculty Perceptions of the Teaching and Learning Center on Faculty Development: A Descriptive Study

To obtain data for this quantitative study, I will be utilizing a survey instrument that measures faculty perceptions of the Teaching and Learning Center’s professional development activities. There is no specific instrument available at this time and I will need to create one. This will be a new instrument, and therefore a formative committee is necessary to validate it. The formative committee consists of an internal committee that will help validate the criteria and instrument being utilized for the study.

The time commitment for this committee will be approximately two or three meetings lasting no more than sixty minutes. Meetings can consist of face-to-face on the campus or communication via email if there are time conflicts.

If you are willing and available to participate on this committee, please contact me by September 5th 2014. I can be reached at nemitchell@keiseruniversity.edu, 786-473-9493(cell), or 772-398-9990 (office) for your response as well as any questions or concerns.

Thank you for considering this request.

_________________________________
Neisha N. Mitchell
Doctoral Candidate
Abraham S. Fischler School of Education
Nova Southeastern University
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Professor
Qualifications. This member is a licensed psychologist with an earned doctorate from the University of Central Florida.

Rationale for formative committee selection. This member was selected because of experience with quantitative data, and familiarity with research surveys, and currently serves as an active ad hoc reviewer for several scientific, peer-reviewed journals including *Body Image* and *Eating and Weight Disorders*.

Process used to communicate. All communication occurred via email except for the initial face-to-face meeting to deliver the letter of invitation to participate as a formative committee member.

Professor
Qualifications. This member is a Doctor of Chiropractic, earned at National University of Health Sciences.

Rationale for formative committee selection. This member was selected mainly because of extensive experience working with statistics and research methodology. This member was also selected due to the ability to provide timely and constructive feedback.

Process used to communicate. All communication occurred via email except for the initial face-to-face meeting to deliver the letter of invitation to participate as a formative committee member.
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Faculty Perceptions of the Teaching and Learning Center
On Faculty Development: A Descriptive Study

Please review the proposed information along with this form and offer constructive criticism by responding to each item.

1. Is the instrument presented in a clear, concise, organized, and user-friendly manner?
   _____ yes
   _____ no
   Comments:

2. Do you have suggestions for any changes in the material presented? (Please add if needed)
   
   #
   #
   #

3. Do you have suggestions for items that should be eliminated? (Please add if needed)
   
   #
   #
   #

4. Do you have suggestions for items to be added? (Please add if needed)
   
   #
   #
   #

Design and Content Criteria
1. The instrument is designed for dissemination as a survey with questions for participants related to the Teaching and Learning Center.

2. The instrument is designed for dissemination as a survey with questions for participants related to their work with a mentor during their initial hire as a faculty member.
3. The instrument is designed to obtain faculty perceptions of the Teaching and Learning Center on Faculty Development.

4. The survey does not contain language that permits bias responses by participants.

Survey Administration
1. The instrument will be delivered to each designated faculty member in the same manner.

2. This survey is the only form of data collection.

3. The instrument requires 15 to 20 minutes for completion.
Appendix E

Summative Committee Invitation
Summative Committee Invitation

Dear:

I am currently in the dissertation phase of doctoral work in the Higher Education Leadership at Nova Southeastern University and seek your assistance with one aspect of this study.

The title of my applied dissertation is Faculty Perceptions of the Teaching and Learning Center on Faculty Development: A Descriptive Study.

To obtain data for this quantitative study, I will be utilizing a survey instrument that measures faculty perceptions of the Teaching and Learning Center’s professional development activities. There is no specific instrument available at this time and I will need to create one. This will be a new instrument, and therefore a summative committee is necessary to validate it. The summative committee consists of an internal committee that will help validate the criteria and instrument being utilized for the study.

The time commitment for this committee will be approximately two or three meetings lasting no more than sixty minutes. Meetings can consist of face-to-face on the campus or communication via email if there are time conflicts.

If you are willing and available to participate on this committee, please contact me by September 5th 2014. I can be reached at nemitchell@keiseruniversity.edu, 786-473-9493(cell), or 772-398-9990 (office) for your response as well as any questions or concerns.

Thank you for considering this request.

_________________________________

Neisha N. Mitchell
Doctoral candidate
Abraham S. Fischler School of Education
Nova Southeastern University
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**Academic Dean**

Qualifications. This member has a Juris Doctor from Hofstra University School of Law and has been teaching legal classes for over five years.

Reasons for summative committee selection. This member also has extensive academic and administrative experience within higher education.

Process used to communicate. All communication occurred via email except for the initial face-to-face meeting to deliver the letter of invitation to participate as a summative committee member.

**Professor**

Qualifications. This member has a Master of Public Health from Loma Linda University, and earned a Doctorate in Public Health from Loma Linda University in 2012.

Reasons for summative committee selection. This member has extensive and recent experience with quantitative research and specifically survey methodology.

Process used to communicate. All communication occurred via email except for the initial face-to-face meeting to deliver the letter of invitation to participate as a summative committee member.
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Faculty Perceptions of the Teaching and Learning Center
On Faculty Development: A Descriptive Study

Please review the accompanying proposed information and offer your constructive feedback by responding directly to each item.

1. Is the instrument presented in a clear, concise, organized, and user-friendly manner?
   _____ yes
   _____ no
   Comments:

2. The instrument allows faculty to evaluate the usefulness of the Teaching and Learning Center Workshops
   _____ yes
   _____ no
   Comments:

3. The instrument allows faculty to evaluate the delivery format of the Teaching and Learning Center’s workshops
   _____ yes
   _____ no
   Comments:

4. The instrument allows faculty to evaluate the convenience of the Teaching and Learning Center workshops
   _____ yes
   _____ no
   Comments:

5. The instrument allows faculty to evaluate the supplemental materials provided by the Teaching and Learning Center workshops
   _____ yes
   _____ no
   Comments:
6. The instrument allows faculty to evaluate the timeliness of communication regarding the Teaching and Learning Center workshops
   
   ____ yes
   ____ no
   Comments:

7. The instrument allows faculty to evaluate potential topics for future Teaching and Learning Center workshops
   
   ____ yes
   ____ no
   Comments:

8. The instrument allows faculty to evaluate the most/least relevant topics offered by the Teaching and Learning Center workshops
   
   ____ yes
   ____ no
   Comments:

5. Do you have suggestions for any changes in the material presented? (Please add if needed)
   
   #
   #
   #

6. Do you have suggestions for items that should be eliminated? (Please add if needed)
   
   #
   #
   #

7. Do you have suggestions for items to be added? (Add additional elements if needed)
   
   #
   #
   #
Design and Content Criteria
1. The instrument is designed for dissemination as a survey with questions participants can answer related to the Teaching and Learning Center.

2. The instrument is designed for dissemination as a survey with questions participants can answer related to their work with a mentor during their initial hire as a faculty member.

3. The instrument is designed to obtain faculty perceptions of the Teaching and Learning Center on Faculty Development.

4. The survey items do not contain language that may bias participants’ responses.

Survey Administration
1. The instrument will be delivered to each targeted faculty member in an identical manner.

2. This survey is the only source for data collection.

3. The instrument requires 15 to 20 minutes to complete.