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Guiding Questions

• What has been the evolution of faculty development?

• How has the field changed over the last decade (demographics, goals, structures, services)?

• In what directions SHOULD and WILL faculty development move in the next decade?

• How can centers better support institutions in creating educational environments required to achieve new century learning outcomes?
Age of the SCHOLAR: 1960s and prior

- Faculty development to advance scholarly competence
- Informal, uncoordinated, few measures of outcomes
- First teaching centers opens in U.S., reflecting emerging interest in improving teaching
Age of the TEACHER: 1970s

- Primary focus on teaching
- Foundation support spurs growth of centers - few studies of impact
- FD gains professional identity – POD Network in Higher Ed founded
Age of the DEVELOPER: 1980s

- Professional staff with PhD’s, teaching, FD experience
- Institutional as well as foundation funding
- New interest in measurable outcomes of teaching, centers
- FD associations founded in Canada, Denmark, Finland, UK
Age of LEARNER: 1990s

- Interest in learner-centered teaching, technology, assessment
- More venues for FD - associations, discipline societies
- FD key to educational excellence - Hesburgh Award, 3M
- Globalization of FD, e.g., ICED
Age of NETWORK: 2000s

- Increasingly diverse professoriate, student body, and pedagogies
- Expansion of instructional technologies and assessment
- Desire for more focus in FD on organizational change
- Partnerships & challenges in serving institutional, professional, international needs
Discussion

• Quick Table Brainstorm
  – It is now 2015 – are we entering a new age of faculty development? If so, what might it be? What are its key issues?
Studies of North American Faculty Developers 2001 and 2012

- **2001**
  - 494 responses from faculty developers at U.S. and Canadian institutions
  - Response rate 50%; 40% center directors

- **2012**
  - 385 responses from faculty developers at U.S. and Canadian institutions
  - Response rate 30%; 45% center directors

(Sorcinelli, et al., 2006; Beach, Sorcinelli, Austin & Rivard, 2013)
Demographics of Faculty Developers 2012

- 73% female
- 26.4% male

Institutional Classification:
- Doctorate Granting University
- Master's College or University
- Bachelor's College or University
- Associate's College/Community College/Technical School
- Special Focus Institution (e.g., medical school)
- Other type of institution, please specify

Age of Respondents:

- Please choose the age range inclusive of your current age.

Total Years in Faculty Development:

- How long have you held a position of responsibility in faculty development? -- Total Years
- Mean = 8.9235
- Std. Dev. = 7.2036
- N = 371
Respondents' Fields of Highest Degree

- Education
- STEM
- Arts and Humanities
- Social Sciences
- Professional (Medical, Business)
- Other
Primary Goals of FD Have Not Changed
Emphasis Among Top Goals HAS Changed

1. Creating or sustaining a **culture of teaching excellence** (72%) **75%**

2. Advancing **new initiatives** in teaching and learning (49%) **57%**

3. Responding to **individual faculty members’ goals** (56%) **29%**

4. Acting as a **change agent** within the institution (26%) **29%**
FD Structures HAVE changed
Increasingly Centralized FD Structures

- Campus-wide unit with dedicated staff (54%) 60%
- Individual faculty member or administrator (19%) 29%
- Committee that supports faculty development (12%) 3%
- Clearinghouse that distributes info (4%) 1%
- Other (e.g. system-wide offices) (11%) 6%
Most offered 2001

1. Integrating technology into traditional T&L settings
2. New faculty development
3. Learner-centered teaching: active, inquiry, problem-based

Most offered 2012

1. New faculty development
2. Integrating technology into traditional T&L settings
3. Learner-centered teaching: active, inquiry, problem-based
   - Assessment of student learning outcomes
   - Course and curricular redesign/reform
Discussion

Reflect on changes in demographics, goals, structures, and services of T&L/FD centers over the past decade.

How have they impacted your work, center and/or institution?
2020: A Forecast to the Years Ahead
In 2001, faculty developers thought we SHOULD head in these directions...
In 2001, faculty developers thought we **WOULD** head in these directions...
In 2012, faculty developers think we SHOULD head in these directions...
In 2012, faculty developers think we WILL head in these directions...
The Future of FD

We chose 2020 for its heuristic value as well as near-future reality. Please take 2 minutes to write individually before opening up to the whole group.

- What will FD look like in 2020? How can our T&L/FD centers better support faculty, students, and our institutions to achieve new century learning outcomes?
Age of EVIDENCE

Increased demand to:

- Support faculty to investigate, assess, document student learning (e.g., SoTL)

- Engage in discipline-based research (e.g., STEM, evidence-based practices)

- Help institutions to assess learning outcomes (e.g., accreditation)

- Assess quality of programming, impact of teaching center
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